THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

Parl. Papers

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

620111

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_july-23-august-16-1878_242

# HANSARD'S

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

## THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

---

41° & 42° VICTORIÆ, 1878.

---

## VOL. CCXLII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF JULY 1878,

TO

THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST 1878.

---

Sixth and Last Volume of the Session.

---

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1878.

# TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

---

# COMMONS.

## NEW WRITS ISSUED.

MONDAY, AUGUST 5.

For *Boston, v.* John Wingfield Malcolm, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 8.

For the *County of Argyll, v.* the Right hon. John Douglas Campbell, commonly called Marquess of Lorne, Chiltern Hundreds.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 15.

For *Newcastle-under-Lyme, v.* Sir Edmund Buckley, baronet, Chiltern Hundreds.

---

## NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

MONDAY, AUGUST 5.

*Haddington Burghs*—Lord William Montagu Hay.

MONDAY, AUGUST 12.

*Boston*—Thomas Garfit, esquire.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

# VOLUME CCXLII.

---

## THIRD SERIES.

---

### LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 23.

*Page*

**Message from the Queen—**

MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE—
Royal Message read by the Lord Chancellor .. .. 1
Ordered, that the said Message be taken into consideration on *Thursday* next.

**Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill** (No. 157)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) .. .. .. 3
Amendments made; and Bill to be read $3^a$ on *Monday* next.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT—MOTION FOR RETURNS—
*Moved,* That there be laid before this House—

"Return made out county by county, in continuation of Return respecting the Endowed Schools Acts, Paper No. (6.), ordered to be printed on the 21st of January last, with in each case a proximate estimate of the annual endowments of (1) The number of Schemes finally approved and in force in England and Wales under the Endowed Schools Acts of 1869, 1873, and 1874; (2) The number of Schemes published by the Charity Commissioners under those Acts, but not yet finally approved; (3) The Endowed Schools not returned in (1) and (2), nor included in sect. 3. of the Endowed Schools Act, 1873, which are within the general provisions of the Endowed Schools Acts; (4) The aggregate number and income of Endowed Schools included in sect. 3. of the Endowed Schools Act, 1873: Also,

"Return, as regards (1), of the grade, determined as in Paper (6.), 1878, of each school under the Scheme in force, and proximate estimate of the number of scholars for which each such school is attended, as well as the total number and grades of such schools and the total number of scholars so estimated,"—(*The Earl Fortescue*) .. 4

An Amendment made: Words *struck out*, and Return, as amended, *agreed to.*

THE EXPLOSIVES ACT—STOWAGE OF GUNPOWDER ON SHIPBOARD—THE "PEREORA"—Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, Lord Henniker .. 13
THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS — THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS — Question, Observations, The Earl of Camperdown; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury:—Debate thereon .. .. .. 18
THE TREATY OF BERLIN — THE PORT OF BATOUM—Observations, Viscount Powerscourt .. .. .. .. 34
CHINA—THE CHEFOO CONVENTION—Question, Observations, The Earl of Aberdeen; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury:—Short debate thereon 34

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 23.

*Page*

## *QUESTIONS.*

THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—Questions, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. 38

THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS—Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. 40

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT—Question, Major Nolan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland .. .. .. 41

THE CIVIL SERVICE—WRITERS—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. .. 42

PARLIAMENT—THE LEGISLATURE OF VICTORIA—SIR BRYAN O'LOGHLEN—Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 42

**Message from the Queen—**

MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE—

Message from Her Majesty *brought up*, and read by Mr. Speaker .. 43

*Moved*, "That this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee to take into consideration Her Majesty's most gracious Message,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Committee thereupon on *Thursday*.

## *MOTIONS.*

PARLIAMENT—NEW WRIT FOR CLARE COUNTY—SIR BRYAN O'LOGHLEN—RESOLUTION—

*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Clare, in the room of Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Baronet, who, since his Election for the said County, hath accepted the office of Attorney General of Victoria,"—(*Mr. Sullivan*) .. .. .. 44

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Member for the County of Clare, has since his Election accepted an office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report their opinion whether he has vacated his seat by the acceptance of the said office,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived*.

Words *added*:—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*.

And, on July 30, Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee .. 47

*Ordered*, That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Indian Vernacular Press Act,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*.)

INDIAN VERNACULAR PRESS ACT—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

*Moved*, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she will be graciously pleased to give directions that all proceedings which may be taken by the authorities under the Indian Vernacular Press Act be reported to the Secretary of State and laid before Parliament from time to time,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) .. 48

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for

INDIAN VERNACULAR PRESS ACT—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—*continued.*

a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive,"—(*Mr. O'Donnell,*) —instead thereof .. .. .. .. .. 69

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 152, Noes 208; Majority 56.

Division List, Ayes and Noes .. .. .. 127

Question proposed,

"That the words 'Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive,' be added, instead thereof" .. .. .. .. .. 129

*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sullivan:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*

Question,

"That the words 'Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive,' be added, instead thereof,"

—put, and *negatived.*

## *ORDER OF THE DAY.*

**Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill**—

Lords' Reasons for insisting on certain of their Amendments to the Bill *considered* .. .. .. .. .. 133

*Moved,* "That this House doth insist on its disagreement to the Amendments made by The Lords to the Bill, to which this House hath disagreed,"—(*Mr. Mellor.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

---

**Commons Regulation (Expenses) Bill**—*Ordered* (*Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Secretary Cross*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 273] .. .. .. 134

## COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 24.

## *QUESTION.*

PARLIAMENT—NEW WRIT FOR CLARE COUNTY—PRIVILEGE—Observations, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 135

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 204]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 22nd July*] .. .. 136

After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Friday,* at Two of the clock.

**Highways Bill** [Bills 95-214]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* .. .. .. .. 194

After short debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the further proceeding on Consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

---

**Jurors Remuneration Bill**—*Ordered* (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Burt, Mr. O'Connor Power*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 274] .. .. .. .. .. 198

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 25.

*Page*

HOUSE OF LORDS — STRANGERS — Question, Observations, The Earl of Camperdown; Reply, The Earl of Redesdale:—Short debate thereon 198

THE TREATY OF BERLIN — THE PORT OF BATOUM—Explanation, The Earl of Beaconsfield .. .. .. .. 202

The Queen's Message—

MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE—

Order of the Day for the Queen's Message to be taken into consideration, read .. .. .. .. .. 202

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message of Tuesday last *considered* accordingly.

Then an humble Address of thanks and concurrence ordered, *nemine dissentiente*, to be presented to Her Majesty thereupon; the said Address to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

**Commutation of Tithes Bill** (No. 151)—

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read .. 205

After short debate, House in Committee; Bill *reported* without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

**Debtors Acts Amendment Bill** (No. 163)—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Limerick*) .. 207

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

**Weights and Measures Bill** (No. 161)—

House in Committee (according to Order) .. .. .. 208

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

**Tramways Bills** (Nos. 130, 122)—

Committee *put off* till *To-morrow* .. .. .. 213

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS—VIVISECTION—Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer, Earl Beauchamp .. .. .. .. 214

Then an Address for—

Return of Licenses granted under the Act 39 and 40 Victoria chap. 77 to amend the Law relating to Cruelty to Animals,—(*The Lord Steward.*)

## COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 25.

### *PUBLIC PETITION.*

PUBLIC PETITION—PETITION FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD—RULES RESPECTING PETITIONS—Petition presented, Mr. J. Cowen; Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. Speaker .. 215

### *QUESTIONS.*

BOILER EXPLOSIONS—LEGISLATION—Question, Sir Thomas Bazley; Answer, Viscount Sandon .. .. .. .. 215

PRISONS ACT, 1877—PRISON DISCIPLINE—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 216

THE EASTERN QUESTION—CONGRESS OF BERLIN—INSTRUCTIONS TO THE BRITISH PLENIPOTENTIARY—Questions, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison, Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Bourke .. 218

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*July* 25.] *Page*

The Eastern Question—The Treaty of Berlin—Transit Dues in Austria and Turkey—Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 220

Coroners' Inquests—Death of Mr. J. Fulton—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 221

The Irish Board of Works—Report of Select Committee—Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. 221

Law and Justice—Manchester and Liverpool Civil Assizes—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. 222

General Prisons Board (Ireland)—Prison Discipline—Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. .. .. 222

Public Health — Small-Pox — Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. .. .. .. 223

Army—The Auxiliary Forces—Retirement of Officers—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. 224

Public Business—Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) Bill—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. 225

Colonial Marriage Law—Western Australia—Natal—Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 225

Sugar Convention—Refining Sugar in Bond—Question, Mr. J. Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. 226

The Anglo-Turkish Convention—The Negotiations—Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 227

The Eastern Question—The Congress of Berlin—Bosnia and Herzegovina — Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. .. .. 228

Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill—Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 229

Law and Justice—The Scotch Judicial Bench—Lord Craighill—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Lord Advocate .. 229

Parliament—Business of the House—Saturday Sitting—Questions, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Onslow; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. .. 230

The Anglo-Turkish Agreement—Production of Papers—Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 230

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**The Queen's Message—**

Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne—

Message from Her Majesty [23rd July],—Order for Committee thereupon read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" .. 231

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the consideration of Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be deferred until there be laid before this House a Return showing in tabular form (1) the Princes; (2) the Princesses of the Blood Royal, being Members of the Royal Family of England (excluding the Sovereign for the time being and Queens Consort or Dowager), from the accession of His Most Gracious Majesty King William the Third to the present time; specifying, with regard to such of them as succeeded to the throne, the date of such accession, and, with regard to such of them as contracted marriages with the consent of the Sovereign for the time being, the date of each such marriage; and also showing separately, with regard to every Prince or Princess, the several applications (if any) made to Parliament for grants, or confirmations of grants, out of the public revenues, and the results of such applications, adding in each case a Copy of the Royal Message by which such application to Parliament was made,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 320, Noes 33; Majority 287.—(Div. List, No. 235.)

[*July* 25.] *Page*

THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE—*continued.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Her Majesty's Message *considered* in Committee .. 256

*Moved,* "That the annual sum of Ten Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, towards providing for the Establishment of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, the said annuity to be settled on His Royal Highness for his life, in such manner as Her Majesty shall think proper, and to commence from the day of the marriage of their Royal Highnesses, such annuity to be in addition to the annuity now enjoyed by His Royal Highness under the Act of the thirty-fifth year of Her present Majesty,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

*Moved,* "That Her Majesty be enabled to secure to Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes, in case she shall survive His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, an annual sum not exceeding Six Thousand Pounds during her life, to support her Royal dignity."

Motion *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

**Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 249]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. James Lowther*) .. .. .. 261

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the names of the Members of the proposed Board should be communicated to Parliament before the consideration of this Bill in Committee,"—(*Mr. Charles Lewis,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 81, Noes 23; Majority 58.—(Div. List, No. 236.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee .. .. .. .. 275

After long time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 275.]

**Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment** (*re-committed*) **Bill**—

*Moved,* "That the Order for Committee be *discharged,*"—(*Sir Graham Montgomery*) .. .. .. .. .. 334

Motion *agreed to*:—Order *discharged;* Bill *withdrawn.*

---

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS [STAMP DUTY]—

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That it is expedient to impose a Stamp Duty on Licences to keep Retreats for the reception of Habitual Drunkards, and also on every Patient admitted into such Retreat, and for the renewal of such Licences, which may become payable under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to facilitate the control and cure of Habitual Drunkards.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

ELDERS WIDOWS' FUND [DEFICIENCIES]—

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of the Revenues of India, of such sums as may be required to make good the deficiency in the Elders Widows' Fund, and to enable the Trustees from time to time to meet the current liabilities of the said Fund, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to enable the Trustees of the Elders Widows' Fund to apply the Capital of the said Fund in aid of Income, and for other purposes relating thereto (Queen's *Recommendation* signified), *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 26.

*Page*

THE TREATY OF BERLIN—THE PORT OF BATOUM—Personal Explanation, Earl Granville .. .. .. .. 336

TRAMWAYS (USE OF MECHANICAL POWERS) BILLS—RESOLUTION—

*Moved* to resolve, That this House is not prepared to sanction the use of steam power on tramways generally under the conditions proposed in the Bills now waiting to be committed without further inquiry:

That further and well considered legislation appears desirable in regard to tramways to be worked by steam along public highways throughout the country in conjunction or in competition with railways, such tramways being free from many of the obligations to which railways are subject, and frequently proposed to be laid on one side instead of the centre of the road thereby affecting the property of frontagers injuriously and unequally,—(*The Earl of Redesdale*) .. .. .. 338

After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

**Idiots, &c. (Ireland) Bill** (No. 148)—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read $2^a$,"—(*The Lord Carlingford*) .. 343

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read $2^a$ accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE TREATY OF BERLIN—ALLEGED AGREEMENT BETWEEN ENGLAND AND RUSSIA—Question, Observations, The Earl of Rosebery; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury:—Debate thereon .. 344

**Naval Discipline Amendment Bill** [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Elphinstone*); read $1^a$ (No. 175) .. .. .. .. .. 385

## COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 26.

## *QUESTIONS.*

LAW AND JUSTICE—THE SCOTCH JUDICIAL BENCH—LORD CRAIGHILL—Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate .. .. 386

ORANGE PROCESSIONS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland .. .. 387

ISLAND OF CYPRUS—SOVEREIGNTY AND ADMINISTRATION—Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. 387

THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN—INSTRUCTIONS TO LORD ODO RUSSELL, JUNE 8, 1878—Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 389

THE EASTERN QUESTION—ALLEGED TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRIA, GERMANY, AND RUSSIA—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. .. .. 390

GREENWICH HOSPITAL—NAVAL PENSIONS—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. 391

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SATURDAY SITTING—Questions, Mr. Charles Lewis, The O'Donoghue; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. 391

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### Message of the Queen—

MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE—REPORT—

Resolutions [23rd July] *reported* .. .. .. 393

Question proposed, "That the Resolutions be agreed to:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 277.]

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 204]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress* 24*th July*] .. .. 396
After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day*.

**Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) Bill**—
Order for Third Reading read, and *discharged* .. .. 450
Bill *re-committed*, in respect of an Amendment to Clause 2; *considered* in Committee, and Amendment made.
Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered.*
*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. W. H. Smith:*) —Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

**Bishoprics Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 197]—
Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next .. .. .. 450

The House suspended its Sitting at five miuutes to Seven of the clock.

The House resumed its Sitting at Nine of the clock.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Colony of Natal—Administration of Native Affairs—Resolution—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House strongly condemns the policy of the Local Government of Natal in employing the machinery of British Courts in that Colony for the purpose of legalising polygamy and validating and enforcing Native usages which recognise rights of property in women and children; and this House is of opinion that measures should at once be taken to promote the civilization of the native tribes, and to facilitate their withdrawal from the savage state, and recommends the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the subject," — (*Mr. Alderman M'Arthur*,)—instead thereof .. .. .. .. 451

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Brewers' Licences—Resolution—Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "licences to conduct recognized trades are unjust and impolitic in principle, and that the licence tax inflicted on the interests of the Brewers ought to be repealed whenever the state of the Revenue will permit the remission of taxation," —(*Sir Edward Watkin*,)—instead thereof .. .. .. 476
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, [House counted out.]

## LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 29.

The Congress at Berlin—The Anglo-Turkish Convention—Observations, Lord Campbell:—Debate thereon .. .. .. 479

Poor Law—The Boarding-Out System — Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Viscount Cranbrook .. .. .. 514

Science and Art—Historical Gallery of Casts—Question, Observations, Earl Cowper; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield .. .. 515

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

### COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 29.

Page

The Congress of Berlin—Thessaly—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. 518

The Judicature Act—Rule I., Order 36—Surrey Assizes—Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. 518

Endowed Schools Act, 1869—Timberscombe School Scheme—Question, Mr. Courtney; Answer, Lord George Hamilton .. .. 519

Municipal Corporations Acts—Legislation—Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. .. 520

Criminal Law—Vaccination Prosecutions—Prison Discipline—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. 520

The Eastern Question—Treaty of Berlin—The Turkish Indemnity—Question, Mr. Laing; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 521

Army—The Auxiliary Forces—Yeomanry Adjutants—Question, Mr. Starkie; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. 522

Poor Law (Ireland)—Union Workhouses—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. .. .. .. 522

Public Business—Medical Act Amendment Bill—Questions, Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. A. Mills; Answers, Lord George Hamilton .. 523

Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard"—Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. 523

Superannuation Act, 1859—The Customs Department—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. 524

Army—Dismissal of the Reserves—Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. .. 524

Coal Mines—The Haydock Explosion—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 524

Army—The Auxiliary Forces—Militia Colonels—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. 525

Treaty of Berlin—Bulgaria—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 526

Public Business—The Supplementary Estimates—Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 526

*Ordered*, That the Orders of the Day subsequent to the Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) Bill be postponed until after the Notice of Motion of the Marquess of Hartington relating to Eastern Affairs,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) Bill—**

Order for Second Reading read .. .. .. 527

After short debate, Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

## *MOTIONS.*

Eastern Affairs—Resolution—

*Moved*, "That, whilst this House has learned with satisfaction that the troubles which have arisen in the East of Europe have been terminated by the Treaty of Berlin without a further recourse to arms, and rejoices in the extension of the liberty and self-government of some of the populations of European Turkey, this House regrets:—

"That it has not been found practicable to deal in a satisfactory manner with the claims of the Kingdom of Greece, and of the Greek subjects of the Porte:

"That by the assumption under the Anglo-Turkish Convention of a sole guarantee of the integrity of the remaining territories of Turkey in Asia, the Military liabilities of this Country have been unnecessarily extended:

[*July* 29.] *Page*

EASTERN AFFAIRS—RESOLUTION—*continued.*

"That the undefined engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the better administration of those Provinces have imposed heavy responsibilities on the State, whilst no sufficient means have been indicated for securing their fulfilment:

"And that such engagements have been entered into, and responsibilities incurred, without the previous knowledge of Parliament,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington*) .. 527

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the first word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learnt with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire,"—(*Mr. Plunket,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Viscount Sandon:*)—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) Bill** (*Lords*)—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*The Lord Advocate*) .. .. .. 612

After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. J. W. Barclay:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 621

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Thursday.*

WAYS AND MEANS—

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £14,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

ELDERS WIDOWS' FUND [DEFICIENCIES]—

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of the Revenues of India, of such sums as may be required to make good the deficiency in the Elders Widows' Fund, and to enable the Trustees from time to time to meet the current liabilities of the said Fund, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to enable the Trustees of the Elders Widows' Fund to apply the Capital of the said Fund in aid of Income, and for other purposes relating thereto.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

---

**Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill**—*Ordered* (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 281] .. 628

**Disqualification of Medical Relief Removal Bill**—*Ordered* (*Mr. Rathbone, Sir John Kennaway, Sir Charles W. Dilke*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 282] .. 628

## LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 30.

Page

**Charitable Trusts Bill** (No. 150)—

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read .. .. 628

*Moved*, "That the Order be discharged,"—(*The Lord Chancellor:*)—Motion *agreed to:*—Order *discharged;* and Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE—ADDRESS FOR REPORT—

*Moved*, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Report of the Committee appointed in 1868 to investigate the condition of the Metropolitan Police Force, and that specially appointed to inquire into the constitution and condition of the detective department of the Metropolitan Police Force,—(*The Lord Truro*) .. 629

After short debate, on Question ? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE MILITIA—CLOTHING REGULATIONS—Observations, Lord Balfour of Burleigh; Reply, Viscount Bury .. 637

## COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 30.

### *QUESTIONS.*

THE INDIAN CONTINGENT—PAYMENT—THE RATE OF EXCHANGE—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 640

MINES REGULATION ACT, 1872—EXPLOSIONS IN COAL MINES—Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 640

TAXATION IN ST. KITTS—Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. .. .. .. .. 641

INDIA—THE RECENT FAMINE—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope .. .. .. .. .. 642

BAR EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE BILL — LEGISLATION — Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 642

CRIMINAL LAW—THE REV. H. J. DODWELL—Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. .. 643

SOUTH AFRICA—OUTBREAK OF THE NATIVE TRIBES—THE TRANSVAAL——Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 643

### *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

EASTERN AFFAIRS—RESOLUTION—ADJOURNED DEBATE [SECOND NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [29th July]:—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 644

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Lowe:*)—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *Thursday.*

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 204]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 26th July*] .. .. 763

After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

**Education (Scotland) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 156]—

*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Assheton Cross*) .. .. .. .. .. 774

*Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. J. W. Barclay:*)——After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

[*July* 30.] *Page*

**Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment Bill**—
Bill *considered* in Committee .. .. .. .. 775
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

---

WAYS AND MEANS—
**Consolidated Fund (No. 4) Bill**—
Resolution [July 29] *reported,* and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); *presented,* and read the first time .. 777

**Marriages (Fiji) Bill**—*Ordered* (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 285] .. .. .. 777

## COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 31.

## *QUESTION.*

THE WAR AND INDIA OFFICES—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. 778

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) Bill**—
*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Raikes*) .. 778
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Plimsoll.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 151, Noes 13; Majority 138.—(Div. List, No. 248.)
Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 204]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 30th July*] .. .. 804
After some time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 286.]

**Bishoprics Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 197]—
Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Assheton Cross*) .. .. .. 829
Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable, so long as the Episcopal Church continues to be established by law, to increase the number of Bishops,"—(*Mr. Joseph Cowen,*)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

---

**Metropolitan Commons Bill**—*Ordered* (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Fawcett*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 287] .. .. 849

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1.

Page

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE—The Queen's Answer to the Address *reported* .. .. .. 850

THE MINISTRY—THE MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS—Personal Explanations, The Earl of Carnarvon, The Earl of Beaconsfield .. .. 850

**Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) Bill—**

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Viscount Bury*) .. 854

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

**Highways Bill** (No. 177)—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Viscount Cranbrook*) .. 856

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE HAMPSHIRE RIFLE VOLUNTEERS—Question, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, Viscount Bury:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. .. .. 858

## COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1.

EAST INDIA (PUBLIC WORKS)—

Report from Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, *brought up,* and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be *printed.* [No. 333.]

## *NOTICE OF QUESTION.*

GREECE—ALLEGED AGREEMENT WITH TURKEY—Notice of Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 863

## *QUESTIONS.*

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE ACT—DEPRECIATION OF MACHINERY—Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 864

SCIENCE AND ART MUSEUM (DUBLIN)—Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Lord George Hamilton .. .. .. .. 864

INDIA—FAMINE IN CASHMERE—Question, Mr. Ralli; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope .. .. .. .. 865

ARMY—PROMOTION OF GENERAL OFFICERS—Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. .. 865

THE LUNACY LAWS—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. .. 865

NAVY—MR. HENWOOD—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Childers .. 866

CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND)—PRISON DISCIPLINE—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland .. .. 867

INDIA—THE INDIAN BUDGET—Questions, Mr. Briggs, Mr. Childers; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 868

THE TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLES 2 AND 61—Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. .. 868

VALUATION OF PROPERTY BILL—Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. 869

Order for Committee read, and *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

IRELAND—LONDONDERRY AND BELFAST—PAY OF CONSTABULARY—Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland .. 869
SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 870

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 870

*Ordered,* That the Orders of the Day, which are appointed for To-morrow, at Two of the clock, be deferred till To-morrow,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## ORDERS OF THE DAY.

EASTERN AFFAIRS—RESOLUTION—ADJOURNED DEBATE [THIRD NIGHT]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [29th July]:—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 871
After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Lord Elcho*:)—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

**Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) Bill** (*Lords*)—
Bill, as amended, *considered* .. .. .. .. 977
After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

**Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) Bill** [Bill 271]—
Bill *considered* in Committee .. .. .. .. 979
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

## LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 2.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

## COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 2.

## PRIVATE BUSINESS.

*Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation Bill* (*Lords*) (*by Order*)—
*Moved,* "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" .. 982
Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "be," to the end of the Question, in order to add the word "re-committed,"—(*Mr. Plimsoll,*)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 130, Noes 74; Majority 56.—(Div. List, No. 249.)
Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered;* to be read the third time.

## QUESTIONS.

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE—EXAMINATIONS—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. .. 992

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*August* 2.]

*Page*

NAVY—CHIEF ENGINEERS—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. .. 992

TURKEY—UNSECURED CREDITORS—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 993

JUDICATURE ACT—LEEDS CIVIL ASSIZES—Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. .. .. 993

METROPOLIS—ST. JAMES'S PARK—Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel .. .. .. .. 994

THE INDIAN TROOPS CONTINGENT—PAYMENT—RATES OF EXCHANGE—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. 994

ARMY ENLISTMENT—THE POLICE—Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. .. .. 995

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT—THE COUNTY OF CORK—Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther ... .. 996

POOR LAW—REMOVAL OF IRISH PAUPERS—Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. .. .. 996

THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 996

FISHERY INSPECTORS—THE ESTUARY OF THE THAMES—Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. 997

COAL MINES—THE HAYDOCK ACCIDENT—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 997

MAIL CONTRACTS—THE CONTRACTS AND CORRESPONDENCE—Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. 998

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

EASTERN AFFAIRS—RESOLUTION—ADJOURNED DEBATE [FOURTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [29th July]:—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 998

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 195, Noes 338; Majority 143.

Div. List, Ayes and Noes .. .. .. 1121

Words *added*:—Main Question, as amended, put.

*Resolved*, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learnt with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire.

To be presented by Privy Councillors.

**Education (Scotland) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bills 156-292]—

Bill *considered* in Committee .. .. .. .. 1126

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Tuesday* next.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 5.

*Page*

INDIA — TAXATION AND EXPENDITURE — Petition *presented*, The Earl of Northbrook .. .. .. .. .. 1139
After debate, Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

INDIA (CIVIL ENGINEERS)—ADDRESS FOR PAPERS—
*Moved*, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of any correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India in Council on the subject of the excess of supply of civil engineers for service in India,—(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)
Motion *agreed to.*

**Tenant Right (Ireland) Bill** (No. 156)—
*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read 2$^{a}$,"—(*The Earl of Longford*) .. 1163
Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now,") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day three months,")—(*The Viscount Lifford.*)
After short debate, on Question, that ("now") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 8, Not-Contents 25; Majority 17:— *Resolved* in the *Negative;* and Bill to be read 2$^{a}$ *this day three months.*

**Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Bill** (No. 168)—
Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read .. 1171
House in Committee (according to Order); Bill *reported*, without Amendment, to be read 3$^{a}$ on *Friday* next.

## COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 5.

### *QUESTIONS.*

TRADE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Viscount Sandon .. .. .. .. 1172

CRIMINAL LAW — CASE OF MR. R. W. HARMAN — Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 1172

JUDICIAL STATISTICS—CONVICT PRISONS—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 1174

PRISONS ACTS—PLANK BEDS—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. .. 1174

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—ARTILLERY SERGEANTS—Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. 1175

INDIA — MADRAS WILLS FOR 1788 AND 1789 — Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope .. .. .. .. 1176

NAVY—COMMANDERS ON THE ACTIVE LIST—Question, Mr. Vans Agnew; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. 1176

SUPPLY — SUPPLEMENTARY ARMY ESTIMATES — Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. .. 1177

RE-ORGANIZATION OF THE ADMIRALTY—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. 1177

NAVY—THE CENSUS—Question, Mr. E. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. .. 1178

THE WINDWARD ISLANDS—BARBADOES—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. .. .. .. 1178

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN MILITARY EXPEDITION—Question, Mr. C. Beckett Denison; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. 1179

[*August* 5.] *Page*

SUPPLY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, &c.—Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. J. Cowen, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. M'Laren; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Hayter; Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 1179

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

H.M.S. "BEAGLE"—EXECUTION OF A NATIVE OF TANNA—JUDICIAL POWERS OF NAVAL COMMANDERS—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that instructions may be issued to the Officers commanding Her Majesty's ships to define and regulate their authority to put persons to death not subjects of Her Majesty,"—(*Mr. Gorst,*) —instead thereof .. .. .. .. .. 1183

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

INDIA (FINANCES) — INDIAN EXCHANGES — Observations, Sir George Campbell:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. 1205

TURKEY—SLAVERY—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION—Observations, Mr. Evelyn Ashley .. .. .. .. .. 1215

LAW AND JUSTICE—APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES—Withdrawal of Motion, Mr. Hutchinson; Observations, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. 1215

THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS—PERAK—Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 1217

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,432,808, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for Public Education in England and Wales, including Expense of the Education Office in London" .. .. .. .. 1219

After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £205,014, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Science and Art Department, and of the Establishments connected therewith" .. .. .. 1257

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £195,014, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Errington:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £331,812, to complete the sum for Public Education, Scotland.

(4.) £1,835, to complete the sum for the Board of Education, Scotland.

(5.) £84,790, to complete the sum for the Britism Museum.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. .. 1261

(6.) £9,133, to complete the sum for the National Gallery.

(7.) £1,500, to complete the sum for the National Portrait Gallery.

(8.) £12,850, to complete the sum for Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. 1262

(9.) £8,244, to complete the sum for the London University.

(10.) £3,010, to complete the sum for the Deep Sea Exploring Expedition (Report).

Supply—Civil Service Estimates—Committee—*continued.*

(11.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Royal Commission appointed in connection with the International Exhibition at Paris, 1878" .. .. 1265
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,467, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Meldon*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(12.) £14,074, to complete the sum for the Universities, &c. in Scotland.
(13.) £1,580, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, &c. Scotland.

Class III.—Law and Justice.

(14.) £50,788, to complete the sum for the Lord Advocate and Criminal Proceedings, Scotland.
(15.) £46,223, to complete the sum for Courts of Law and Justice, Scotland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. 1269
(16.) £27,380, to complete the sum for the Register House Departments, Edinburgh.
(17.) £61,160, to complete the sum for Prisons, Scotland.
(18.) £65,678, to complete the sum for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland.
(19.) £29,867, to complete the sum for the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. Ireland.
(20.) £21,169, to complete the sum for the Queen's Bench, &c. Divisions, Ireland.
(21.) £8,662, to complete the sum for Land Judges' Offices, Ireland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. 1271
(22.) £8,567, to complete the sum for Probate, &c. Registries, Ireland.
(23.) £7,738, to complete the sum for the Court of Bankruptcy, Ireland.
(24.) £1,280, to complete the sum for the Admiralty Court, Registry, Ireland.
(25.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,672, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office for the Registration of Deeds in Ireland" .. .. .. .. .. 1273
After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,042, be granted, &c,"—(*Mr. Maurice Brooks*:)—After further short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(26.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,155, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses in the Office for the Registration of Judgments in Ireland" .. .. .. .. .. 1277
*Moved,* "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Hopwood*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(27.) £103,885, to complete the sum for the Dublin Metropolitan Police.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 286]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* .. .. .. .. 1278
After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Meldon*:)—After further short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 6.

**Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) Bill** (No. 180)—
*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) .. .. .. .. .. 1281
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

**Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill** (No. 130)—
Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read .. 1282
After short debate, House in Committee (according to Order):—Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended (No. 193.)

**British Museum (Transfer of Collection) Bill** (No. 183)—
*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read $2^{a}$,"—(*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) .. .. .. .. .. 1285
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read $2^{a}$ accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

**Statute Law Revision (Ireland) Bill** (No. 185)—
*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read $2^{a}$,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 1285
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read $2^{a}$ accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

**Highways Bill** (No. 192)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) .. .. .. 1285
A further Amendment made; and Bill to be read $3^{a}$ on *Thursday* next.

Army and Militia Reserves — Question, Observations, The Earl of Camperdown:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. 1286
Army—The Auxiliary Forces—The Militia—Fines for Drunkenness —Question, Observations, Lord Waveney; Reply, Viscount Bury .. 1297

**Consolidated Fund (No. 4) Bill**—
Read $2^{a}$ (according to order); Committee *negatived*; then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with*: Bill read $3^{a}$, and *passed*.

## COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 6.

## *QUESTIONS.*

India—Finance—Anglo-Indian Balances—Questions, General Sir George Balfour; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 1298
Criminal Law—Case of G. W. Smith—Question, Mr. Milbank; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. .. 1299
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners — Perpetuity Rents— Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. .. 1300
The Estimates — Revenue and Expenditure—Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 1301
Corrupt Practices at Elections Act — Carlisle — Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. 1302
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill — Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 1302
Anglo-Turkish Convention—Observations, Mr. Fawcett .. .. 1302

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to raise any sum not exceeding Two Million Pounds by the creation of securities chargeable on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) .. .. .. .. .. 1303
After long debate, Resolution *agreed to*.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Commissioners may raise such sum by Exchequer Bonds, Exchequer Bills, or Treasury Bills, or by either, or by all of such modes:"—Resolution *agreed to*.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the principal of all Exchequer Bonds which may be so issued shall be paid off at par, at the expiration of any period not exceeding three years from the date of such Bonds" .. .. 1364

WAYS AND MEANS—Committee—*continued.*

*Moved,* "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. E. Jenkins* :)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Resolution *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the interest of all such Exchequer Bonds shall be paid half-yearly, and shall be charged upon and issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof" .. 1366

After debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ARMY—ALLOWANCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE RESERVES—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the present allowance of 6*d.* per diem for each wife and 2*d.* for each child of the Reserve men should be increased in those cases in which the calling out of the Reserve men has left their families with inadequate means of support,"—(*Major Nolan,*)—instead thereof .. .. 1378

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

PARLIAMENT—ORDER—DISORDERLY CONDUCT OF A MEMBER—

*Moved,* "That Major O'Gorman for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair be directed to withdraw,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) .. 1384

After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sheil* :)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed,

"That Major O'Gorman for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair be directed to withdraw."

Amendment proposed,

To leave out the words "for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair," and, at the end of the Question, to add the words "for disregarding the authority of the Chair,"—(*Major Nolan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put:—*Ordered,* That Major O'Gorman, for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair, be directed to withdraw,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*Moved,* "That the conduct of Major O'Gorman towards the Chair be taken into consideration to-morrow, and that he be ordered to attend in his place to-morrow,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment (*Major Nolan*), by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—YEOMANRY ADJUTANTS—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the present system of seconding Officers in Cavalry Regiments requires amendment, as it is calculated to give undue advantages in promotion and retirement under the Royal Warrant of the 13th day of August 1877 to Officers holding such appointments,"—(*Major O'Beirne,*)—instead thereof .. .. 1395

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

[*August* 6.] *Page*

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read—*continued.*

HOUSE OF COMMONS—SALARIES OF OFFICIALS—Observations, Mr. O'Clery; Reply, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. 1396

ARMY—PHYSICAL EXAMINATION OF OFFICERS—REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE—Observations, Mr. Hayter:—Short debate thereon .. 1397

ARMY—CASE OF SURGEON-MAJOR CLARKE—Observations, Mr. Meldon; Reply, Colonel Stanley; Observations, General Sir George Balfour .. 1402

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £386,800, Charge for Commissariat, Transport, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. .. 1406
(2.) £3,185,000, Provisions, Forage, &c.
(3.) £806,000, Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. .. 1407
(4.) £1,330,000, Warlike Stores.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1410
(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £854,300, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879" .. .. .. .. .. 1412
After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £851,300, be granted, &c.,"—(*General Shute*:)—After further short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(6.) £162,400, Military Education.
(7.) £33,300, Miscellaneous Effective Services.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1419
(8.) £251,500, Administration of Army.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1419
(9.) £33,300, Rewards for Distinguished Services.
(10.) £92,000, Pay of General Officers.
(11.) £870,300, Retired Full Pay, Half Pay, &c.
(12.) £121,000, Widows' Pensions, &c.
(13.) £16,900, Pensions for Wounds.
(14.) £35,600, Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions).
(15.) £1,025,000, Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (Out-Pensions).
(16.) £164,600, Superannuation Allowances.
(17.) £40,200, Militia, Yeomanry Cavalry, Volunteer Corps.
(18.) £1,080,000, in aid of Army Estimates for Home Charges for Regular Forces in India.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. 1421

CIVIL SERVICES.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(19.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £88,245, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens" .. .. 1423
*Moved,* "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Whitwell*:)—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(20.) £6,262, to complete the sum for Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland.
(21.) £15,050, to complete the sum for Edinburgh University Buildings.
(22.) £137,057, to complete the sum for Public Buildings, Ireland.

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,435, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office for Public Works, Ireland:"—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(23.) £817,652, to complete the sum for the Constabulary, Ireland.
(24.) £61,158, to complete the sum for Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Ireland.
(25.) £4,786, to complete the sum for Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Ireland.
(26.) £49,133, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*; Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 286]—
Consideration, as amended:—Adjourned Debate [5th August] *resumed* .. 1424
Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

---

**Bankers' Books (Evidence) Bill**—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Herschell, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Rodwell*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 293] .. 1424

## COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7.

### *PRIVATE BUSINESS.*

*Christ Church, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation Bill* (*Lords*) (*by Order*)—
*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read the third time" .. .. 1425
Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of a new Clause,—(Saving rights of the General Post Office,)"—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson,*)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*
Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of a new Clause."
*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*
Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *re-committed* in respect of a new Clause.
On Question, "That the Clause be read a second time?"—Clause read a second time, and *added* to the Bill.
Bill *reported,* with a further Amendment; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

### *QUESTIONS.*

PRISONS ACT, 1877—THE NEW RULES—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther .. .. .. .. 1437
CHINA—THE CHEFOO TREATY—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 1438

### *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

PARLIAMENT—ORDER—DISORDERLY CONDUCT OF A MEMBER .. 1438
The Order for Consideration of Major O'Gorman's conduct towards the Chair having been read,
The honourable Member for Limerick County rose, and said that he had been requested by Major O'Gorman to ask leave of the House that he might be allowed to submit a statement and apology for his conduct to the House;
Leave being given, the Serjeant was directed by Mr. Speaker to acquaint Major O'Gorman, That he had permission to return to his place:—Then Major O'Gorman returned to his place, and offered to the House and to the Chair the expression of his deepest regret for what took

PARLIAMENT—ORDER—DISORDERLY CONDUCT OF A MEMBER—*continued.*

place last night, and submitted himself to the favourable judgment of the House:—

Whereupon Mr. Speaker addressed the House as follows:—

"The House has now heard the statement and apology of Major O'Gorman.

If it should be the wish of the House to proceed no further in the matter, it would be an agreeable duty on my part to declare the will of the House in favour of indulgence.

The House may be assured that, while jealous for the character of this House, and determined so far as lies in my power to maintain order in debate, it is with great reluctance that I have put in force the authority of the Chair as I felt bound to do upon this occasion."

Then the House after considering the apology of Major O'Gorman, and, in consequence of what Mr. Speaker had said, consented that the said Order of the Day should be discharged.

*Ordered,* That the said Order be discharged,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*Ordered,* That the Order for the attendance of Major O'Gorman in his place be read and discharged,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in order to facilitate the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates, it is desirable that a Select Committee should be appointed at the commencement of each Session of Parliament, to go through the details of such Estimates, and report generally upon those particulars which may appear most to demand the attention of the House,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn,*)—instead thereof .. .. 1442

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 64, Noes 46; Majority 18.—(Div. List, No. 251.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a further Supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,845,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for additional Expenditure for Army Services consequent upon the War between Russia and Turkey, and the Native outbreak in the Cape of Good Hope, &c., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879" .. 1456

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a further Supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,820,500, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Hayter:*)—After long debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(2.) £5,520, Supplementary sum for Royal Palaces.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. .. 1493

(3.) £10,000, Science and Art Museum, Dublin.

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

(4.) £30,000, Supplementary sum for the Mint, including Coinage.

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(5.) £210, Supplementary sum for Revising Barristers, England;

[*August* 7.] *Page*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(6.) £5,000, Supplementary sum for National Gallery.

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

(7.) £10,800, Supplementary sum for Diplomatic Services.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. .. 1494
(8.) £8,000, Cyprus.

---

(9.) £6,000, Supplementary sum for Post Office Packet Service.
(10.) £19,865, Abyssinian Expedition.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [6th August] *reported.*
First Eighteen Resolutions *agreed to.*
Nineteenth Resolution *postponed.*
Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*
Postponed Resolution to be considered *To-morrow.*

---

**Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—**
*Moved,* "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to continue various Expiring Laws," —(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)
Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

WAYS AND MEANS—
**Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) Bill—** }
Resolutions [August 6] *reported,* and *agreed to* :—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 295.]

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1876-7—
*Resolved,* That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon the Grants for Navy and Army Services in the year ending on the 31st day of March 1877, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year.
*Ordered,* That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments which were presented upon the 18th day of February and the 12th day of March last, be referred to the Committee,—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8.

**Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) Bill** (No. 190)—
*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) .. .. .. .. .. 1498
After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

**Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill** (Nos. 128-130)—
House in Committee (according to Order) .. .. .. 1499
Amendments made: the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD TRAINING SHIP—
Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; Observations, The Earl of Redesdale .. .. 1500

## COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8.

## *PRIVATE BUSINESS.*

*Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation Bill (Lords) (by Order)*—

*Moved*, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration,"—(*Sir Sydney Waterlow*) .. .. .. .. .. 1502

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Thomas Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 71, Noes 78; Majority 7.—(Div. List, No. 252.)

Words *added*:—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *put off* for three months.

Parliament—Clare County Writ—

Mr. Assheton Cross *reported* from the Select Committee on Clare County Writ; That they had agreed to a Resolution, which they had directed him to report to the House .. .. .. .. 1522

Report to lie upon the Table.

Minutes of Proceedings to be *printed.* [No. 343.]

*Resolved*, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to give directions to Her Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to communicate the Report to Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Her Majesty's Attorney General for Victoria.

## *QUESTIONS.*

Navy—Engine-room Artificers—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. .. 1523

Elementary Education Act, 1870—Wymington—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Lord George Hamilton .. .. .. 1524

Railway Accidents, 1877 — Continuous Footboards — Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot .. .. .. 1525

India (Finance) — The Indian Debt—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope .. .. .. 1525

Criminal Law — Prosecution of Crime — Legislation—Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. 1526

India—The Straits Settlements—Troops in Perak—Pay and Allowances—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1526

Navy—The Naval Review at Portsmouth—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton .. .. .. 1527

Public Elementary Schools — Musical Instruction — Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Lord George Hamilton .. .. 1527

Law and Justice—Leicester Assizes — Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. .. 1528

India — The Madras Civil Service—Case of Mr. F. Lascelles—Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope .. .. 1528

Post Office (Telegraphic Department) Charges — Questions, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Whitwell; Answers, Lord John Manners .. 1529

Corrupt Practices at Elections Act — Carlisle—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 1529

India (Finance)—The Indian Budget—Questions, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 1530

Turkey and Russia — Bulgaria—Question, Mr. Bruce; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 1530

SALMON FISHERY INSPECTORS—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. .. 1531
POPULATION STATISTICS—THE REGISTRAR GENERAL'S RETURNS—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. 1531
FIJI—STATUS OF THE NATIVES—Question, Dr. O'Leary; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. .. .. .. 1532
EXCHEQUER BILLS AND BONDS (No. 2) BILL—Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 1532
NAVY—TRANSPORTS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN—Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. 1532
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. 1533

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

NAVY—THE ROYAL NAVAL RESERVES—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the Royal Naval Reserve is not adapted for the present requirements of the Nation, and should at once be superseded or at least supplemented by a large increase of Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers; and that, in order to secure efficiency, such men should be trained on board sea-going gunboats stationed round the Coast and available for service on the shortest notice,"—(*Captain Pim,*)—instead thereof .. .. .. 1533

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

GREENWICH HOSPITAL—AGE PENSIONS—Observations, Mr. P. A. Taylor:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. .. 1538
COAL MINES — HAYDOCK COLLIERY EXPLOSION — Observations, Mr. Macdonald:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. 1547
THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—Observations, Mr. Fawcett:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. 1555
NAVY—H.M.S. "EURYDICE"—Observations, Mr. D. Jenkins:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. .. 1564

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—NAVY ESTIMATES.
(In the Committee.)
(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,350,140, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879 .. .. .. 1567
After debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*
(2.) £1,199,300, Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c.
(3.) £1,042,000, Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c.
(4.) £148,802, Greenwich Hospital and School.
(5.) £678,000, Supplementary sum in respect of Extraordinary Naval and Transport Services.
(6.) £434 7*s.* 5*d.*, Greenwich Hospital and School (Excess, 1876-7).

### CIVIL SERVICES.

### CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

(7.) £22,435, to complete the sum for the Public Works Office, Ireland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. .. .. .. 1586

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICES—Committee—*continued.*

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(8.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £111,253, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Expense of the Superintendence of Prisons, and of the Maintenance of Prisoners in Prisons in Ireland, and of the Registration of Habitual Criminals" .. 1586

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £110,753, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. O'Connor Power* :)—After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed:—After short debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £111,153, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Mitchell Henry* :)—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 21, Noes 51; Majority 30.—(Div. List, No. 253.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

After further short debate, Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

**Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—**

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [7th August]:—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. .. 1610

*Moved*, "That leave be not given,"—(*Major O'Gorman* :)—Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 61, Noes None.—(Div. List, No. 254.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Matthew Ridley.*)

SUPPLY [15th July]—Postponed Resolution [reported 16th July], *considered* and *agreed to* .. .. .. .. 1610

SUPPLY [5th August] — Postponed Resolution [reported 6th August], *considered.*

Resolution again read as follows:—

"That a sum, not exceeding £14,672, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office for the Registration of Deeds in Ireland" .. .. 1610

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£14,672," in order to insert "14,357,"—(*Mr. Meldon.*)

After short debate, Question put, "That '£14,672' stand part of the Resolution."

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing as a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared that the Ayes had it.

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [7th August] *reported* .. .. 1613

The First Resolution being read a second time:—*Moved*, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution:"—Question put.

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing to be a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared the Ayes had it.

Second Resolution *postponed.*

The Third Resolution being read a second time:—*Moved*, "That the House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution:"—Question put.

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing to be a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared the Ayes had it.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Bishoprics Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 197]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [31st July] :—Question again proposed :—Debate *resumed* .. 1642

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 75, Noes 38; Majority 37.—(Div. List, No. 255.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to* :—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Monday* next.

**Inclosure Provisional Orders Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 192]—

Order for Committee read :—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Sir Matthew Ridley*) .. .. .. 1686

*Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn* :)—Question put, and *agreed to* :—Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

SUPPLY—REPORT—Supply [6th August],—Postponed Resolution [reported 7th August], *considered* .. .. .. .. 1687

Resolution again read, as followeth :—

> "That a sum, not exceeding £88,245, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£88,245," in order to insert "£87,745,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That '£88,245' stand part of the Resolution :"—After short debate, Question put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 82, Noes 29; Majority 53.—(Div. List, No. 262 :)—Resolution *agreed to.*

SUPPLY [7th August], — Postponed Resolution [reported 8th August], *considered* .. .. .. .. .. 1689

Resolution again read, as followeth :—

> "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £5,520, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Maintenance and Repair of Royal Palaces."

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£5,520," in order to insert "£5,020,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That '£5,520' stand part of the Resolution :"—After short debate, Question put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 93, Noes 31; Majority 62.—(Div. List, No. 263 :)—Resolution *agreed to.*

SUPPLY [8th August],—Resolutions *reported* .. .. .. 1690

First Four Resolutions *agreed to.*

Fifth Resolution read a second time.

After short debate, Amendment proposed, to leave out "£678,000," in order to insert "£658,000,"—(*Mr. David Jenkins*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That '£678,000' stand part of the Resolution :"—After further short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn* :—Resolution *agreed to.*

Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1876-77—REPORT—

Resolutions [August 8] *reported* .. .. .. 1693

After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to.*

[*August* 9.]

Page

**Telegraphs Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 257]—

*Moved,* "That the Second Reading be fixed for Twelve of the clock on Saturday,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) .. .. 1695

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read a second time," — (*Lord John Manners :*)—After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sullivan :*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

After further short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to :*—Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

*Moved,* "That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee on the Bill,"—(*Lord John Manners.*)

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to insert the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Mr. Onslow,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question :"—Question put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 87, Noes 30; Majority 57.—(Div. List, No. 264.)

Main Question put :—*Resolved,* That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee.

**Education (Scotland) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 292]—

*Moved,* "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration,"—(*The Lord Advocate*) .. .. .. .. 1701

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to :*—Bill, as amended, *considered.*

After further short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

**Training Schools and Ships Bill** [Bill 48]—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be read a second time this day,"—(*Captain Pim*) 1711

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to add the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question :"—The House *divided;* Ayes 39, Noes 42; Majority 3.—(Div. List, No. 265.)

Words *added :*—Main Question, as amended, put :—*Resolved,* That the Bill be read a second time upon Tuesday next.

**Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education)** (*re-committed*) **Bill**—

*Moved,* "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Wheelhouse*) .. .. .. 1712

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to insert the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question :" — After short debate, Question put : — The House *divided;* Ayes 40, Noes 40 :—And the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker declared his vote with the Noes.—(Div. List, No. 266.)

Words *inserted :*—Main Question, as amended, put :—*Resolved,* That this House will, upon Tuesday next, resolve itself into the said Committee.

**Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote) Bill** [Bill 71]—

*Moved,* "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Wheelhouse*) .. .. .. 1713

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to insert the words "upon Thursday next,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question:" — After short debate, Question put: — The House *divided;* Ayes 33, Noes 48; Majority 15.—(Div. List, No. 267.)

Words *inserted:*—Main Question, as amended, put:—*Resolved,* That this House will, upon Thursday next, resolve itself into the said Committee.

**Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment Bill**—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [26th June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" .. .. 1714

*Moved,* "That the Debate be further adjourned till this day,"—(*Mr. Monk.*)

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to add the words "upon Thursday next," — (*Mr. Dillwyn,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 32, Noes 48; Majority 16.—(Div. List, No. 268.)

After short debate, Main Question, as amended, put.

*Ordered,* That the Debate be further adjourned till Thursday next.

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill**—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be read the third time this day,"—(*The O'Conor Don*) .. .. .. .. .. 1716

After short debate, Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to add the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Captain Pim,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 61, Noes 18; Majority 43.—(Div. List, No. 269.)

Main Question put:—*Ordered,* That the Bill be read the third time this day.

---

WAYS AND MEANS—

Resolution [August 8] *reported,* and *agreed to* .. .. .. 1720

**Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill**—*Ordered* (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); *presented,* and read the first time .. 1720

## COMMONS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 10.

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill**—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*The O'Conor Don*) 1721

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "be," to the end of the Question, in order to add the word "re-committed,"—(*Mr. P. J. Smyth,*)—instead thereof, *Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday* (*Ireland*) *Bill*—continued.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 63, Noes 22; Majority 41.—(Div. List, No. 270.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

## LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 12.

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE HAMPSHIRE RIFLE VOLUNTEERS—Personal Explanation, Viscount Bury; Observations, Lord Truro .. 1748

**Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) Bill** (No. 271)—

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read .. .. 1750

Bill read 3ª (according to Order):—After short debate, Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

METROPOLITAN POLICE—Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon .. .. .. .. 1751

**Municipal Corporations Bill** [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 198) 1761

## COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 12.

EASTERN AFFAIRS—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address *reported* .. 1761

## *QUESTIONS.*

INDIA—THE SALT TAX—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope .. .. .. .. 1761

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. .. .. .. .. 1762

PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT—PRISON INSPECTORS—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. .. .. 1763

INDIA—MYSORE—Question, Mr. W. M. Torrens; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 1763

CUSTOMS—OUTPORT CLERKS—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. .. 1763

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ADVANCE—Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison; Answers, Mr. Bourke .. .. 1764

SCOTCH AND IRISH FISHERY LOAN ACCOUNTS—SECTION 10, 5 GEO. IV., c. 64—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. .. 1764

PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT—PRISON PILLOWS—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. 1764

CONSULS—CONVENTION WITH THE UNITED STATES—Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. 1765

JUDICATURE ACTS—LEEDS ASSIZES—Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, The Attorney General .. .. .. .. 1766

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—ACTION FOR LIBEL—Question, Mr. Isaac; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. 1766

CONGRESS OF BERLIN—GREECE—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 1767

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE FLEET IN THE DARDANELLES—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 1767

NAVY—THE CHANNEL AND PARTICULAR SERVICE SQUADRONS—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. 1768

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Short debate thereon .. .. 1768

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Expiring Laws Continuance Bill** [Bill 296]—

Order for Second Reading read .. .. .. 1769

After short debate, Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

**Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 275]—

*Moved*, "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration," —(*Mr. J. Lowther*) .. .. .. .. 1776

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill, as amended, *considered.*

After long debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

**Inclosure Provisional Orders Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 192]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th August], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. .. .. .. 1828

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate be postponed till after the other Orders of the Day," —(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient to proceed with this Bill until evidence has been obtained from disinterested witnesses as to the desirability of sanctioning the proposed inclosures, and until the obstacles which impede the application of the Clauses for the regulation of Commons, contained in the Commons Act of 1876, have been removed by the Commons Regulation Expenses Bill now passing through Parliament,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 66, Noes 22; Majority 44.—(Div. List, No. 275.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment.

On Question, "That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow?"—After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

**Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill**—

*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Raikes*) .. 1844

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND)—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, having, with the assent of Her Majesty's Government, on the 7th of May last passed a Resolution that the position of the Irish National Teachers called for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government with a view to a satisfactory adjustment of their claims, this House is of opinion that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to have given effect during the present Session to such Resolution, and to have made proposals to this House for securing with certainty to the Irish National School Teachers the full amount of the result fees to be earned by them in the current year,"—(*Mr. Meldon,*)—instead thereof .. .. 1844

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 47, Noes 30; Majority 17.—(Div. List, No. 276.)

*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill*—continued.

Stipendiary Magistrates (Ireland)—Observations, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Reply, The Attorney General for Ireland .. .. 1853

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

**Telegraphs Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 257]—

Bill *considered* in Committee .. .. .. .. 1854

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

**Highways Bill** [Bill 298]—

Lords Amendments *considered* .. .. .. 1855

Lords Amendments *agreed to,* with Amendments, and with Consequential Amendments to the Bill.

**Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill** [Bill 299]—

Lords Amendments *considered* .. .. .. 1855

After short debate, Consideration of Lords Amendments *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

**Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 137]—

Order for Committee read .. .. .. .. 1856

After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Wednesday.*

## LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 13.

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill**—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read $2^a$,"—(*The Lord O'Hagan*) .. 1861

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read $2^a$ accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** [H.L.]—

Returned from the Commons with the amendment made by the Lords to the amendments made by the Commons and the consequential amendment made by the Lords to the Bill *agreed to,* and the amendment made by the Commons to which the Lords have disagreed, *not insisted on.*

## COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 13.

## *QUESTIONS.*

Mines Regulation Act, 1872—Dinas Collieries—Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. .. .. 1868

India—Deccan Riots Commission—Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope .. .. .. .. 1868

Railway Passenger Duty—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. .. 1869

Ireland—A Departmental Commission—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. .. .. .. 1869

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1875)—Searches for Arms—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. 1869

The Irish Board of Works—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. 1870

Post Office—West Indian Mail Contract—Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. .. .. 1870

[*August* 13.] Page

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

India—East India Revenue Accounts—The Financial Statement—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. E. Stanhope*) .. .. .. 1871

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House regards with apprehension the present position of Indian finance, and in view of the power claimed by the Crown to employ any number of Indian Troops in all parts of Her Majesty's Dominions, except the United Kingdom, is of opinion that there is no sufficient security against the Military expenditure of India being unduly increased,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 59, Noes 20; Majority 39.—(Div. List, No. 277.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

East India Revenue Accounts—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the Ordinary Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1877 was £50,399,411; the Revenue from Productive Public Works, including the Net Traffic Receipts from Guaranteed Companies, was £5,596,374, making the total Revenue of India for that year £55,995,785; that the Ordinary Expenditure in India and in England, including Charges for the Collection of the Revenue, for Ordinary Public Works, and for Interest on Debt exclusive of that for Productive Public Works, was £51,430,673; the Expenditure on Productive Public Works (Working Expenses and Interest), including the payments to Guaranteed Companies for Interest and Surplus Profits, was £6,747,890, making a total Charge for that year of £58,178,563; that there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £2,182,778; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,809,284.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

**Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill**—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Raikes:*)—

Central Asia — Russian Advance — Observations, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Reply, Mr. Bourke:—Debate thereon .. .. 1927

Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

---

**University Tests Bill**—

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Tests in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham, and the Colleges therein.

Resolution *reported:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Dodson, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 305] .. .. 1943

**Coroners Bill**—*Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 303] .. .. .. 1944

## LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14.

Page

## QUESTIONS.

PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT — PETITIONS AND PRESENTMENTS — Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 1945

POST OFFICE—SURVEYOR GENERAL'S CLERKS, EDINBURGH AND DUBLIN—Question, Sir Arthur Guinness; Answer, Lord John Manners .. 1945

ISLAND OF CYPRUS—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS—Questions, Mr. Monk, Sir William Harcourt; Answers, Colonel Stanley .. .. 1946

CENTRAL ASIA — RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—Question, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. 1947

THE DIRTY CONDITION OF LOWER THAMES STREET—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. .. .. .. 1947

METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. 1948

ARMY—GOOD CONDUCT MEDALS—Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. .. 1949

TURKEY—ALLEGED OUTRAGES IN THESSALY—Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. 1949

## ORDERS OF THE DAY.

**Expiring Laws Continuance Bill** [Bill 296]—

Order for Committee read .. .. .. .. 1951

After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered:*—After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

**Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—**

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Raikes:*)—

TURKEY—MURDER OF MR. OGLE—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, Mr. Consul General Fawcett's Report upon Mr. C. C. Ogle's death is inconclusive, and that a fresh Commission of Inquiry ought to be instituted, composed of Englishmen only: who should be specially empowered to assure the witnesses of the protection of Her Majesty's Government,"—(*Mr. Henry Samuelson,*)—instead thereof .. .. .. 1956

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

TREATY OF BERLIN—ROUMANIA—Observations, Sir George Campbell:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. .. 2004

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

**Bishoprics Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 197]—

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read the third time" (Queen's *Consent* signified) .. .. .. .. .. 2008

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 62, Noes 20; Majority 42.—(Div. List, No. 278:)—Bill accordingly read the third time, and *passed,* without Amendment.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 15.

Page

**Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—**
**Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—**
Read 2ª (according to order); Committees *negatived;* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with;* Bills read 3ª and *passed.*

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill—**
Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read .. .. 2009
After short debate, Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed.*

Army Records of Military Service—Observations, Lord Strathnairn; Reply, Viscount Bury .. .. .. .. 2010

## COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 15.

### *QUESTIONS.*

Island of Cyprus—The Tithes and Taxes—Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. 2015
Italy—Diplomatic Relations with the Pope—Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 2016
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Bill—Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. 2016
India—The Mission to Cabul—Questions, Mr. Fawcett, Sir Henry Havelock; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 2016
Coal Mines—The Homer Hill Colliery Accident—Case of Thomas Shaw—Question, Mr. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 2018
Russia and Turkey—Batoum—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 2018
Spain—Case of George White—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 2019
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill—The Lords' Amendments—Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. .. .. 2019
Turkey—Crete—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. 2020
Navy—The "Ganges" Training Ship—Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. 2021
Turkey—Asia Minor—The Lazes—Questions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. 2021
Island of Cyprus—Health of the Troops—Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. 2023
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Importation of Cattle—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Observation, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. .. .. 2024
Education Department—The Report—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Viscount Sandon .. .. .. .. 2024
Treaty of Berlin, Article 18—Reforms in Turkey—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. 2025
Post Office, Dublin—Pay of Telegraph Officials—Question, Mr. O'Byrne; Answer, Lord John Manners .. .. .. 2025

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 137]—

*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Solicitor General*) 2026

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Sir George Bowyer.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*, without Amendment.

**Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) Bill** [Bill 178]—

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Order for Committee be discharged,"—(*Mr. Solicitor General*) .. .. .. .. 2040

Motion *agreed to*: — Order for Committee read and *discharged*: — Bill *withdrawn.*

---

Parliament—Business of the House—

*Moved*, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Bourke.*)

Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice"—Observations, Lord Charles Beresford:—Short debate thereon .. .. .. .. 2041

Poor Law (Ireland)—Pauper Children in Workhouses—Industrial Training—Observations, Mr. Arthur Moore, Major O'Beirne; Reply, The Attorney General for Ireland .. .. .. 2051

South Africa—The Transvaal—The Correspondence—Observations, Mr. Courtney; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. .. 2061

Question put, and *agreed to.*

## LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 16.

### PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The Royal Assent was given to several Bills; And afterwards, Her Majesty's Speech was delivered to both Houses by The Lord Chancellor.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Saturday the second day of November next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Saturday the second day of November next.

## COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 16.

## *QUESTIONS.*

Army — The Roster for Medical Officers — Questions, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answers, Colonel Stanley .. 2086

[*August* 16.] *Page*

TURKEY—THE PAPERS—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 2087
CENTRAL ASIA AND AFGHANISTAN — Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. 2087

THE EASTERN QUESTION — THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION — REFORMS IN ASIA MINOR—Question, Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins .. 2088
*Moved,* "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)
Reply, Mr. Bourke.
Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ISLAND OF CYPRUS—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS—Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. .. .. .. 2089
SPAIN—CASE OF GEORGE WHITE—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. .. .. .. .. 2090

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

**Coroners Bill** [Bill 303]—
*Moved,* "That the Order for the Second Reading be discharged,"—(*Mr. Assheton Cross*) .. .. .. .. 2091
Motion *agreed to*:—Order for Second Reading read, and *discharged;* Bill *withdrawn.*

**Magistrates (Summary Jurisdiction) Bill** [Bill 304]—
*Moved,* "That the Order for the Second Reading be discharged,"—(*Mr. Assheton Cross*) .. .. .. .. 2091
Motion *agreed to*:—Order for Second Reading read, and *discharged*:—Bill *withdrawn.*

NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD"—Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith .. .. .. .. 2092

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—
Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS .. .. 2092

# HANSARD'S

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

*FIFTH SESSION* OF THE *TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET 5 MARCH, 1874, AND THENCE CONTINUED TILL 17 JANUARY, 1878, IN THE FORTY-FIRST YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

## HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

---

SIXTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Tuesday, 23rd July,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) * (168); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (169); Turnpike Acts Continuance* (170).

*Second Reading*—Corrib (Galway) River * (166); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance * (165).

*Committee*—Epping Forest * (164).

*Committee—Report*—County of Hertford * (154).

*Report*—Roads and Bridges (Scotland) (157).

*Third Reading*—Local Government Provisional Order (Darenth Valley) * (152), and *passed*.

### MESSAGE FROM THE QUEEN—MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND STRATHEARNE.

**THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD**: My Lords, I have a Message from the Queen, under Her Majesty's Sign Manual.

And the Royal Message having been *delivered* by the Earl of Beaconsfield, was read by the Lord Chancellor, as follows:

"VICTORIA R.

"Her Majesty having agreed to a marriage proposed between His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert Duke of Connaught and Strathearne, Earl of Sussex, Duke of Saxony, Prince of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, third daughter of His Royal Highness Prince Friedrich Carl Nikolaus of Prussia, has thought fit to communicate it to the House of Lords:

"The numerous proofs which the Queen has received from the House of Lords of their loyalty to the Throne, and of their attachment to Her person and family, leave Her Majesty no doubt of their readiness to concur in enabling Her Majesty to make a further provision for His Royal Highness.

"V. R."

Ordered, that the said Message be taken into consideration on *Thursday* next.

## ROADS AND BRIDGES (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 157.)

(*The Lord President.*)

### REPORT OF AMENDMENTS.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, he had two or three small Amendments to propose to Clause 36, in order to remove certain ambiguities which had been allowed to remain in the clause after the adoption by the Government in the House of Commons of an Amendment to the effect he desired. He wished to strike out such words as "proprietors," applied to the ownership of bridges; because a person could not be considered the absolute proprietor of a bridge of which the public had the use. The clause would then read thus—

> "The trustees of any county or counties and the local authority of any burgh or burghs shall, as soon as may be after the commencement of this Act, in such county or in any of such counties, adjust and settle with the persons or trustees having the management of any bridge or bridges forming part of or connecting any highways, whether situated wholly in one county or burgh or not, at which pontages are legally leviable by any person or trustees or the magistrates and town council of any burgh, &c."

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he had looked into the Amendments with the Bill, and he agreed with the noble Earl that there was some ambiguity in the clause as it had stood, and that the Amendments which left the clause as quoted above would render it much clearer than formerly; and he was, therefore, very happy to accept the Amendments.

Amendments *agreed to.*

Further Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE drew the attention of the House to the fact that the clauses in the Act of 1 & 2 *Will.* IV. incorporated in the Schedule were numbered by Roman numerals, instead of common figures, as was the practice before the passing of the Reform Bill. Having inquired at that time what was the reason for the change, he was informed that some Members of the Reformed House of Commons did not understand Roman numerals, and that the change was made for their convenience. Since that time there had been further changes in the constitution of that House, and their Lordships might probably be of opinion that it was desirable to order that the Roman numerals in that part of the Bill to which he referred should be altered to common figures.

## ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT.

### MOTION FOR RETURNS.

EARL FORTESCUE, in moving for Returns in continuation of Return respecting Endowed Schools Act, Paper No. 6, ordered to be printed on the 21st January last, said, the subject was one with which he had troubled the House more than once before. The question, however, seemed to him to become more urgent and more important year by year, as from time to time one educational endowment after another formerly misused or disused, became permanently misapplied by the centralizing system established by the late Government and perpetuated by the present. In 1875, while explaining to their Lordships the unhappy results of the administration of the old Commissioners, and while applauding the appointment of each one of the new Commissioners individually, he ventured to predict that, in spite of the personal excellence of the latter, it would be impossible for them to do well, and for this reason—that they had work given them to do which the Schools Inquiry Commission had emphatically stated could not be done by the central authority without the co-operation of some provincial authority, which should be capable of looking at the county, or perhaps several counties, as a whole; but which should know the district well, and not act in mere dependence on the Reports of its officers. Now, in finding fault with the results of the administration of the present Commissioners, he begged to say that he did not blame the men—he blamed the system under which they were acting; a system adopted, as he said before, in spite of the emphatic warning of the Schools Inquiry Commission. The noble Duke the Lord President of the Council was of all the statesmen he remembered of his own time the most confirmed admirer of centralization; for, two years ago, when he (Earl Fortescue) pressed for the establishment of provincial boards, in accordance with the recommendations of the Schools Inquiry Commission—upon which the Report of the Endowed Schools Commission professed to be, though it was not really, based—the noble Duke took the opportunity of expressing his opinion that the Central Commissioners, supplied with information through their Inspectors and Assistant Commissioners, would be more capable of forming an impartial opinion than persons who, from local considerations, would naturally be anxious to have schools of the highest grade. Against that view of the noble Duke, however, there was the opinion of the Commissioners themselves, who had acknowledged the great advantages of provincial boards, in that they would be composed of men

> "capable of thoroughly understanding and appreciating local claims, yet not hampered by a tendency to consider them alone."

The Commissioners spoke, too, of the absolute necessity of establishing new machinery to do entirely new work; and of the desirableness of local knowledge on the part of those who were to prepare the schemes. The Schools Inquiry's Report, too, insisted in the strongest language upon the necessity of dealing with schools in groups—a point which had been pressed upon the Commissioners by witnesses of the highest authority. In the Report of 1872, the then Commissioners stated that they had strenuously endeavoured to deal with the schools in groups, but that local and other difficulties had prevented such an arrangement, and that they had been obliged to treat each case in an isolated manner and without reference to the other schools in the district. One might have hoped, however, that Her Majesty's Government, justly objecting to the animus displayed by some of the Commissioners, whom they displaced, would have seized the opportunity, when legislating on the subject, of taking the whole question in hand, and altering the provisions which had rendered the Act unworkable in regard to what the Inquiry Commissioners had stated to be a point of vital importance. But nothing of the sort was done. The Schools Inquiry Commission, by a series of investigations and calculations, had ascertained that at least one-half of the school accommodation above the level of elementary education was required for the third grade. The Endowed Schools Commission divided the schools into three grades—The first, that in which the age of leaving was about 18 or 19; the second, in which the age was about 16; and the third, in which the age was about 14 or 15. The Commissioners, also, expressed their opinion that the proportion of day scholars in the third grade ought to be larger than that in the first and second grades; but, according to the joint Report of the Endowed Schools Commission and the Charity Commissioners, the number of first-grade schools for which schemes had been approved was 42; second grade, 96; and third grade, only 99. The Schools Inquiry Commission, again, said that the most urgent educational need of the country was that of good schools of the third grade for children up to the age of 13 or 14; because private enterprize could not supply the want, as every master of a private third-grade school, when successful, naturally turned it into a second-grade school, with higher payments. There had been complaints from various parts of the country of the deficiency of second-grade education—of an undue preponderance of first grade, and an insufficiency of second grade. In Bradford, by sanction of the Privy Council, the school board had established an elementary school, with fees in the cases of a certain number of children as high as 9*d.* per week, for the purpose of giving a higher education. He did not pretend to be acquainted with the special circumstances of Bradford; but, upon general grounds, as rates were levied on real property alone—not on the whole income of the nation, but only on about one-fifth of it—he thought it hard that the ratepayers should be compelled to provide schools for the lower middle classes and the higher class of artizans, when there were large endowments available for the educational requirements of the nation. He could not state the certain result more tersely or clearly than in the words he used once before—

> "The undue multiplication of first and second-grade schools will not only be a waste of money, but by furnishing a supply in excess of the natural demand, will tend to diminish the prosperity and, with it, the efficiency of each school. You will have a disastrous competition between them for pupils. They will either lower their prices to keep up their numbers, and thus tempt parents to send their children to schools of too high a grade, and to keep them unduly long at learning, instead of beginning earning; or they will have their schools half empty with fewer masters, obliged each to teach more subjects, and therefore teaching less well; while, in either case, the standard of masters will be lowered

through the impaired prospects of remuneration offered. . . . . . When the learned Professions, and that of clerks and such like, are already so overstocked, when trade is dull and manufactures slack, is it wise to multiply schools for qualifying boys chiefly for the work of distribution or verification, involving only little or very light manual labour, and to stint the number of third-grade schools, better suited to boys early to be trained to hard bodily labour. . . . . . The classes using the first and second-grade schools, thus unduly multiplied, will have the education of their children in them deteriorated in consequence. But what is far more serious, the best of the lower middle class, and the most intelligent and self-denying of the artizans, willing to make sacrifices in order to secure for their children a better education than they had themselves enjoyed, will be cruelly and unjustly denied their fair share of the benefits of the magnificent educational endowment, yielding more than £666,000 a-year, and worth more than £20,000,000, provided by the pious munificence of our ancestors. And their case will be all the harder because, for reasons which I have already given from the Report, they cannot expect the void thus needlessly created to be supplied by private enterprize; and the present respectable misapplication of these endowments is much more hopelessly irrevocable than was the previous state of abuse, misuse, and disuse of many of them which invited reform."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxv. 962-3.]

He ventured to ask, in these circumstances, whether the Government—all whose Members were not as bureaucratic in their views as the noble Duke—would not, before the remaining half or so of the income of £666,000 a-year was disposed of by the Commissioners, consider the expediency of establishing a system of local provincial boards to assist the central authorities in the preparation of schemes for meeting the local educational wants of the country at large? He begged to move for the Return of which he had given Notice.

*Moved*, That there be laid before this House—

"Return made out county by county, in continuation of Return respecting the Endowed Schools Acts, Paper No. (6.), ordered to be printed on the 21st of January last, with in each case a proximate estimate of the annual endowments of (1) The number of Schemes finally approved and in force in England and Wales under the Endowed Schools Acts of 1869, 1873, and 1874; (2) The number of Schemes published by the Charity Commissioners under those Acts, but not yet finally approved; (3) The Endowed Schools not returned in (1) and (2), nor included in sect. 3. of the Endowed Schools Act, 1873, which are within the general provisions of the Endowed Schools Acts; (4) The aggregate number and income of Endowed Schools included in sect. 3. of the Endowed Schools Act, 1873; Also,

"Return, as regards (1), of the grade, determined as in Paper (6.), 1878, of each school under the Scheme in force, and proximate estimate of the number of scholars for which each such school is attended, as well as the total number and grades of such schools and the total number of scholars so estimated."—(*The Earl Fortescue.*)

The Bishop of EXETER desired to express his concurrence with what had fallen from the noble Earl, and his very great regret that whilst so very much good work had been done by the Endowed Schools Commission, it had, nevertheless, been so very much marred by want of really effective machinery. He confessed that when first the Endowed Schools Act was passed, he did not anticipate that what they had said in the Schools Inquiry Commission would be so completely corroborated by the actual results. He thought, at that time, that the central authority might very possibly be able to hold its own against certain local interests; but the working of the Endowed Schools Commission from that day to this had only proved more and more that the Schools Inquiry Commission were right in saying that the work to be done was not of a sort that could be thoroughly done by a central authority. The work to be done, as far as they might briefly express it, was this—to create a great number of third-rate schools, and also to group our English schools in such relations to each other, that instead of a very foolish and unhealthy kind of competition, they might all do a part of the work to be done. Of these two objects, it would be difficult to say which was the most important. The want of the third-rate schools was really depriving the lower half of the middle classes of this country of anything like an efficient supply of educational resources. Not only was this the case, but it appeared to be doing serious mischief to the elementary schools below them; because, in all schools, it was of great importance indeed that the scholars should be stimulated, where they had any talent, and were able to do something more than the average run of their schoolfellows, by the possibility of their rising to a higher education. Such a stimulus was good for both boys and masters. His former experience as an Inspector led him to regret the sort of deadness which prevailed in the elementary schools; for even in regard to the most clever boys, the education seemed to aim at nothing higher. He could not but help feeling, by comparing the spirit in the elementary schools with the spirit in the schools of a higher grade, that there was a real want that could only be supplied by there being a possibility of rising out of these schools to schools of higher education. But such schools did not exist. It would, for the sake of the elementary schools, be a great object to provide these third-rate schools. He did not know whether the establishment of due relations between the various grades of schools was not quite as important a matter as the creation of schools of the third grade. It was a very important matter that there should not only be schools for the boys of the lower middle classes in sufficient abundance, but that there should also be an opportunity of rising to something higher, and it was very often a great matter that the schools should be adapted to the particular localities where they were to be placed. One school might, for instance, have a direction given to it that would suit it to prepare boys rather for commercial pursuits; another school might be designed to prepare boys for manufacturing operations; another might prepare them for the lower ranks of law, or occupations of that kind. The education in each case would, very rightly, vary; and if there was an authority thoroughly acquainted with all the localities, it would be possible to arrange that the different schools should do their different work, each work being the best fitted for its own place. But he did not think it was possible to do it unless there was some authority on the spot, and thoroughly acquainted with all the circumstances of the locality; because, in all these schools, there had been all sorts of petty local interests influencing their management for a very long time; and, as far as he could see, there was only one way to deal with small local interests, and that was to put against them larger local interests. If they attempted to deal with them by a central authority, they invariably found that the central authority was beaten from ignorance of the particular circumstances of the case. Not only so, but the central authority had not so strong interest in upholding its principles, but was much more likely to give way to strong representations from the place where the school was situated than the larger local authority would be. If it were proposed, for instance, that a school in a particular town should be made a second-grade school, and the town wished to make it a first-grade school, the local authority of the county at large would be able to look at the matter, taking in the circumstances of the spot, and taking in, also, the interests of the surrounding locality. There would be a fair competition of interests, and he was quite ready to admit that the central authority would be in its place in judging between them, and might be able very often to decide which of the interests ought to prevail. But as the thing now stood, the larger local interests were left out of sight, because there was no person with the local position and local right to defend them. It was very difficult in this country to get people to take up anything simply for the public good. But it was quite as difficult to get them listened to when they did take it up. If a man came forward and said—"This is what is best for the county," he was immediately met with the inquiry—"What right have you to speak on behalf of the county?" But if there was an authority representing the county, it would be impossible to put that question, and the county interest would be sure to have its real weight as between it and the particular town. As the matter now stood, it seemed to him that it would be impossible to find any single instance in which the larger local interest had been allowed its fair weight as against the smaller. He did not mean at all to deny that the Endowed Schools Commissioners were doing their best. The aims they put before them in the Report they had issued were certainly exceedingly good. They were aiming at the right thing; but it was not the aim that was in question, it was their power of reaching that aim. He could not help feeling confident that a larger local authority, representing one or two counties, would in each case have produced an exceedingly different result from that which had been brought about by the Commission. There was always this difficulty in arguing a matter of this sort—that if an attempt were made to go down to the details of each separate case, it was almost impossible to prove that the wrong thing had been done. In each separate place it might very fairly be said—"There is one opinion on one side, and another opinion on the other side. The Endowed Schools Commission took the one opinion and not the other." But when they looked at the result as a whole, it was quite evident now that the aim which was pointed out by the Schools Inquiry Commission as that which ought to be attained had been, to a large extent with the present machinery, impossible of attainment. They had nothing like a sufficient number of third-rate schools, and as to putting the schools into better relation to one another, he could hardly say there had been anything done.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON said, he had certainly not expected, upon a Motion which was not opposed by Her Majesty's Government, for the production of certain Returns that were really a continuation of Returns already given, that the noble Earl (Earl Fortescue) would have thought it necessary to go so fully into the subject. The noble Earl had, as he told them, quoted very largely from the speech he delivered on the subject last year. He had also done him (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) the honour of quoting also from the speech he made last year in answer to him; and these facts being before their Lordships, and the noble Earl's opinion of last year, as he expressed it, and his (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon's) opinion, which he expressed last year, being also precisely the same, he did not think he need enter at any length into that branch of the subject. Another year's experience had shown him that the work done by the Charity Commissioners had been done in the most satisfactory manner. He had been thrown a great deal in connection with them from his position as President of the Council, and he could honestly and conscientiously say that they had done their work satisfactorily; and he, therefore, held an opposite opinion to that entertained by the noble Earl, for he believed that the work had been, and could be, done well by a central body. The noble Earl had said that the operations of the Charity Commissioners under the powers of the Endowed Schools Act had done harm to the elementary schools.

Earl FORTESCUE denied that he had said what was attributed to him.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON stated, that he had understood the noble Earl to say that by the provisions that were made for endowed schools harm was done to the elementary schools below them. But if he had misunderstood the noble Earl, he withdrew the expression, and took it that the action of the Charity Commissioners in carrying out the endowed schools system was not productive of any harm at all to the elementary schools of the country. Therefore, they had, at all events, the elementary schools separated from his blame of the manner in which the schools above them were conducted. The right rev. Prelate who had spoken (the Bishop of Exeter) had complained that there was a considerable amount of deadness in the manner in which the elementary schools were carried on when he was an Inspector. He could not help thinking that if the right rev. Prelate were now to inspect the schools—which he might do in the course of his duties in his diocese—he would see that in many elementary schools, certainly deadness did not prevail. The right rev. Prelate objected to the action of the Charity Commissioners that they did not sufficiently consider, in their Report, the encouragement which ought to be given in elementary schools to scholars to rise. He was sorry to differ from the right rev. Prelate; but that was precisely what they did, or endeavoured to do. They provided exhibitions for boys who were clever, with the view of enabling them to rise in their studies and to pass to the higher schools. Both the noble Earl and right rev. Prelate did what it was very easy to do—they raised their objections in general terms. They did not bring forward any instance of neglect on the part of the Commissioners in any particular locality or school. Had they done so, the Commissioners would have been put upon their trial, and it would have been for them to show that they had not neglected either the powers or the duties placed upon them by the Act. The right rev. Prelate argued that it would be very difficult to bring up any separate instance in which the Commissioners had done wrong; but until he was prepared to do so, he (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) was inclined to say that the charges of neglect of duty existed more in theory than in practice. At any rate, until cases were brought before him, he was content to believe that the present system was well worked; and until the need of amendment in the system itself were proved, he was quite prepared to leave things as they stood. There would be no objection to the Returns asked for by the noble Earl, if the last line of the Motion—"proximate estimate of the number of the total scholars by which each such school is attended," and "total number of scholars so estimated," were struck out.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, without entering upon the general question, wished to draw the attention of the noble Duke to a point, not of much importance, perhaps, but still worthy of notice. He by no means asserted that the Charity Commissioners were neglectful of their duties; but, as a trustee of an endowed school, he found that a practice prevailed amongst that body which was not to be found in any other Public Office. About this time of the year the Commissioners departed, apparently in a body, on what they called "the recess;" and if a letter was written then on any business connected with the Department, the answer received was—"Will be attended to after the recess." Such a practice he considered to be exceedingly wrong, and he trusted the noble Duke would see that arrangements were made by which the Public Business would not in future suffer in that way.

EARL FORTESCUE, in reply, said, he did not doubt that the Charity Commissioners and the Endowed School Commissioners had endeavoured to do their duty; but he maintained, on the authority of one of the most statesmanlike and powerful Commissions of his day, that they had work given them to do which, from the very nature of the case, they could not do satisfactorily, and he claimed that the speech of the noble Duke that evening had fully confirmed that view.

Amendment made: Words *struck out*, and Return, as amended, *agreed to.*

## THE EXPLOSIVES ACT—STOWAGE OF GUNPOWDER ON SHIPBOARD—THE "PEREORA."—OBSERVATIONS.

LORD TRURO called attention to the improper stowage of upwards of 20 tons of gunpowder on board the merchant and passenger sailing ship *Pereora* in the Thames; to the defective state of the law as requiring proper magazines for the transport of gunpowder on merchant ships; and to the inefficient inspection of the stowage of gunpowder on merchant ships in and at the mouth of the Thames either by the Board of Trade or the Thames Conservancy. The noble Lord said, that the whole subject relating to the stowage of gunpowder on board vessels was, to his mind, one of considerable importance both to the public and the merchant shipping of this country. The case of the *Pereora* was not one of which he desired to make any great point; but he had availed himself of it as an illustration of certain deficiencies in the administration of the Port of London. The *Pereora* was a vessel of 1,600 tons, belonging to the New Zealand Shipping Company, and was on a voyage from the Port of London to Auckland with a general cargo, which it appeared was made up, or made complete, by placing on board a considerable quantity of gunpowder—amounting, he was informed, to as much as 30 or 40 tons; though, for the sake of being within the mark, he had put it down at 20 tons. Before going further, he wished to state that the matter to which he proposed to call attention did not in any way indicate a conflict of jurisdiction between the Thames Conservancy and the Board of Trade. Not long since, a Statute, called "The Explosives Act" was passed, which, he would not say empowered, but directed, the Thames Conservancy to draw up certain bye-laws regulating the stowage and other matters connected with vessels. Therefore, it was not from any conflict of authority that that of which he complained had arisen; but from a disinclination on the part both of the Conservancy and the Government to exercise the powers placed in their hands. Now, he wished to direct the attention of the Government to three things—first, to the stowage of gunpowder on board merchant and sailing ships; secondly, to the inspection of magazines in which gunpowder was stored; and, thirdly, to the defective state of the law in regard to notice. In regard to this latter point, he would at once say that he hoped the House would take some steps for insuring that notice of the intention to ship gunpowder should be given, not only to the Board of Trade, but to the passengers and crew of a ship. It appeared that the Board of Trade had always been unwilling to impose any restrictions or regulations which might be considered unduly to interfere with commerce; and, therefore, had left this matter very much to the supervision of the Thames Conservancy. He was aware that there were certain regulations in force in reference to the stowage of small quantities of gunpowder. It was required to be packed in kegs of a certain size; those kegs could only be taken on board in small numbers, and they were required to be kept separate from the rest of the cargo, or any combustibles. But there were no regulations of any moment imposed by the Thames Conservancy, much less by any direct law; and the consequence very often was that which happened in the case of the *Pereora.* It appeared that at 12 at night, before the ship left the Thames, the captain was informed that it was the intention of the shippers to embark gunpowder on board. The following morning the carpenters set to work to erect what was considered, by them, a sufficient magazine, but which was a mere wooden partition; and the gunpowder having been taken on board, to the amount of 40 tons, the ship then left the following morning for its destination. No notice having been given to the passengers, they could offer no appeal, and the consequence was that the relatives of those on board were not in a very happy frame of mind as to what might happen. Now, it was not at all a difficult matter to ship gunpowder on the Thames over-night, to elude all inspection, and then next morning to slip down the river without any interruption on the part of the authorities. There was a regulation that a red flag should be hoisted on ships leaving the Port of London; but it was easy enough to avoid that by dropping down the river late at night, after the officials had gone to bed, there take the gunpowder on board, and next morning get away without notice or interference. No doubt, there was a law to stop all this; but it was in a very unsatisfactory condition and required alteration. For himself, he took a much wider view of the question than that indicated in his Notice. Their Lordships might not be aware that there was no law existing which compelled notice to be given either to the Board of Trade, or any other authority, by the owners of vessels leaving any of the ports of England laden with gunpowder; and, that being so, he wished to ask Her Majesty's Government whether they did not deem it right and advisable to consider the expediency of enforcing the construction of proper magazines on board merchant ships for the stowage of gunpowder, and to direct that the officers of the Board of Trade should supervise them from time to time? The Board of Trade might answer, and very probably would—"Why should we not call upon the River Conservancy, who are the local authority, to see to the construction of these magazines, and to supervise them by a proper Inspector?" With all respect to the Board of Trade, he could not help thinking that this was rather an Imperial concern, than a matter to be left to local management and local inspection. When they considered the extent of the shipping of the country in many of their ports, and the lives and property that were at stake, they surely ought not to be content with the supervision that might be exercised by the local authorities. They ought certainly to look to the Imperial power for the enforcement of regulations of this character, and ought not to be satisfied without it. Now, a word as to the notice. In the case he had mentioned, there was no notice; but a relation of one of the passengers on board the *Pereora,* who appeared to have been alarmed at this taking in of gunpowder, made it his duty to go, first, to the Inspector of the Conservancy Board, and then to an Inspector of the Board of Trade; and after much running about from one to the other, craving mercy for his friends on board, he was told by the Board of Trade Inspector that he could do nothing; and the Conservancy Board Inspector told him he was powerless, there being no regulation or bye-law of either Board which would justify his action. It was quite true there was something of the nature of a magazine; but it was not such a magazine as would exist on board Her Majesty's Navy, or in any of Her Majesty's ships; and he thought he was justified in contending that if the crews of Her Majesty's ships were entitled to the protection afforded by a well-built and properly constructed magazine, the crews and passengers of the Mercantile Marine were entitled to no less care and protection. He had now touched upon the three matters which he desired, with all respect, to bring before Her Majesty's Government. In order, however, to confirm what he had said about there being no bye-laws to justify interference with ships in this matter, he quoted a judgment of Mr. Rothery, one of the Wreck Commissioners, in a very important case, arising before him a short time since. In this judgment, it was pointed out that the bye-laws provided that in any ship or boat carrying a greater quantity than 300 lbs. of explosives—

> "Due precaution shall be taken by the protection of a bulkhead, partition, or otherwise, and by careful stowing, to secure the explosives from being brought into contact with any other article or substance carried in such ship or boat."

Mr. Rothery said—

> "It will be seen that this bye-law imposes no obligation on shipowners to construct a separate compartment for explosives, but only to separate them from the rest of the cargo by bulkheads, partitions, or otherwise."

He (Lord Truro) did not expect from Her Majesty's Government a full and complete answer to the suggestions he had made; but he thought it was a subject that ought to receive the careful and full consideration of Her Majesty's Government. He hoped next Session to revive the subject, and he trusted the suggestions he had offered would receive that consideration which was their due.

LORD HENNIKER said, that at the present moment the Board of Trade had no information regarding the *Pereora.* He should be very glad to make a full statement as to the law and the regulations concerning the shipment and stowage of gunpowder and other explosives, if the noble Lord would give him a little longer Notice; but he would immediately lay on the Table of the House copies of the bye-laws of the Thames Conservancy Board, and also copies of the instructions issued by the Board of Trade on this subject. The Thames Conservancy Board proposed, after consultation with the Board of Trade, to amend one or two of their bye-laws so as to secure the hoisting and carrying of a red flag when ships were taking in gunpowder or explosives, or when they were laden with gunpowder and explosives. This would insure greater safety to life and property. He could only further say that the attention of the Board of Trade had been given to this subject constantly. It was a subject beset with all kinds of difficulties. On the part of the Board of Trade, he had to thank the noble Lord for drawing public attention to it.

## THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS—THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN asked Her Majesty's Government for a statement of the details of the financial arrangements concluded with the Porte in regard to the Island of Cyprus? In the Convention dated the 4th June last, between Great Britain and Turkey, the following paragraph occurred:—

> "It is agreed that England will pay to the Porte whatever is the present excess of revenue over expenditure in the island, this excess to be determined by the average of the last five years, stated to be 22,936 purses."

He wished to have an explanation of the expression "excess of revenue over expenditure;" because, as it appeared to him, these words were capable of more than one interpretation. There were other financial points about which he hoped Her Majesty's Government would give some information. At the present time they knew very little about the Island of Cyprus, and Her Majesty's Government had admitted that they could not add much to their information; but what little they did know, he believed their Lordships would be of opinion, was not of a highly encouraging character. They knew that the administration of that Island had been distinguished for corruption, rapacity, and, he might say, almost all the faults of which an Administration was capable. They knew that the population had been dwindling. He believed at one time the population amounted to 1,000,000 souls; but under the benefits of Turkish rule, they had dwindled away to 150,000 or 250,000 persons—he was not sure which. They knew also that the cities were in ruins. They knew that the cultivators of the soil had been harassed by arbitrary exactions. They knew that commerce had been driven away from the Island. They knew that the harbour, or whatever used to represent a harbour, had been silted up; and they also knew that even the wells were filled up, and that all sanitary precautions had been neglected. He believed there were now no roads, or only very bad ones, in the Island. This was the Island we had undertaken to administer. At the first start, and for a very considerable time afterwards, the Government would find plenty to do there, and he would venture to say that when the bill came to be paid, they would find that it would have to be paid, not in hundreds of thousands, but in millions of pounds. The question was, where were these millions to come from? He should have thought that when England undertook the administration of this Island, and to guarantee the Eastern frontier of Turkey in Asia, she took upon herself a responsibility that was serious enough. He should have thought, when she found herself obliged to take, or to ask for, a military position from which she might be able to discharge the responsibility which she had assumed, that she might reasonably have expected that the Power she had undertaken to protect would only have been too glad to hand over that position to her without cost. He thought that if any Turkish statesman had been asked two months ago whether Turkey would hand over the Island of Cyprus free of cost on condition that England would guarantee the Eastern frontier of Turkey, he would have said at once that he would hand over not only Cyprus, but Crete, and half the Islands of the Archipelago. But the arrangement, they were told, was that England was to pay to the Porte the present excess of revenue over expenditure in the Island, and that that was to be calculated on an average of five years. It was stated to be nearly 23,000 purses. That was the statement of the English Government; but perhaps their Lordships would like to hear what was the official statement of the Turkish Government on the subject. On the 11th July, Reuter's telegraph agency sent the following official statement from Constantinople:—

> "In virtue of the Treaty for the British occupation of Cyprus, England engages to pay to the Porte annually £150,000 sterling, whereas the present revenue is only £120,000."

He was not going to ask them to attach any serious importance to this official statement, as they all knew what Turkish official statements were. But, at the same time, that was the view which the Porte professed to take of the Treaty, and that was the view he hoped would not be taken when we came to verify the revenue of the Island. These words, "the present excess of revenue over expenditure," might mean a great deal. He should like to know, in the first place, what was meant by the word "revenue?" What he understood by the word "revenue," was any excess which might exist from the amount raised by taxation in the Island, after defraying the whole expense of civil administration in the Island; but he should think there was very considerable doubt whether, in this sense of the word, Turkey had ever received any full revenue from the Island of Cyprus for many years. This meaning of the word revenue would contradict Turkish practice in two points. In the first place, it was not the custom of Turkey to tax her subjects in the sense in which we used the word, nor her custom to pay the expense of administration. What she did was to exact from her subjects, by means of her officers, as much as she could, without being very particular as to the manner in which the money was raised, and then to leave her officials to pay themselves, no doubt, by taking another squeeze of the Cyprian orange. He should like to know whether these 23,000 purses were really the revenue which had found its way to Constantinople, after all the expenses of Government had been defrayed. That was a matter which he thought it would be very difficult for Her Majesty's Government to verify. In the next place, he should like to ask, was this charge to be a first charge upon the revenue of Cyprus? It was not stated whether England was to defray all the expenses out of the surplus or not; or what amount should be paid over to the Turkish Government. The construction which he put upon the words—and the construction which it seemed to him they were intended to bear—was this, that the Turkish Government having, during the last 25 years, derived 23,000 purses from the Island, we were to guarantee that sum without taking into consideration the expenses that might be afterwards incurred. If so, all he could say was that it was a very bad bargain for us to have made. He believed that it was a fact that, for a considerable period, there had been no surplus of revenue whatsoever over the expenses of administration. The Island had been reduced to a very poor condition; and the result was that for a number of years it would be found necessary to limit considerably the amount of taxation which would ultimately have to be levied. He would like to know, then, whether the Government could give any idea of the deficiency likely to arise, and whether, whilst there was a deficiency, it was intended to make any payment to the Porte? They must recollect that England was sending some thousands of troops to the Island. Was the pay of these men, kept there to watch over the Eastern frontier of the Porte, to be defrayed by Turkey or by England; and, in the latter event, was England also to make payment to Turkey out of the revenue of Cyprus? It must be remembered that England would have to incur very heavy expenditure for the digging out of harbours at Famagousta and elsewhere, for the making of roads, and for other works. Was it intended that those charges should fall on the British taxpayer; and, if so, what arrangements had been made as to the manner in which those charges were to be met in the possible event of England restoring Cyprus to the Porte? These were a few of the questions which had suggested themselves to him on reading the 3rd clause of the Treaty—questions upon which he thought the House would be glad to receive some information.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The object of Her Majesty's Government in making this agreement with the Porte was that the Porte should not be financially the worse for the part it has undertaken—that is to say, that the amount of the surplus of revenue—whatever it may have been—for the last five years, after all expenditure civil and military has been defrayed, shall still continue to flow into the coffers of the Porte. That seems to me to be a very fair arrangement, and it was especially incumbent upon us when we remember that what the Porte receives from Cyprus, as well as from other places, is already pledged to the bondholders of the Porte; so that, perhaps, it might have been considered a questionable proceeding if we had induced Turkey to hand over the surplus to us. There are no detailed arrangements between us which I can lay upon the Table, because none such have as yet been agreed to; and until we receive the Report of the Administrator, Sir Garnet Wolseley, it is impossible to give any information upon official authority, because before his arrival there was no official authority to ascertain it. Now, the noble Earl appears to take a very gloomy view of our engagements. I will not attempt to compete with him in the matter of prophecy; but I would just point out to him that if the falling-off of revenue has been as great as he appears to imagine, it will be all the better for England; because, henceforth, the revenue will be honestly collected, and the surplus will, consequently, be that much larger than it has been. In the same way, if the resources of the Island have been terribly neglected, and the springs of its prosperity allowed to run to waste, it will be all to the advantage of an honest and capable Government which will produce from the Island the revenue it ought to yield. But upon all these matters the Government are awaiting information. I am far from admitting that that which we do possess are of the gloomy character depicted by the noble Earl. I believe the Island will be as capable in the future, as it has been in the past, of maintaining a large population, and where there is a large population there must necessarily be a large revenue.

EARL GRANVILLE: Although the Question put by my noble Friend (the Earl of Camperdown) appears a very reasonable and prudent one, I apprehend he was scarcely sanguine enough to expect much more information than he has obtained. The fact is, the Government have adopted a system of secrecy which I never remember before in the practice of Her Majesty's Government on questions of this sort. Her Majesty's Government negotiated an Anglo-Turkish Convention, and signed and ratified it in complete secrecy. They alleged that reasons of high policy made that necessary; but now that the Convention is concluded, now that it has been presented to Parliament, what is the information which they vouchsafe us? We have not the slightest inkling, so far as I am aware, of any communications having taken place with other Powers. We do not know even how the Turkish Government itself received the proposal. My noble Friend thinks that, perhaps, the Turks were only too glad to get rid of an Island that had become a burden to them; but I should like to know whether they were so rejoiced, or whether they received the proposal with considerable indignation? On this point we know absolutely nothing. The same perfect system of secrecy is observed in regard to all the arrangements in connection with this agreement with the Turkish Government, and in regard to the decisions which Her Majesty's Government has taken as to the future administration of the Island. I may say, too, that the same secrecy has been maintained as to the very hopeful account which the noble Marquess has given of the state of the Island; for, so far as I am concerned, the only help he has given me on that point was to refer me to a book which did not contain any information on the subject, and which has been the only source open to me. Now, in respect to the latter question, I cannot help thinking that the want of information is owing to two facts—first, that the Government did not seek for very much information before they took this important step of theirs; and secondly, that the information they had received on the different matters connected with the negotiations do not seem to them to be of a very trustworthy character. The noble Marquess talks of his hopes for the prosperity of the Island. I have not the slightest doubt that there is no Island with a tolerably good climate, and reduced by misgovernment, that would not materially profit under British rule and the expenditure of British capital. But that is not the question here. The only reason alleged by Her Majesty's Government for the purchase of the Island is that having contracted very onerous responsibilities, it appeared to them necessary that in return they should have some addition to their strength in order to enable them to meet those responsibilities. Now, it is quite clear that the question of whether the Island is fertile, or whether the roads are improving, is not in any way to the purpose; for by showing that the country is rich and fertile, or may be made so, you do not get rid of the imputation that we wished to get hold of a good portion of the spoil—an imputation put forward in certain Western countries of Europe. What we want to know is, is the Island of any use to us, as adding to our strength? No one can say that it will add to our military or naval strength to take that which is not a good naval station; and I have great doubt—I had not at first—whether the Government can quote any opinion which they received previous to the Convention favourable to the Island in that character. For myself, I do not know a single naval officer, of high or low command, who has not pronounced against it as a naval station. The noble Earl the First Lord of the Treasury spoke for a considerable time the other evening in defence of the Ministers Plenipotentiary for having ceded Batoum, which he said had been obtained by the Russians—meaning, of course, under the Treaty of San Stefano. He said, too, that it would be very difficult for Her Majesty's Government, after the Congress had decided in favour of cession, to take steps to prevent it; but he added that after all it was not a matter of much importance, because the port of Batoum was a bad port. I do not pretend to have made myself master of the Protocols, although I have read them; but I have been unable to find the slightest trace of the Congress having come to any decision in this matter—whether they agreed to the cession or not. The question was raised, and the next person who spoke after Prince Gortschakoff was the first British Plenipotentiary, who expressed unbounded delight at the proposal which the Russian Chancellor had made. I say, however, that I am utterly at a loss to know when the decision of the Congress was taken. Again, the noble Earl said that Batoum was a wretched port—he did not use the word "wretched," but he described it to that effect. Now, I had never heard that Batoum was an indifferent port, though I certainly never believed it to be a Portsmouth; but the noble Earl went on to tell us exactly how many ships it would contain. He said it would contain three ships; but he made the further admission that it might be made to contain six, if they were as closely packed together as ships in the London Docks. Now, I do not know exactly how many ships Batoum can accommodate; but this I do know, that very recently a Turkish Fleet, consisting, not of three ships, or of six ships, but of 13 ships, with one transport, were actually in that port. That being so, I think we have some reason for asking upon what authority Her

Majesty's Government offer us the details which they put forward as the only information they have to give upon a most interesting and important subject?

Lord HAMMOND said, although he did not consider the Convention between this country and the Porte to have been very artistically framed, yet it clearly showed that England had bound herself to pay between £100,000 and £150,000 a-year to the Porte, whether raised out of the taxation of the Island or not. He would like to know if the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs took any steps to ascertain what was the actual state of the expenses of the Turkish Government previously to negotiating, and before signing the Treaty. Looking to the Consular Reports of 1876, they did not find them speak very favourably of the trade and commerce of Cyprus. The whole trade of Larnaca in imports was valued at about £155,000, of which £3,500 fell to the share of British enterprize; and about £208,000 exports, of which about £35,000 were British. The trade of Limasol was about £51,000 imports, of which £2,900 were British; and about £60,000 exports, of which about £8,150 were British. They could not, therefore, consider that the commercial value of Cyprus was very great. Whatever might have been the expenses of the Turkish administration, there could be no doubt that, under the British rule, the expense of administration would be far greater, and after the payment of the tribute we had engaged to pay to the Porte—for, as far as Cyprus was concerned, we were a tributary State—we should have to provide for the expenditure of the British administration, of the British garrison, of the civil, naval, and military, establishments which it might be necessary to maintain. As regarded the latter class of expenses, it might be asked where was the necessity, after the Congress of Berlin had restored peace to Europe, to maintain in Cyprus a garrison of 10,000 men—double the number we retained in Malta? The Indian contingent of 7,000 men had been sent there, as well as three British regiments, besides engineers and other officers. When we considered, not only the expense incurred by the occupation and administration of Cyprus, but that we had also undertaken the protection of Asiatic Turkey from encroachment on the part of Russia, and had further undertaken the protection of the Turkish subjects in Asia Minor against maladministration on the part of Turkish authorities—for, disguise it how we might, we had virtually undertaken such a Protectorate—and when, in return for these onerous engagements, we found ourselves saddled with the occupation and administration of an unhealthy Island, insufficiently supplied with water, without a harbour for our ships, accommodation for our garrison, or establishments for those engaged in civil administration, we could not look without grave apprehension at the prospect before us. He felt it difficult to understand how an Island in a remote corner of the Mediterranean could serve as a basis of operation against a Russian invasion of the North-eastern corner of Asiatic Turkey, or form a nucleus from which a system of good government in the interior of Asia Minor could be promoted or secured. There was another point, to which he almost shrank from alluding. We were not called upon to pronounce on the morality or immorality of measures adopted by foreign Governments; but we might properly regard our own; and, judging by our standard the course we had taken, as regarded Cyprus, we might fairly consider whether, after our solemn engagements to respect the integrity of Turkey, our participation in its spoils was not, to say the least of it, an act of questionable morality.

The Earl of BEACONSFIELD: The charge made against the Government by the noble Earl (the Earl of Camperdown), if his observations really alluded to anything, is that we have not favoured the House with sufficient information respecting the occupation of Cyprus, and the noble Earl who supported him in his remarks complained of the secrecy of the negotiations by which the occupation was carried into effect, and he laid that also as a charge against the Government. But, in fact, the two charges answer each other. It is a fact that this was a secret negotiation, and when the matter is fairly brought before the House with due notice, I shall be quite prepared, and my Colleagues also, to give very valid reasons for the secrecy of these negotiations. It is not the first secret negotiation into which this country has entered, and I shall be able to show not only by precedent, but also, I hope, by very good reasons, that secrecy was the right policy of the Government, and that the object we had in view could not be realized except by secrecy. If secrecy were necessary, if secrecy were pursued, and if it were only by secrecy that the object of the Government could be achieved, it was quite impossible that we could make those appeals to the Turkish Government, or that the Turkish Government themselves could pursue those inquiries or make those arrangements which, had they been pursued and made, would have put an end to the secrecy. Therefore, there is no doubt, though the Treaty was signed on the 6th of June, a whole month elapsed before it was sufficiently known to enter into any inquiries which were, of course, expedient, and to make many arrangements with the Turkish Government, which are now under discussion. But, at the same time, I must say, on the part of the Government, that it is a great error to suppose that they decided upon the occupation of Cyprus without being in possession of adequate information. The House is entitled, and Parliament is entitled, to possess that information when affairs are in that state that we think these documents can be produced without injury to the Public Service, and I hope only a short time will elapse before that information may be laid before Parliament, when noble Lords will be able to bring this matter fairly before the House; and when they have the information before them, and when they bring forward their views, although they may be views opposed to the Government, we shall clearly understand what is the policy they denounce, and what is the policy they recommend. We will meet them in fair discussion, and the House will decide, and the country will decide, which is the policy they think most advantageous to the country to adopt and to maintain. That is the only general observation I can make to remarks so desultory as those I have to encounter. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) maintains that I called Batoum a "bad," and afterwards he said I called it a "wretched" port. I have no recollection of using either word.

Earl GRANVILLE: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. I did not use the word "bad," and though I used the word "wretched," I retracted it immediately, and said the noble Earl had used other language depreciatory of the character of the port.

The Earl of BEACONSFIELD: I have no objection to the noble Earl using any epithet he pleases. The noble Earl used many epithets, and I can easily understand if, in substituting another word for the first he used, he employed one which was not very felicitous, that he should have forgotten it. I believe that Batoum is neither a bad nor a wretched port. I believe it is a good port; but it is a port of very limited capacity, and that is what I wished to impress upon your minds. The statement that three considerable ships could be received in the harbour with facility was made by me upon the highest authority that I could well appeal to, one particularly acquainted with the country and the locality; and I have such confidence in the information I received from that authority that I shall not without very prolonged investigation, which may lead to a very different result, change my opinion. The same authority who said that three considerable ships might be at anchor in the port of Batoum, did say, using the expression which the noble Earl has recalled, that if they were packed as the ships were in London Docks, probably there would be room for six ships—may be eight. That was an expression used by a judge as high in such matters as could well be fixed upon; and it appeared to me to give a picturesque and clear view of the capacity of the port. It is an excellent port, but its capacity is extremely limited. With regard to the ports of Cyprus, it is, of course, easy to pick out musty details from obsolete gazetteers, and to say "there are no ports in Cyprus;" but I venture to say your Lordships will find by this time next year that there are ports sufficient to accommodate British ships.

Viscount CARDWELL: I have never met with a more striking instance than that afforded by the speech of the noble Earl of the skill of a debater who assumes that questions have been put which have not been put, and who fails to answer those which have been actually addressed to him. Notwithstanding the questions put to the Government, we have entirely failed to extract from the noble Earl any satisfactory information. The noble Earl says he did not tell us that Batoum was a bad or a wretched port. But what did he tell us? He told us that it would only hold three ships in the ordinary course, and six if they were packed as they were packed in the London Docks. Now, what says my noble Friend beside me? He tells you that he knows or has been informed that the Turkish Admiral had there a fleet of 13 vessels, many of which were iron-clads, together with all those other ships which attend upon a fleet of that kind, transports, and so forth. The noble Earl opposite does not tell us, however, whether there is any foundation for this statement. He only repeats what he stated before; and he does not tell us what additional information he has received. There are other matters besides this. We want to know something about the revenue of Cyprus. We have made inquiries, not to-night for the first time, but on former occasions. But have we obtained any answer? None whatever. We have been left entirely in the dark. It is, no doubt, extremely kind of the noble Earl to tell us that if we only bring forward a Motion he will have an opportunity of answering us. We are extremely indebted to him. We have now reached the 23rd of July. What will be the condition of your Lordships' House by the time the noble Earl is prepared with his full official information and a debate can come on. Then there are other subjects to be taken into account besides, the details of which we are ignorant. The other night I ventured to ask the noble Marquess opposite why, if, as we had understood, Cyprus was to be made into a Crown Colony, he could have any hesitation in saying whether or not slavery was to be continued there? We have read in the newspapers—and it is really only from the newspapers that we have any information on this subject—that a high functionary had gone from Constantinople to give up the Island to a high functionary of ours, and that the British flag had been hoisted there. I certainly thought it would have been an easy thing to say—"The British flag is flying in Cyprus, and where the British flag is flying, slavery cannot exist." But what was the answer given? No answer at all. I have seen in the newspapers that Her Majesty's Attorney General said—"Cyprus is not a Crown Colony." Then, I should like to know what it is? Surely, before we are challenged, in the emphatic manner of the noble Earl, to come down with our Resolution, we have a right to know some of the rudiments of the subject? I looked to the Treaty which has been laid upon your Lordships' Table for the best information I could get, and I found that, according to the Treaty, certainly Cyprus is to remain Turkish territory, but that its occupation and administration are to be in our hands. I want to know, then, under what law the Island is to be governed? Is it to be a country subject to Turkish law, or is it to be a country subject to English law? There are arguments on both sides; but Parliament has a right to know definitely which it is to be. In concluding these remarks, I would say we have a right to have some better assurance than we have ever yet received of the sobriety and gravity with which this undertaking has been conceived. We ought to have learned more about Cyprus from the Government than the Government has vouchsafed to us; but there seems to be some difficulty about communicating information. So far as we can learn from what has happened, Her Majesty's Government did not begin to think about this matter yesterday; they have been thinking about it for some time. Did the Government make any inquiry about Cyprus before taking it over? Did they know whether it had any harbours or not, or whether slavery existed there or not before they arranged for its cession? Did they enter upon any of these considerations which a Government was bound to entertain, and carefully examine, before making a Treaty, and before concluding it, and ratifying it behind the back, and without the knowledge of Parliament? They ought to have made themselves familiar with all these points. If they had done so, there could hardly be any difficulty about communicating them to your Lordships. Your Lordships do not know what law runs in Cyprus, or would run in it, or what liabilities we incurred when we accepted the responsibilities of it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR remarked, that the noble Viscount who had just sat down (Viscount Cardwell) had commenced his observations by referring to the skill of a debater who could assume that Questions were put which had not been put, and who failed to answer those which had actually been addressed to him. But the noble Viscount had performed a feat still more remarkable, because he had repeated a number of Questions, and, assuming that they had been put, he complained bitterly that they had not been answered. Why, asked the noble Viscount, had no person explained whether this was a Crown Colony or not; why had no one told them what law was to be administered in the Colony; and why had no one shown on what footing the jurisdiction of the English Crown was to be exercised? Were these the Questions the noble Earl (the Earl of Camperdown) had put upon the Paper? The noble Earl's Question upon the Paper related merely to the revenues of the Island, and there was not a word in it about whether it was a Crown Colony or not a Crown Colony, and not a word on the subject of slavery. Well, he could answer the Questions now put. They were perfectly plain, and there was not the least difficulty about them. It was the law of these countries that whenever Her Majesty possessed by Treaty with a foreign Power the right to exercise power and jurisdiction out of Her own Dominions, She might do so in the same way as in a conquered or ceded country. It was a well-established principle that where they had a conquered or a ceded territory possessing laws of its own, those laws would apply to the subjects of that territory generally until they were altered. It was perfectly well-known that British subjects in the Turkish Dominions had a right to have justice administered to them by their own laws. All these rules would, in the present instance, be attended to and faithfully observed. The noble Viscount asked a Question on the subject of slavery. He might rest assured that the course taken by Her Majesty's Government in regard to slavery would not be different in the Island of Cyprus from that adopted in other places where the laws of Her Majesty were administered. The noble Viscount then asked whether Cyprus was a Crown Colony? He would find the position of Cyprus exactly defined in the Convention. Cyprus was not a territory of the Crown in any other than in this sense—that it was an Island which, under the Convention, was to be occupied and administered by Her Majesty according to the terms of the Convention.

Lord SELBORNE observed, that his noble and learned Friend had promised to answer the Questions put by the noble Viscount; but he must say that an answer more extraordinary or more totally wide of the mark, he could not conceive. The noble and learned Lord told their Lordships that they were to administer Cyprus under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, his statement was that by the Foreign Jurisdiction Act Her Majesty, if She was authorized to exercise jurisdiction, had power to do so as in a conquered or ceded territory.

Lord SELBORNE said, that under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, Her Majesty's own subjects in those countries to which that jurisdiction was applicable, were under, and could avail themselves of, that jurisdiction. But he wanted to know how far that jurisdiction carried them in Cyprus, and who were Her Majesty's subjects in Cyprus? The same class of persons who, under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, would have been subject to British law in Cyprus under the old condition of things, would still be subject to British jurisdiction in Cyprus, just as they were before the Convention was made. The power giving Her Majesty jurisdiction over Her own subjects, and authority to exercise it by Her own laws and through Her own Courts in the Turkish Dominions extended to Cyprus before the Convention was made, as it did to other parts of those Dominions. But the Island was now placed under our administration for all time to come, the condition of our remaining there being an event which nobody expected to happen—namely, the retrocession by Russia to Turkey of all the Asiatic territories she had acquired in the recent war. We were undertaking for all time to come the administration of the entire Island of Cyprus, and consequently of the whole population. We must, therefore, administer justice to all the inhabitants, whether Turks, Greeks, or the subjects of any European State; and we must determine the question of slavery, not only as to our own subjects in the Island, but as to everybody else there. By singular ingenuity we had contrived to get a cession of territory, and yet not a cession;

because, nominally, the Island would continue to be Turkish, though practically it would be English. Technically, all the Mussulmans and any non-British inhabitants who might happen to be in Cyprus were not our subjects; technically, they were Turkish subjects. He still wanted to know by what law these people were to be governed, and how the administration of justice was to be managed?

LORD LILFORD, in reply to the remark that very little was known about Cyprus, said, he could easily furnish a list covering five pages of closely printed octavo, giving merely the names of books from about the middle of last century up to the present time. There were also later books, and he thought he might fairly say it was the fault of noble Lords opposite, if they were entirely ignorant with regard to Cyprus. He called attention to a letter in *The Standard* of the previous day, written by someone who was evidently acquainted with the subject. This writer quoted a book of great weight, just published at Athens—*Les Iles de la Mediterrannée*—by J. Jassonides—

> "We know," said the Correspondent of *The Standard*, "that the Greek merchants and bankers have already gone to the Island, and that the Maltese have speedily followed their example; surely this should be enough for us. We ought to know that these people, by their proximity to Cyprus and knowledge of it, would not go there *en masse* unless they were satisfied as to the climate, and that, under British rule, the most fertile spot in the Mediterranean would be a source of unlimited wealth to those who are first in the field."

Then the writer quoted the following from the authority he had just named:—

> "For 40 years have I been going from Isle to Isle, ascertaining their political, commercial, and social aspect, and this Island—Cyprus—notwithstanding the barbarity of its present rulers, through which it is cut off from the rest of the world, is my favourite; it is a little world in itself—here do I wish to die. My limited means would keep me in comparative luxury. Although old, I am getting strong and feel young; no wild beasts or numerous reptiles disturb my solitude, my water is sweet and cool; but, above all, I know that my grave would be respected, and that kind hands would close my eyes."

There was much controversy regarding the climate of the Island, and upon this point he should just quote a sentence from the Correspondent—

> "My personal experience of the Island enables me to state that in summer it does not resemble a desert; many mountains are perpetually covered with snow, and in the summer they water the land by their numerous rivers and streams."

He had a suggestion to make touching the financial position of the Island, which he should reserve till the noble Viscount the Under Secretary of State for War was present.

## THE TREATY OF BERLIN—THE PORT OF BATOUM.—OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT POWERSCOURT wished to offer a few remarks upon a subject very nearly related to that they had been discussing. Some 12 years ago he travelled in Russia, and he had gone along the whole of the Southern coast of the Black Sea. In some senses, Batoum might be said to be unimportant, still he could understand the desire of the Russians to possess it; because Poti was a most wretched place, and could boast of few advantages except those that a very shallow river could give. The anchorages along the Southern coast of the Black Sea were very bad, and before she got Batoum, Russia had no harbour there except Poti. Batoum, though not a large place, was the best harbour there, and, relatively, a very important one.

## CHINA—THE CHEFOO CONVENTION.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF ABERDEEN asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to carry into effect the arrangement concerning opium, as proposed in Clause 3 of Section III. of the Chefoo Convention; and whether any further Papers connected with the Convention could now be laid upon the Table, especially the remaining portion of Sir Thomas Wade's Report, and the reply of the Indian Government to the reference made by Her Majesty's Government with respect to the Chefoo Convention? He might, perhaps, be allowed to remind their Lordships that this Convention was provisionally agreed upon in the month of September, 1876. Although it arose out of the murder of a British officer on Chinese territory, it dealt with various matters, and clearly had an important bearing upon the diplomatic and commercial relations between this country and China. The 3rd section in part related to commerce, and under it China agreed to make certain concessions, especially with respect to the opening of new ports to foreign trade; while, on the other hand, England gave to China increased facilities for regulating the import of opium, for collecting the duty upon it, and for checking the evasion of the tax — an evasion which was not difficult, owing to the small compass in which large quantities of opium could be stowed. Since the time when this agreement was first formed, statements had, in reply to inquiries both in Parliament and out-of-doors, been made on behalf of Her Majesty's Government with respect to it, and especially with respect to the points referred to in the Question which he had put upon the Paper for that day. He thought the latest piece of information was that given on the 24th of last month, when it was stated that although Her Majesty's Government had decided to give a formal approval to the Chefoo Convention, the clauses relating to the collection of the opium tax were still under consideration. Now, although not many weeks had passed since that statement was made, and although we had in the interval been passing through a momentous period, he hoped that the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs might now be able to announce that the whole Treaty was, without further delay, to be fully ratified. In case it might appear to their Lordships that he needed some further justification for bringing the matter forward now, he wished to say that although it did not occupy a foremost place in politics, it was watched with considerable interest by a number of people, and that feeling had been indicated by the presentation of a Memorial last year to the noble Earl who was then at the head of the Foreign Office, strongly urging the ratification of the Chefoo Convention. The signatures to the document would show that it was one of an important and representative character. Among the signatures were those of several of the Members of that House, and also a large number of Members of the other House of Parliament. He also observed among them many names well known in the Church and at the Universities, as well as the names of many gentlemen connected with the China trade. An allusion to our trade with China might, perhaps, raise the question whether the provisions of the Convention were likely to be acceptable to our merchants? Now, while there was, doubtless, some difference of opinion upon it in the commercial world, it was satisfactory to observe that several of the most important Chambers of Commerce—especially those of Manchester, Liverpool, and Glasgow—had expressed their approval of it. But he should like to try and lay more stress upon the feeling with which, as he understood, the matter was regarded in China, meaning, of course, in the political circles of that country. The Chinese Government had done what we had demanded of them; and, considering the Treaty as a settlement, and, on the whole, a favourable settlement, of unfortunate complications, they regarded it with satisfaction and naturally looked for a full ratification of it. They all knew the jealous nature of the Chinese, and a feeling of doubt as to our intentions might lead to reflections unfavourable to us as compared with other nations with which they were brought into contact, and cause mischief not easily removed. He could not help, therefore, earnestly hoping that no consideration of any possible risk of a subordinate character would be allowed to interfere with the full settlement of a Treaty which appeared to him to involve, in a very important degree, our best interests in China.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, the Chefoo Convention had been ratified with the exception of two provisions—the levying of likin on opium in the Custom House before delivery to the purchaser, and the definition of the port area within which likin might not be levied upon other merchandize. Considerable controversy had arisen about these two provisions. The stipulation in respect of them was that they should come into operation—that they should be fixed as soon as the British Government had arrived at an understanding on the subject with Germany and other foreign Governments. The question of levying likin interested several other Governments very much, and certainly no understanding had yet been arrived at with foreign Governments upon this matter. The Chinese, he understood, were willing to entertain negotiations for the purpose of so modifying those Articles that the necessary agreement might be arrived at, and those negotiations were now going on. It would not, in the ordinary course of things, be proper to lay upon the Table the portions of Sir Thomas Wade's Report which referred to this matter; because, as long as negotiations were going on, it was not usual to lay Papers upon the Table relating to them. He was aware, however, that considerable interest was felt in the question, and certainly anything which came from Sir Thomas Wade was so able that a very natural interest was felt on the part of Chambers of Commerce to be put in possession of it. He would inquire carefully into the matter, and he hoped after a little time to be able to produce the Papers asked for by the noble Earl.

**Lord HAMMOND** remarked, that the Chinese, in return for the great concessions they had made to us by the agreement of Chefoo, might naturally expect that something should be done upon our part to prevent the evasion of payment of those duties on opium which they were justly entitled to levy. The effect of the agreement would be to bring the collection of interior duties on opium under the control of the foreign inspectorate of Customs, instead of leaving it to subordinate local authorities, whose interference frequently gave occasion for serious difficulties. The Chinese Government were doubtless desirous to set up their own opium against foreign opium. In China, plenty of opium was grown, and practically the growth of it was encouraged as much as possible. It was believed that if this arrangement were carried out, it would interfere with the introduction of British opium from India into China; and, accordingly, some people in this country, with that view, desired to see the arrangement carried out. But he did not believe this arrangement would diminish the sale of opium by a single chest. The good people in this country who thought the importation of opium from India into China a crime would not, by means of this Convention, do anything to diminish the consumption of opium in China—whether Indian or Chinese grown, opium would be as much consumed as ever. In negotiating a Treaty with China the one-sidedness which characterised some previous Treaties will be avoided. It did not improve our relations with that country.

**The Marquess of SALISBURY,** while recognizing the value of the advice tendered by the noble Lord, which his experience entitled him to give, reminded him that really the question was one of great complication. If the agreement was merely for the levying of an existing charge, he did not think there would be much objection to the Convention. But the fear was that it would give to local officers, who were irresponsible, the power of raising and levying the charge to an enormous amount. Of course, there were some people who thought that the application of that process to opium, even if it had the effect of ruining the Indian Revenue, would still be an application of great advantage; but his belief was—that was, as far as his information went, and he had received very considerable information on the point—that, if every chest of Indian opium was excluded from China, it would have no effect in limiting the consumption of opium. Opium was grown to an enormous extent in various parts of China. The only thing to be feared was that some Chinese Governments might raise the likin to an unlimited extent, and the desire so to raise it had more to do with Protection than with any idea of morality. We could scarcely be expected to support a leaning so Protectionist.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till Thursday next, half past Ten o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Tuesday, 23rd July, 1878.*

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — Indian Native Troops (Transport and Employment Abroad), *nominated.*

Public Bills—*Resolution* [July 22] *reported*—Intermediate Education (Ireland) *.

*Ordered—First Reading*—Commons Regulation (Expenses) * [273].

*Withdrawn*—Valuation * [35].

## *QUESTIONS.*

### THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION.

QUESTIONS.

**Mr. RYLANDS** asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the Government are in possession of information, confirmatory or otherwise, of a statement which has appeared in a recent letter of a Correspondent of the "Daily News," to the effect that

> "at the Grand Council held on Monday, the Sultan announced that he only signed the Anglo-Turkish Treaty on the condition that the reforms should be subsequently defined, and that an annex to the Treaty states that the reforms in which England should aid in the execution must be in conformity with his sovereign rights and jurisdiction;"

and, whether there is any such annex to the Anglo-Turkish Treaty?

MR. BOURKE: No, Sir. Her Majesty's Government are not in possession of any information that would justify the statement in *The Daily News*. The only annex to the Treaty is the one before the House.

MR. GOSCHEN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he intends to lay any further Papers relating to the Anglo-Turkish Convention upon the Table of the House; whether any communications subsequent to the Despatch of the 30th May have passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Porte relating to that Convention; and, especially whether any reply has been received to the Despatch of Lord Salisbury of the 30th May?

MR. BOURKE: Sir, the right hon. Gentleman will see that the Question, although addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, relates to my Department.

MR. GOSCHEN: The hon. Gentleman has not answered the Question whether any reply has been received to the Despatch of Lord Salisbury.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: My answer to that Question, Sir, is this—that the reply to that Despatch, which was telegraphically communicated to the Porte beforehand, was contained in a Despatch from our Ambassador at Constantinople containing the annex to the Treaty which has already been laid on the Table.

MR. GOSCHEN: I am sorry to press the right hon. Gentleman; but, are we then, to understand that there are no other Despatches from Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople with reference to this Convention which might be submitted to the House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am informed by my noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that there are no other Despatches which can be at present laid on the Table of the House.

MR. GOSCHEN: I understand the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be that there are no other Despatches which the noble Marquess the Foreign Secretary considers can be at present laid on the Table of the House. Will they be laid on the Table after the Resolution of my noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) has been discussed, or can they not be presented before that time?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Will the right hon. Gentleman give Notice of that Question?

MR. GOSCHEN: I will give Notice for to-morrow if the right hon. Gentleman wishes.

MR. GLADSTONE said, that at the same time he would inquire whether the document which, he presumed, had by accident been omitted from the Papers presented—namely, the agreement between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff—would be laid on the Table.

## THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS.

### QUESTION.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether, under the Anglo-Turkish Convention, Cyprus is to be regarded as a foreign country or as part of Her Majesty's possessions; in whom the ultimate sovereign authority to make Laws for the inhabitants of that Island now resides; what Law Her Majesty's Government propose to administer in Cyprus to the native population, Christian or Mussulman, to British subjects, and to immigrants from foreign States; whether the natives of Cyprus passing into other parts of the dominions of the Sultan will be treated as British or as Turkish subjects; and, whether the authority of the British Government in Cyprus will be exercised under "The Foreign Judrisdiction Act, 1843?"

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): Sir, I will answer the Question of the hon. and learned Member, though not, perhaps, in the order in which he has put it. Any power or jurisdiction which Her Majesty possesses by Treaty out of Her Majesty's dominions, the Queen may, by the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, exercise in as ample a manner as if Her Majesty had acquired it by the cession or conquest of territory. In conquered or ceded countries which have laws of their own, the laws of the country remain until they are altered, unless, indeed, they should appear to be contrary to natural justice. With regard to the population of the Island generally, law will be administered on this footing — British subjects will have justice administered to them according to their own laws, as they would at present. Natives of Cyprus passing into other parts of the dominions of the Sultan will, it is apprehended, be treated as Turkish subjects. While the Government of Cyprus is administered by Her Majesty, Her Majesty will exercise the right of making such laws and ordinances as are necessary. Cyprus will not become a part of Her Majesty's possessions in any other sense than as an island which is to be occupied and administered by Her Majesty, according to the terms of the Convention.

## PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT.

### QUESTION.

MAJOR NOLAN asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether, since in the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, passed during the present Parliament, the hours during which houses may be forcibly entered are determined by the rising and setting of the sun, and that the Attorney General has pointed out the inconvenience of introducing this definition into the Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) Bill, he will amend the Peace Preservation Act, or would explain why the words between sunrise and sunset should be retained in Irish Acts?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON): Sir, the subject referred to in the answer of the Attorney General and the subject referred to in this Question are not at all identical. The Attorney General merely stated that he proposed, in the Criminal Code now before Parliament, to continue the definition which constitutes the existing rule as to night time; whereas, in the Peace Preservation Act of 1875, the words of limitation between sunset and sunrise are not used as part of a criminal definition, but merely a restraint on the power of such vested in the Crown. Those words of limitation from sunset to sunrise are to be found in the Act passed in the eleventh year of the Queen's reign, and continued in several other Acts of Parliament, and were introduced into the Act of 1875 by an Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick. I may add that it is not intended this Session to introduce another Peace Preservation Act. And it is intended to give instructions to the constabulary, in the absence of special directions from the Government, not to execute the search warrants at times when the people of the houses searched may be reasonably supposed to be in their beds.

## THE CIVIL SERVICE—WRITERS.

### QUESTION.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, under the circumstances of the important duties often confided to writers in the public service and of the very low scale of the remuneration now afforded them, Her Majesty's Government will consider some scheme for the amelioration of their conditions of service?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: Sir, the regulations under which copyists take service provide against their being employed upon any work except mere copying, or routine work under direct supervision, which preclude copyists from being employed on confidential work. This is the rule which the Treasury—so far as in their power—have endeavoured to enforce throughout the Public Service; and there being no intention, on their part, to depart from that rule, the question of ameliorating the conditions of service does not arise.

## PARLIAMENT—THE LEGISLATURE OF VICTORIA—SIR BRYAN O'LOGHLEN.

### QUESTION.

MR. SULLIVAN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he can inform the House if it is not the case that Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, subsequently to his acceptance of the office of Attorney General of Victoria, while a Member of the Victorian Legislature, resigned his seat and submitted himself for re-election in due accordance with the provisions of the Victoria Government Act of 1855?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Yes, Sir; I am informed by the Governor of Victoria that Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, prior to being appointed Attorney General of Victoria, resigned his seat and submitted himself for re-election.

## MESSAGE FROM THE QUEEN— MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND STRATHEARNE.

Message from Her Majesty *brought up*, and read by Mr. Speaker (all the Members being uncovered), as followeth:—

*VICTORIA R.*

*Her Majesty having agreed to a Marriage proposed between His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert, Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, Earl of Sussex, Duke of Saxony, Prince of Saxe Coburg and Gotha, and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, third daughter of His Royal Highness Prince Friedrich Carl Nikolaus of Prussia, has thought fit to communicate it to the House of Commons.*

*The numerous proofs which the Queen has received from Her faithful Commons of their Loyalty to the Throne, and of their attachment to Her person and family, leave Her Majesty no doubt of their readiness to enable Her Majesty to make a further provision for His Royal Highness.*

*V.R.*

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I beg to move that this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee to take into consideration Her Majesty's most gracious Message.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to give Notice that on Thursday, on the Motion that Her Majesty's most gracious Message be taken into consideration, I shall move, as an Amendment, for certain Papers which go to show that there is no Constitutional precedent earlier than the present reign for this application.

Motion *agreed to.*

Committee thereupon on *Thursday.*

*Mr. Sullivan*

## *MOTIONS.*

## PARLIAMENT—NEW WRIT FOR CLARE COUNTY—SIR BRYAN O'LOGHLEN.

### RESOLUTION.

MR. SULLIVAN, in rising to move—

> "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Clare, in the room of Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Baronet, who, since his Election for the said County, hath accepted the office of Attorney General of Victoria,"

said, a Motion for a New Writ was usually moved without observations, and taken as a matter of course. There were, however, features of novelty in the present case, which required some explanation on his part. It was right that, in a matter of this kind, care should be taken lest they should, by an omission or commission, act contrary to precedent or to the usage and custom of Parliament. It was in the knowledge of the House that in July last Sir Colman O'Loghlen, who, up to that time was sitting for the county of Clare, died——

MR. E. JENKINS, rising to Order, asked Mr. Speaker, whether there were in the possession of the House any authoritative documents upon which this Motion could be made?

MR. SPEAKER said, he was not prepared to answer the question, until the hon. and learned Member had his opportunity of laying his case before the House.

MR. SULLIVAN suggested to his hon. Friend the Member for Dundee, that he would have done well to wait until his statement was concluded before attempting to intervene. By the practice of the House, when a Member rose on his own responsibility to move a New Writ, he was never asked for Papers. Sir Colman O'Loghlen, who died last July, was one of the most honourable and high-minded Members of that House, and the county of Clare was so anxious to mark their respect for his name and family, that they took the unprecedented course of electing in his place his brother, Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, then absent in the Colonies. On the 28th July, 1877, the Speaker's Warrant was issued for the Election, and, on the 10th August, Sir Bryan O'Loghlen was returned. Parliament did not, however, sit until the January of the present year. On the 16th February, Sir Bryan was returned for the county of West Melbourne, under the auspices of the Colonial Government then in Office. On March 30, he accepted the Office of Attorney General of Victoria, and the evidence he (Mr. Sullivan) adduced for that fact was the statement of a responsible Minister of the Crown, made in the hearing of the House, which had always been so jealous of its Privileges that it had never called for other evidence. On the 30th March, the Speaker of the Victoria Constitution issued his Warrant for a new Election for West Melbourne, because Sir Bryan O'Loghlen had accepted an Office of profit under the Crown. He was re-elected under the 17th section of the Victorian Act. The present Motion was made under the 7 *Anne,* c. 7, s. 25. The 25th section defined "new Office" to be any Office under the Crown created subsequently to the 25th October, 1707, and provided that the holder of any new Office should not only vacate the seat of a Member, but be incapable of election so long as he held such Office. Section 26 laid down that if a Member accepted an office, not a new one, he would not be incapacitated for re-election; but must submit himself to the ordeal of re-election. He based his Motion on the 25th clause, and held that the Office which Sir Bryan O'Loghlen had accepted was a new Office of profit under the Crown, and that it incapacitated the holder of it, so long as he held it, from being re-elected or taking his seat. He admitted this was a novel Motion, as there was no precedent in reference to a Colonial appointment; but there was a precedent for the issue of a Writ for the election of a Member in place of one who had never taken the oath and his seat. That had occurred in the Session of 1847-8, when an elected Member who had not taken the oath and his seat doubted whether he had not disqualified himself in respect of some contracts, and accordingly applied for the Chiltern Hundreds, and after debate, it was allowed that he could do so. Here, then, was the case of a Member who had never been sworn, who had never appeared at the Bar, who never took his seat, and who was allowed to vacate it and accept an Office of emolument under the Crown. As to whether the Office accepted by Sir Bryan O'Loghlen was such an Office, he would refer hon. Members to the statement which had been made officially that day, that that gentleman had vacated his seat in Victoria because, as the Resolution of the House in Victoria stated, he had accepted an Office of profit under the Crown, and he had done that in compliance with a clause of the Victorian Constitution, which did not incorporate the Statute of Anne, to which reference had been made. He submitted that the seat was vacated, and accordingly moved for the issue of a Writ.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Clare, in the room of Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Baronet, who, since his Election for the said County, hath accepted the office of Attorney General of Victoria."—(*Mr. Sullivan.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am sure there can be no disposition on the part of anyone to question the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Louth; but, at the same time, it must be borne in mind that this case is a peculiar one, and that we have no exact precedent for such a mode of vacating a seat. Under the circumstances, I think it would be more in accordance with the dignity of this House that we should proceed in the matter in a manner somewhat more solemn than usual. It is, I think, desirable to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the case; because, without questioning the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman, it is evident we have not before us, as in the case of an acceptance of the Chiltern Hundreds, any Papers to which we can refer. I beg, therefore, to move that a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, the Member for the county of Clare, has since his election accepted an Office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report whether, under the circumstances, he has vacated his seat in this House by the acceptance of that Office.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Member for the County of Clare, has since his Election accepted an office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report their opinion whether he has vacated his seat by the acceptance of the said office,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SPENCER WALPOLE thought it would be better to amend the Amendment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer by inserting in it words referring to the particular Statute affecting the question.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) thought it would be inconvenient to insert any reference to a particular Statute, as there were several Statutes of the Irish Parliament affecting the question, also Statutes made after the Union; and the whole question might be raised under the words of the Amendment.

Mr. SULLIVAN hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take steps to insure that the Report of the Committee upon this question should be presented to the House before the end of the Session.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY inquired when the right hon. Gentleman proposed to nominate the Committee.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: There shall be no delay in nominating the Committee. It shall be done immediately.

Question put, and *negatived*.

Words *added*.

Main Question, as amended, put.

*Ordered*, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Member for the County of Clare, has since his Election accepted an office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report their opinion whether he has vacated his seat by the acceptance of the said office.

And, on July 30, Committee *nominated* as follows:—Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Spencer Walpole, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Lord Francis Hervey, Sir William Dyke, Mr. William Edward Forster, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Butt, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Adam:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.

*Ordered*, That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Indian Vernacular Press Act.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## INDIAN VERNACULAR PRESS ACT.

### MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I rise for the purpose of moving that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praythat She will be graciously pleased to give directions that all proceedings which may be taken by the authorities under the Indian Vernacular Press Act, be reported to the Secretary of State, and laid before Parliament from time to time. I have not been encouraged by such communications as have reached me to hope that Her Majesty's Government will, as I had originally trusted they would have done, be disposed to accede to this Motion; but I may, at least, venture to express my hope that, if the course they are about to take in reference to this Motion is dependent in any degree upon the tone and nature of this debate, there will be nothing in the character of the debate, nor in that of my own speech, which will raise any difficulty on their part in acceding to this Motion. I must, indeed, take exception, in one respect, to an act of Her Majesty's Government; but that act was done by Lord Salisbury, who is no longer the responsible Minister for India, and I do not feel it necessary, for the reason I shall state, to include any notice of that act in the Motion I have to submit to the House. I regret, exceedingly, the suddenness and the rapidity of Lord Salisbury's proceedings in this matter. A telegraphic despatch was addressed to him from India on the 13th of March, proposing an entire and immediate change in a fundamental branch of the law in India—because I cannot think that the law relating to the Press of India is less than a fundamental branch of the law relating to the liberty and the general conditions of the country. On the morning of the 14th of March, Lord Salisbury's reply, affirming and sanctioning the proposal to pass an Act of the kind, was despatched from this country, and was transmitted to India in sufficient time to permit the Act which is now under our consideration, to be passed into law, and to bear the date of the 14th of March, only one day after the first official communication on this great subject had been made to Lord Salisbury. This question of the liberty of the Vernacular Indian Press is felt to be a very important one. The liberty of the Press has subsisted in India for considerably more than 40 years, and it was established there by no hasty or precipitate proceeding. It was in the year 1818 that Mr. Silk Buckingham, in order to test the state of the question, and to bring about the freedom of the Press in India, published a newspaper in that country. For a considerable time he was permitted to continue the publication of that journal without any interference on the part of the Government. It was said, and, as far as I can ascertain, it was said with truth, that the Marquess of Hastings—the then Governor General of India—approved the liberty of the Press being established in that country, not that he was insensible to the fact that certain inconvenience; must result from the abuse of that, as of every other liberty. In the spirit, however, as I conceive, of very wise statesmanship, he conceived that the advantages of a free Press very greatly outweighed its possible inconveniences; and, accordingly, he gave a practical sanction to the proceedings of Mr. Buckingham. After the departure of Lord Hastings, and in the interval which ensued before the assumption of Office by Mr. Canning, the permission to Mr. Buckingham to publish the newspaper was withdrawn, and it accordingly ceased to exist. The effect of this proceeding was to draw much attention to the subject. Lord Amherst, who became Governor General, was greatly occupied during his tenure of Office with other matters, especially the Burmese War. Lord William Bentinck, when he was appointed Governor General in 1827, resumed the consideration of the question, and deliberately and distinctly expressed his approval of the course taken by Lord Hastings in the matter. In 1835, Sir Charles Metcalfe was Governor General for a time, and he was one of the very first, I believe, in mental rank of all the great statesmen whom India has produced. And among them all I know not whether there was one who, having been educated as he was, amidst what I may call despotic circumstances, and without practical experience of the working of free institutions, recognized this institution of the freedom of the Press in India as he did, as though he had had a seat in one of the Houses of Parliament. His authority was very high, and the matter was carefully considered at that time by Lord Macaulay and the Members of the Legislative Council, and it was after long consideration that the liberty of the Press was established in India. That the working of that liberty has been satisfactory upon the whole, no one can doubt. In the very peculiar circumstances of the Indian Mutiny, Lord Canning doubtless found it necessary to restrain the liberty; but no one can be surprised, or be disposed to complain of his conduct in that respect. It bore the marks of his general prudence and sagacity. He did not fall into the error of abolishing the liberty of the Press altogether — he merely suspended it for the time, and he made no invidious and painful distinction between newspapers published in the vernacular language and in the English language. We have now got a law in India, under which it is perfectly allowable for any man to publish in English an article, which article, when translated into one of the Native tongues, may draw down upon the head of the publisher the resentment of the Government, and the man who gives publicity to that article in a newspaper may be ruined. I may also observe, I think with justice, that all the annual Reports which have been placed in onr possession with regard to the working of the Native Press Law have been Reports expressive of great satisfaction with its working. They have been made, I believe, from year to year. Those of last year are not before us, and the change which has taken place in the language of the Government is an entire and absolute change. It is to me a matter of the deepest regret that Lord Salisbury should have proceeded to sanction this sudden and secret proceeding—almost as if by a stroke of lightning, such is the velocity of the Act—and that he should have done this without the sanction of the Indian Council. That Lord Salisbury proceeded without the sanction of the Council of India would lead me into a province distinct from the merits of this question. I have no doubt that to pronounce a fair and complete judgment on the proceeding of Lord Salisbury, we should require to examine and ascertain with care what has been the habitual or ordinary proceeding of other Secretaries of State at a former period, with respect to taking the Council of India into their confidence. I think that this matter, which is one of great importance, would be more conveniently considered in conjunction with another very important subject which it seems to me will have to receive at some period—and I hope at some not very remote period—the attention of Parliament—namely, the manner in which the provisions of the Act of 1858, relating to the powers of the Council and the co-operation of the Council with the Secretary of State, and the restraint exercised by the Council upon the proceedings of the Secretary of State, have worked under the several Administrations that have been in power since the passing of this Act. Before the Act of 1858, it was the regular practice of Parliament to inquire from time to time into the working of the East Indian Government; and it seems to me that there will be great advantage from, and strong public arguments of every kind for, an examination of that kind with respect to what has taken place since 1858. With respect to the body by whom this piece of legislation was conceived and brought to maturity, it is impossible not to regret a manifest defect in the composition of that body. They were 16 gentlemen—I have no doubt distinguished and honourable men—brought together to consider a matter of the utmost delicacy as between the Rulers and the people. Unhappily, there is not one of these 16 gentlemen who has ever, so far as I know, had the smallest practical knowledge of the working of the free institutions of this country. Lord Lytton, of whom I speak with personal respect and regard, and in the liberality of whose mind and intentions I fully believe, received his education as a diplomatist at foreign Courts, and I do not recognize a single name—I should be glad if I am mistaken—I do not recognize a single name among the 15 that follow known to us in connection with the history of English politics. Now, this is by no means a trivial or supererogatory remark; because it does happen that this question was brought under the notice of two men—and, as far as I can remember, of two men only—who had been conversant with home affairs and British institutions. One of them was a very able gentleman—Sir Arthur Hobhouse—of whom I will not speak at length, because the able Minute in which he recorded his opinion is not fresh, and has not immediate reference to the circumstances we are now considering. But I have very great satisfaction in referring to the other of these two distinguished gentlemen—namely, the Duke of Buckingham—because, as he has served as a Cabinet Minister in a Cabinet at home, and so long in this and the other House of Parliament enjoyed the esteem and respect in an eminent degree of all who knew him, and has maintained the character of an undeniable and unimpeachable Conservative politician, it is to me a matter of the greatest satisfaction that, rising, as an Englishman should rise, above all Party differences, when principles rooted in the Constitution of this country are at stake, the Duke of Buckingham, like Sir Arthur Hobhouse, has recorded his opinion in a sense as strongly as possible adverse to the passing of the Indian Vernacular Press Act. At the same time, I shall refrain from all hard words with respect to Lord Lytton and his Council. Lord Lytton has earned a title to my consideration quite independent of the policy of his proceeding. I confess I do not take an unfavourable view of his proceeding with reference to a recent judicial case in India, where he showed that such was his disposition to give weight and value to the personal rights of the Natives, that he exposed himself to criticisms on the part of those who attach, and justly attach, a high value to the independence of the Judicial Body by something in the nature of an interference with judicial proceedings. I likewise learn that it is the desire of Lord Lytton to carry further, if he can, the principle of admitting eminent Natives into the Indian Council. It is, therefore, my duty to consider this Act entirely as an isolated Act, and not as an Act indicating, in any sense, a despotic disposition or high-handed designs on the part of the Government of India. I shall consider it as an isolated Act. The errors—the grievous errors which are involved in this proceeding are as follows. In the first place, there is the haste and secrecy of the transaction. I cannot conceive what justification can be found for it. Her Majesty's Government are in a position in which I know they must experience difficulty, and I sympathize entirely with those difficulties.

They are bound to be loyal to the Governor General of India, unless and until they are prepared to recall him. I make, therefore, no complaint against them; but I am sure it is necessary that it is a good policy that in measured, well-considered, and decided language, we should allow the people of India to understand that there is a care for them in this House, and that proceedings in themselves irregular and impolitic, and adverse to liberty, will not be allowed to pass without notice. Now, Sir, in the government of India, I have the satisfaction of thinking that, difficult as is the task we have in hand, we have in good faith taken our stand upon the only ground that makes that task hopeful or possible—namely, that we shall endeavour to govern India for the good of those in India, and that, however we may associate the retention of our Indian Empire with British interests, we shall not allow a consideration of British interests so to warp our minds as to divert it from that which we feel to be our first and highest duty—namely, the direction of all our proceedings in that country by the best lights we possess, and with all the assistance we can get towards the promotion of the welfare of the people. It is no exaggeration to say that not only have we taken up that ground, but that the people of India know and believe that we have taken up that ground. They have, or think they have, plenty of causes of complaint. I, for my part, cannot deny that they have some causes of complaint. I am sorry to say I regard this Press Act as one of the most salient among them; but as I observe — most of all from reading through extracts sent home in order to make a case for this Act—all these complaints in India appear to me to be particular complaints. They complain of what they think the misdeeds and errors of the Government, just as we should complain and do complain of them in this country. When there is a proceeding we think wrong, or an Act, passed which we think bad, we assume the liberty of complaining; but we do not, because we complain of that Act, abandon the Government of the country, or renounce our allegiance to the Throne. And so I find, if I rightly understand the strain of Indian feeling, that, however loudly they may complain of the spirit of particular men in office, of the weight of particular taxes, of the neglect of particular works, or of the operation of particular laws, yet there is no disposition to deny that our rule is beneficial to India; and, I confess, to my astonishment—to my gratified astonishment—I found an extract in which the writer contends that the hopes of India, as she exists at present, lie in the continuance and not in the destruction of British rule. Well, when you have made a a progress so real and so considerable as that—when you stand necessarily on a footing of inequality, and are not yet in a condition to apply freely to the whole of India the very first principles of civil government without considerable restraint, I think, if one thing is more obvious than another, it is that, whatever we do give, we should not retract; and that when we have communicated to India the benefit which is, perhaps the greatest of all those that we enjoy under our own institutions—namely, the publicity of proceedings in which the nation is interested, and the allowance of sufficient time to consider them at their several stages, to afford securities against wrong and error—it is deplorable in a case like this in India that the utmost haste and the closest secrecy should have been observed, not in amending or altering, but in completely overturning, as far as the Native Press was concerned, a cardinal part of the legislation of the country. Again, I have already referred briefly to that most unhappy distinction, which I am sure it is impossible to defend, and which I greatly doubt whether any Member of this House will defend, between the Native and the Anglo-Indian Press. It appears that on the face of these Papers, so far as loyalty is concerned, taking as a test the dangerous and critical period of Lord Canning's Administration, the Anglo-Indian Press earned a very large share of penal notice which the Government had then to take of certain publications in the periodical Press. There is no distinction of merit, therefore, between the two. The distinction is in the audience. It is stated in these Papers that the Anglo-Indian Press is addressed to an intelligent public. Do you wish it to be understood that the Vernacular Press is addressed to a public which is not intelligent; that those who read the English tongue are safe and to be trusted, while those who only read the Native tongues are not? That seems the natural inference to be drawn from this proceeding; and it is to be deprecated, as it exhibits the hopeless contradiction in which the authors of this measure are involved. But the most unfortunate feature which the measure presents is the removal of Press prosecutions from the judicial establishments of the country, in order that they may be dealt with as matters of Executive discretion. I may say that anything more trivial, more impotent than the pleas that are urged on behalf of this peculiar proceeding, I cannot conceive. There is again that unfortunate mixing up, which is not a blending, but a confusion of two subjects which ought to be kept totally distinct in the mind and procedure of the Indian Government. One of them is the publication of writings which are supposed to tend to create disaffection, and the other the publication of writings which have no political character at all, but are of an entirely personal nature, and intended to intimidate official persons, chiefly Natives, in the discharge of their duties. With regard to that last branch of the subject, I hear it said that the Native functionaries are not accustomed to the atmosphere of free countries; that they are not contented to move, as we are, under a constant fire of the more or less adverse criticism of the Press; that, consequently, they are greatly hampered in the discharge of their duties by the constant, and possibly, in many cases, libellous character of the articles published; and that public mischief is done in that way. Now, if legislation had been addressed only to a point like that, although in our minds we might have regarded it with some jealousy and suspicion, yet we should have found that it was, to a great extent, an Indian question, and a question bearing on it this one redeeming feature—that we should not have been interfering on our own behalf, if we made a stringent Press Law against libels of that description; but should have been interfering to maintain Native functionaries in a position where they could act with perfect independence. But it is most unfortunate to have mixed up this question —which is not a political question between us and India—with that which is above all others a political question of the utmost delicacy—namely, whether it is wise for the Government to take into its own hands, and out of the hands of the established legal jurisdiction, the power of determining what writing is seditious, and what is not. Then the argument that is made for the abstraction of these matters from the Courts of Justice, is one which strikes at the root of the whole of our policy, and at the best part of our proceedings in India. It is said—"Oh, no, we will not prosecute in the Court; for if we do that, the prosecution will bring these men popularity and local notoriety, and the mischief of the prosecution would be greater than that of submission to the evil." And this is always joined most inconsistently with a loud profession—I believe, a sincere profession—namely, that the great mass of the Indian people are of undoubted loyalty to the Queen and to Great Britain. That is said, and that I believe is true, and is known to be true by those who say it. But if the great mass of the Indian people are sound and loyal, why are you not to allow prosecutions for disloyalty to take place in their sight and hearing? I do not think it is possible to find an answer to that question. This Act proceeds on suppositions, the very reverse of what our policy has long been—the very reverse of what I am convinced the policy of Lord Lytton himself will be; for it is only on the supposition that the great mass of the people are not loyal, but are disloyal, that you can say it is dangerous for them to become acquainted with the matter of a prosecution for disloyalty. I am sorry to find in these Papers reference to the Irish Press as a sanction and an example to guide Indian legislation. In the first place, I am not prepared to say that our own Press Acts, when we have resorted to them under a sense of necessity, have entirely attained their end. I conceive it to be a very arguable question whether the precise thing that has been done was exactly wise or not. But whether that be so or not, it had nothing to do with the action taken by the Viceroy of India. It was an Act essentially temporary which was passed for the Irish Press; it was never intended to bring about a permanent change in the *status* of the Irish Press; and, in the next place, and what is more important and vital in this case, we did not restrain the Irish Press for mere disaffection, but for the security of human life. [*Murmurs.*] I see a gesture of dissent on the Treasury Bench; but I apprehend I am strictly correct in saying that. I will not say that we have never restrained the Irish Press from fear of disaffection. Far from it; but if we are to go back to the history of old proceedings in Ireland, I say they are to be quoted for the purpose of being avoided. I understand the reference to be entirely to the last proceeding as to the Irish Press; and, in regard to that, I am right in saying that it grew out of the outrages in Westmeath, and was not at all intended to maintain the position of the Government in the face of the people, but to maintain the sanctity and security of human life. Well, upon all these grounds, I think it is not immoderate to say that this measure is in the nature of an error to be deeply deplored. But now let us look to what is to be said as regards the pleas made on its behalf. The noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) who was recently removed by a most well-deserved promotion from the Office of Under Secretary for India, with his accustomed courage, on the first arrival of this Act, with, no doubt, imperfect information, was inclined to defend it, on the ground that it was a mitigation of existing law. But, in my opinion, the noble Lord failed in his defence. Certainly, we had already a stringent Press Law in India. I do not say it was too stringent, considering the peculiar nature and tenure of our power in that country. It is prohibited by law, under very severe penalties, to write in a newspaper anything that tends to excite disaffection against British power in India. There is, no doubt, a clear definition of the word disaffection; but everything tending to disaffection before this unfortunate Act was severely punishable before the ordinary Courts. With that law, why was it necessary for us to stir? It is said it was done by the unanimous approval of the Council. That is not so. The only Native who sat in the Council expressly and carefully reserved his judgment. I have not troubled the House with citations; but I do not think I ought to make that remark without quoting the words. At page 19 of the Papers, it will be found that the Native Member of the Council said—

> "Yet that some sort of a check should be put on this liberty of the Press I cannot deny; but whether the provisions of the existing law are not sufficient for the purpose is what I am not in a position to judge."

Then he went on to say—

> "Out of deference to the authority of the officers of the Government, those responsible for the good government of the country, without giving any opinion with regard to the provisions of the Bill, I deem it my duty to give support to the action of the Government."

That is the opinion of the only Native Member of the Council, given in support of the Bill, but not of the matter of the Bill. The Indian Government have supplied us with a number of extracts from the Native Press, which I hope hon. Members will read. I do not know what, by the use of a microscope, might not be discovered in those Papers. I find a great deal that is silly and frivolous along with a good deal that is permissible, and a great deal that is positively useful; and upon the question of usefulness I will hereafter make a quotation from the Duke of Buckingham. As to the material of sedition and disaffection, I cannot conceive by what morbid asperity of view the authorities in India have conjured up this phantom for themselves. Let me give you a summary, as given by Mr. Paul, who says he has in his hands 150 extracts from the Native papers. I have those extracts, though the Government have reduced them to a smaller nnmber. But here is the Advocate General's account, on which the Press law is founded. He says the reading of the extracts has satisfied him that these publications contain matter falling under the following heads:—

> "1. Seditious libels, malicious and calumnious attacks on the Government, accusing it of robbery, oppression, and dishonesty, and imputing to it bad faith, injustice, and partiality."

These things are to be lamented, but there is nothing in them to justify a Press Law of an arbitrary character.

> "2. Libels on Government officers. 3. Contemptuous observations on the administration of justice, pointing to its alleged impurity and worthlessness"

—a class of subject very desirable to leave open to discussion and all manner of remark, even when not well-founded, because it would be of great assistance in taking care that anything which required improvement was duly looked after—

> "4. Libels on the character of Europeans, attributing to them falsehood, cruelty, and heartlessness."

But is it really to be said that a telegram is to be despatched from India on the 13th of March, an answer to be sent back on the 14th, and a law to be made with closed doors, in the course of two or three hours, simply because there is a certain limited number of very insignificant newspapers writers who ascribe to Europeans the character I have indicated? Falsehood, deceit, cruelty, and heartlessness are not qualities of the most amiable description; but they are qualities which some of us in this country are accustomed to have ascribed to us from day to day. Mr. Paul proceeds—

> "5. Libels on Christians and Christian Governments, and mischievous tendencies to excite race and religious antipathies."

As far as I can gather, the views of the Indian Press are views which really obtain considerable sympathy in portions of this country, for one of the great topics which seem to be favoured by the Indian writers is the Eastern Question; and the Indian writers seem to think that Her Majesty's Government has by no means been distinguished by a sufficient degree of loyalty to the Turkish cause, and that is what they find fault with freely.

> "6. Suggestions and insinuations which their authors believe fall short of seditious libels by reason of the absence of positive declarations."

That is the highest count of the Advocate General's indictment, and it is equivalent to saying that the worst of all things they do, not in a moral but in a political sense, is that they make suggestions and insinuations which they believe to be of a legal nature, and to be within the law. If the Advocate General believes that the writers have gone beyond that field, why does he not try the matter in a Court of Justice? One proposition is entirely beyond dispute; and that is, that the first thing which had been required of all Governments when they have addressed themselves to the Houses of Parliament for the purpose of obtaining increased power for the enforcement of the law, has uniformly been to show that they have tried the existing law and found it insufficient. I believe that to be a rule—though it might be dangerous to make unqualified assertions—absolutely without an exception. But in India, where we have charge of the fortunes of 240,000,000 of people, it is thought enough to meet in those chambers and to make speeches about that abuse of liberty which is known in every country where liberty exists at all; and when the question of a new law is produced, it is not attempted to be shown that it has been endeavoured to put the present law in force; but, on the contrary, reasons are shown why it should not be put in force—reasons which, if they have any force now, were more forcible and valid at the time the law was made. In the course of the last 45 years you have made great progress in India. You have drawn your hearts nearer to the Natives, and the hearts of the Natives have been drawn nearer to you. But by this measure you are condemning with ten-fold force those who preceded you, and that which has previously been done. Well, Sir, the Advocate General says something more. I should like to see an Attorney General in England rising, when he was about to propose a restrictive law, and making a statement of this kind—"I cannot resist the temptation of reading a specimen of the inflated conception of Native excellence." Here is the specimen—

> "Are there not thousands of educated Natives before whose intelligence, judgment, courage, justice, and moral conduct the abilities of the best civilians fall into insignificance, like the gleams of a candle before the resplendency of the sun?"

Is it possible that the Law Adviser in India could think that double-distilled trash of this description is matter—is selected matter—which should be laid before a Legislative Body gathered under pressure of a great public emergency? He goes on—

> "Having attentively considered these extracts, I am irresistibly led to the conclusion that it is intended by these publications to disseminate disaffection, to excite evil prejudices, to stir up discontent, and to produce mischief of the gravest order—in short, to render the Government, its officers, and Europeans generally, hateful to the people."

Those words appear to me to indicate a great confusion of thought on the part of some at least of these legislators. They seem to me to confound the dislike which may be entertained, and which may be explicable on many grounds, of persons engaged in administering the Government of India with the disposition of the people towards the law. He says that the publications are intended to disseminate disaffection; but he also says that their authors believe they are not disseminating disaffection in the sense of the law. He joins together those two propositions.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: That is only one out of a series.

MR. GLADSTONE: It is No. 6, and it is his strongest. It bears on disaffection. If my right hon. Friend will point out another.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No. 1.

MR. GLADSTONE: No. 1 reads—

> "Seditious libels, malicious and calumnious attacks on the Government, accusing it of robbery, oppression, and dishonesty, and imputing to it bad faith, injustice, and partiality."

I read that before. You have got the law in India. Why do not you try it? Do not let there be a mere bandying of words between the right hon. Gentleman and myself. I attach but little value to my own opinion—his may be worth more; but I say, why did you not go into the Courts and show what was disaffection and what was not? Unhappily, you determined to reverse the first rule of procedure in these cases, and instead of proving that the existing law was insufficient, you assumed that it was not, and on the ground of that assumption took back the whole subject into the province of Executive—that is, of arbitrary control. Well, Sir, of those extracts which I have read, I will only say that I am totally unable to discover in them anything material worthy of the grave notice of the Government, and I fall back upon authority. I fall back upon the authority of the only man in India concerned in this subject who has held Office in this country—I mean the Duke of Buckingham. I regret to find an effort made to show mistrust of the Duke of Buckingham; and I think it is one of the most unfortunate passages of this official Report—mistrust of him, not personal, but of his authority in its application to this subject; because they say that they have got the assent of all the local Governments in which there is to any extent a Native Press; and thus far they give you to understand that it is in the Presidency of Madras that there is no very great extent of Vernacular Press, and accordingly the Duke of Buckingham is a sort of stranger to the case, and has no sufficient competency to speak with authority upon it. But, unfortunately, Sir, the case depends not upon the question in what part of India these articles are written, but upon the writings themselves. The whole case set out in the Papers was transmitted to the Duke of Buckingham. He was not asked to report upon the cases in the Vernacular Press in the Presidency of Madras calling for interference; he was called upon to read the extracts on which the legislation was founded, and then to give his judgment. And what judgment did he give? One worthy of his rank, of his position, of his character, and of his ancestry. He thinks that by this fidgety attempt to bolster up power by a law of an arbitrary character the Government of India were not gaining strength, but were bringing upon themselves weakness. They were cutting off, not a mischief, but a good, which it was their business to cherish, and which would increase the means of good government in India. Aye, even in many cases, it might be through the very folly and levity of the things written, but in which indications might be found of intelligence and right-mindedness. Here is his language—

> "I hold the Vernacular Press to be a useful indication of the undercurrents which may be running through the mass of Indian population; but if any serious spirit of disaffection or hostility is increasing among the people, indications will float to the surface among the vernacular papers as surely as the dross is thrown to the surface of molten metal. Systematic attempts to excite hostility of sedition, I would prosecute; but for this the present law provides in the Penal Code, and to my mind sufficiently; and in emergency, should any such arise, there is the same power in the State to restrain the man who writes treason as the man who speaks it."

I will not read further, except the few words in which he says, not of the Press in his own Presidency of Madras, but of the Papers sent to him as the foundation of the Bill—

> "Reading the extracts which have been culled through 18 months to form this selection, I believe them all to be of the class which Mr. Eden has well characterized as rubbish."

And yet on account of this rubbish all the rules of procedure have been set aside, an amount of agitation and disquiet in India created, the House of Commons compelled to give its attention to the subject, and opinions propagated that the English Government, after all, is not so sure of its position as it might be, or otherwise it would not resort to arbitrary measures—all, I say, in consequence of a handful of rubbish which has passed through a score or two of papers in India, few of the writers in which papers are able to find the required deposit. Well, Sir, I do not think there is much more to say upon the case for the Bill. I have referred to the meetings which have been held in India. I have no adequate means of ascertaining their importance; but this I can say for them, that in the Petitions they have presented, they have argued the case with a considered intelligence and a measured use of language, generally speaking, which causes their Petitions and their strength of reasoning to compare very favourably with a great number of the speeches which were delivered in support of the Bill. I think I have said as much as it is necessary to say on the subject of this most unhappy and unfortunate law, and I hope I have kept my promise that while I should reserve any further judgment upon the proceedings of Lord Salisbury, I have not any charge to make against Her Majesty's Government. I have read the despatch of Lord Cranbrook, in certain parts of it with satisfaction. I do not say that, as a whole, I could entirely subscribe to it; but that is quite another matter. Lord Cranbrook is the responsible Minister, and he has to consider the course which he should take—not how to annul the law—that course I have not suggested, and, therefore, I felt the necessity of his being supported. I have in my experience been placed in dilemmas of this kind, and more especially with respect to the Indian Government. Nearly the first question which fell to my lot to consider as an Adviser of the Crown, 35 years ago, was the question of the conquest of Scinde by Lord Elgin. That question came before the Cabinet of Sir Robert Peel immediately after the conquest had been effected. I think I may say with safety that there was not a single Member of the Cabinet who approved the proceeding, but neither was there a single Member who thought it could be reversed. I am, therefore, by no means disposed to to call upon Her Majesty's Government for any strong measure, which would have the effect of discrediting the Government of India in the face of the people of India. I feel keenly what they have done; but I feel that they had before them a choice of difficulties, and that it is for the interest of the people of India themselves that the Government of India should not be unnecessarily discredited. I, therefore, have considered very carefully what appears to me to be the proper counsel to offer to the House of Commons. This most serious matter has been brought before us, and I think it impossible for us altogether to put it aside. There is one way in which the mischief which has been done may be greatly mitigated and corrected without a withdrawal of the law. I am thankful for the modification which the Secretary of State has suggested; but that modification, very good in itself, certainly does not, as I know from direct communications, give any satisfaction at all to those who have moved in India against the law, and could hardly be expected to do so. Nothing has been removed, except the censorship. The bond still remains which those writers are to give, and which, in many cases, it is totally impossible for them to give. The power of punishment remains—the power of inflicting cruelty by a perfectly irresponsible judgment remains. Well, Sir, that being so, I say it is perfectly impossible for the House to put aside the question; and I have made a proposal which seems to me to demand recognition. What I propose is, that we should pray Her Majesty that the proceedings taken by the authorities under the Act shall be reported to the Secretary of State, and laid before Parliament from time to time. What is the objection to that proposal? I shall, perhaps, be told that it is not desirable to have the proceedings of the Executive Government in India made the subject of debate here. Unquestionably it is not. But if a Bill is passed that is dangerous in its character; if it greatly interferes with the liberty of the subject; if we are uncertain how the agents of the Government of India may give effect to the Bill, this House, which is the great Inquest of the Realm, cannot consistently with its duty relegate this subject into oblivion. We are bound to keep our eyes upon it; and, I venture to say, we will do so, In my opinion, the mildest course we can pursue is to ask that the proceedings under the Act shall be reported. That is the most innocent and salutary check we can give to these proceedings —namely, the knowledge of those who conduct them that their countrymen at home are aware of them, and will comment upon their merits. I am not acting without precedent. Colonial Acts of Parliament must be laid on the Table before they receive the Royal Assent, or, at least, are liable to be cancelled if an Address be presented against them; the reason being, that it was thought well that the proceedings of the Colonial Legislatures should, if necessary, be brought under review, and it was believed that the knowledge that they would be brought under review would tend to improve their character. Take the case of discipline in the Army; every trial held, and every punishment inflicted, is regularly reported to this House, and accounts of them are regularly laid upon the Table in the Annual Reports of the Army Department. Is it desirable that the House should even meddle at all in discipline of the Army, except in very extreme cases? Certainly not, nor is it intended that the House should do so; but it is acknowledged that the House has a duty to perform, and that it is its duty to be aware that the authorities are acting in a proper spirit, and we know that the existence of those provisions tends to keep within due bounds the administration of the great powers which the management of the Army requires. That Sir, is the spirit in which my Motion has been conceived. I think I can see what will happen if such a Motion is not allowed to pass. It will be taken on the part of some at least of the official authorities in India as a distinct approval by this House of the Indian Vernacular Press Law—as a distinct approval of the mass of proceeding which I have, perhaps, wearied you in proclaiming, but which was absolutely required to be made known to you as Representatives of the people of this country. Possibly you may have a substitute—you may have something better than my Motion. If so, I shall not be so governed by self-love of the proceeding which, in innocence of intention, I have made, as to be unwilling to waive it for something which might be more effectual. But there is another inconvenience which, in my opinion, will happen if this Motion is rejected. I think that the proceedings of the Indian authorities will, undoubtedly—after they have received such a compliment from the House of Commons as the refusal by the vote of a majority to look into the consequences of this most singular and unprecedented Act—be less guarded and less temperate, in some cases, than they would be if it were known among all the officers of the Government of India that the eye of Parliament was upon them. The consequence of that may be that you will have more aggravated cases of repression under the use of the power of the Act than you would have if you had shown them that you recognized their interest and concern in the matter. Aggravated cases will arise, and will come home by virtue of their very aggravation; they will attract the notice and sympathy of Members of this House, accustomed to interest themselves in the affairs of India; and it not an extraordinary opinion to hold that the effect of rejecting a Motion of this kind—which would tend to give regularity and moderation to the whole of the proceedings—may be, not that you will keep the cases under the Act out of the hearing of Parliament, but that you will have more and more serious cases, and probably more and more discussion on the subject. These are the general grounds on which I propose the Motion which I have presented to the House. I repeat most strongly, that I should exceedingly regret if discredit were to be thrown upon the Indian Government. I have faith and confidence in its general administration. I believe in its good intentions, and in its general prudence and wisdom. I look upon this as an isolated error, and my sincere purpose and design are to offer a contribution towards keeping the consequences of that error within the narrowest possible bounds.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that all proceedings which may be taken by the authorities under the Indian Vernacular Press Act be reported to the Secretary of State and laid before Parliament from time to time."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

MR. O'DONNELL, in rising to move the following Amendment;—

"That Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive; that there is no reason to believe that Lord Lytton is qualified by any acquaintance with Indian vernacular languages to control the reports of his subordinates upon the tone of the Native Press of India; that serious accusations are brought against the excessive garbling of the opinions attributed to the Native Press in the extracts alleged by Lord Lytton as a justification for the recent Press Act, and that in some instances this garbling appears to extend to a complete falsification; that this House deplores the unjust and insulting tone used towards the people and languages of India in the said Press Act, and in other documents laid before Parliament; that this House recognizes the services of the Native Press of India in explaining the sentiments and exposing the grievances of the Indian people still unfortunately destitute of any Constitutional opportunities of representation, and considers that those services were especially required at the moment when the real opinions of the people of India on the subject of the employment of Indian military resources for the European policy of the Cabinet were suppressed by the sudden and arbitrary action of the Viceregal Government;"

said, he was aware that the Government had the most sincere desire to promote the welfare of India, and he was quite prepared to concede that even the extraordinary measure which the House had under its notice had been framed for no other object. He made, therefore, no specific charge against Lord Lytton, though he thought he should have given the Home Government fuller reasons for the Act than he had apparently done. His main objection to the Act in question was its comprehensiveness. A Bill dealing with the newspaper Press alone ought not to contain a clause as to vernacular political literature in general without giving the Home Government due time to express its opinion on it. Now, Section 10 of the Act included in its scope not only newspapers and periodicals, but every work of literature which might appear to the Governor to contain passages likely to excite dissatisfaction, so that it could only be by the grace of the Governor that any political publication could exist. In one case a history of the Sepoy War in the vernacular had been stopped by the publisher's unwillingness to run the risk. He would withdraw the implied censure on Lord Lytton, and only affirm that his decided opinion was against the inclusion in the Act of vernacular works in general, the most innocent of which might be deemed objectionable or seditious, according to the caprice of the Governor. He believed the Indian Government was perfectly justified in quoting the precedents with reference to the way in which the Home Government dealt with the Irish Press. Anything that could be said against the Indian Press Act now under consideration could be said with equal force against the Press Acts which had been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. He had never been able to see how it could be fairly said that the security of human life was the governing motive for the coercion Acts which were passed against the Irish Press. It was news to him—and he was sure to every hon. Member—that the deplorable outrages which had marked agrarian transactions in Ireland were solely due to the teachings of the Irish Press. He had been under the impression that the question had hitherto been one as between landlord and tenant, and that it was legalized outrage on the one side which had led to illegal outrage on the other. He had heard with pleasure the disclaimer which had been pronounced that evening, and he hoped that under no future Liberal Government would anything be heard of coercion Acts applied to the Irish Press. He wished rather to call attention to a few of the prominent characteristics of the Indian Press Act than to suggest a remedy; because he thought the mischief of measures of this kind was much more likely to be prevented in the future by exposing the circumstances attending the late gagging Act than by any other course. He could not understand why the Government would not consent to make periodical reports as to the working of the Act, because it would be competent to hon. Members at any time to bring each individual case before Parliament and to take full discussions upon them. There could be no real supervision without a very accurate knowledge on the part of the supervisors of the languages and dialects in which the articles impugned were written; and if the Government purposed to decide upon the strength of translations, he could only think that the worst results would follow as far as the prestige of the Government in India was concerned. Native scholars and leaders of opinion in India had openly impeached the accuracy of the extracts from the local Press, and the most convincing reply which the Government could make to a charge of that kind would be to attempt a prosecution in India against those who made such an accusation. This, however, they were well aware the Government would not venture to do. The law, moreover, was specially unfair in directing its whole force against the Native Press alone. He thought all should have been treated alike, whether the offenders were Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, or Natives. The action of the Government in regard to this measure could only have the effect of proving to the peoples that they were not regarded as an integral part of the Empire. The contemptuous references to the ignorance and inferiority of the readers of Native journals, and the depreciation of the Native intellect, was a much greater incentive to disaffection than the wildest complaints which had been culled from obscure journals to form a ground of justification for this measure. It was desirable for the Government of India on mere grounds of expediency to allow liberty, and even licence in the expression of Native opinion. The suppression of public feeling in India had been to leave the Government without any indication of the feeling of the Natives on the policy of sending troops to Europe to aid the European policy of the Government. Indeed, the Governor General had himself admitted that it was owing to the agitation in the Indian bazaars on the Turkish question that the necessity arose for muzzling the Indian Press. He was quite satisfied that even though by the influence of the Government the House was induced to reject both his own Motion and that of the right hon. Gentleman, the Act would remain a dead letter, or that, if enforced, a single prosecution would cause more trouble and ferment than a dozen prosecutions under the ordinary law. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Amendment.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive,"—(*Mr. O'Donnell,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GORST said, that, in common with many who sat on his side of the House, he had listened with great attention and interest to the moderate speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, and he hoped, unless some strong reasons were shown to the contrary, that his Motion would be adopted without a division. It was quite impossible to justify in itself this Press Law. So many were the objections which could be raised to it, that it was difficult to select any particular one as deserving of greater prominence than another. The right hon. Gentleman had dwelt upon its character as a piece of class legislation. That seemed to him to be a fatal blot on such a law. To his mind the most objectionable feature of the Act was the manner in which it put an end to the function of official bodies. It might be that he looked at the question from the standpoint of his Profession; but he must say that he had never read a law which seemed to him more calculated to place the Executive Government so entirely above the control of the law in carrying out its provisions. Although the Government of India was a despotic one, hitherto the people had possessed a security against its tyrannical administration in the independent judicial tribunals of the country; but if this law was to be carried out as it stood that security would be entirely gone, because the Government alone was made the judge of the character of any article in the vernacular papers of which they themselves complained. He was sorry to say that this was not the only instance in which the Government of India desired to put itself above the law. The House ought to watch the propensity of that Government to put itself above the law. The Government of India was gradually becoming more independent of the Secretary of State at home. The principle on which the Government of India acted was that not only the authority of the Secretary of State and Council, but that the jurisdiction of that House should be excluded. So far as he could see, there was no objection to the

Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. It did not ask the House to reverse the action of the Indian Government, nor to do anything that could humiliate Lord Lytton and his Colleagues in the eyes of the people, but simply to require that all proceedings taken under the Act should be brought under the review of Parliament, so that the effect necessarily produced by this false step might be minimized as far as possible. Speaking for himself, he confessed he should wish the House to approve of that principle.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL observed, that if his opinion on that subject was at all as clear and decided as that of the right hon. Member for Greenwich, he thought he should have proposed a Resolution a good deal stronger than the one which the right hon. Gentleman had moved. On the other hand, he was surprised to gather that the Government were likely to oppose the Motion, which he regarded as a most innocent and reasonable one ; for whatever might be done by the Government of India in this matter must be published in *The Gazette*, and so would be made public before the official papers could reach this country and be laid before Parliament. It was quite true that when a country had been conquered it was somewhat difficult to restore it. On the other hand, this was a question of domestic policy. For his part, he saw no difficulty in reversing it if it was desirable to do so. He was not going to propose that course, because it was one of those subjects which the more one looked into, the more difficulties were apparent ; and, having passed a great portion of his life in India, he was even now a waverer on the matter. He hoped the House would pardon him for referring to what might be called a personal matter. Lord Lytton, in proposing this measure, did him the honour of quoting some words which he had used in referring to this subject, and said that he had urged upon the Government of India a measure similar to that which the Government of India had been compelled to adopt. Now, when this subject was discussed in a very brief manner on a former occasion—coming into the House, as he did, at the end of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone)—he had stated that he had no recollection that he had himself proposed a measure of the kind. Certain papers had been published by the Government of India which were supposed to contradict the statements he had made ; and although he had spoken apologetically, he thought he might justify himself in saying that there was nothing in them to contradict what he had stated to the House. The contrary belief was founded on a letter of his to the Government of India, dated 7th August, 1873, and that commenced with a passage which showed that the initiative in the matter was not taken by him. The fact was that an article of a very seditious character having appeared in an Indian paper, the attention of Lord Northbrook and his Council was drawn to the subject, and being then Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, he (Sir George Campbell) was requested to give his opinion as to what ought to be done in the matter. Thereupon he stated what he had himself done, and what his views were. His views were confined to a somewhat strong opinion, expressed in a brief form, to the effect that there should be a law for the punishment of seditious and mischievous libels on the Government without the *éclat* of a great State prosecution. Being pressed on the subject, he had, he admitted, expressed such an opinion ; but he submitted that that was nothing in the nature of any measure proposed by him to the Indian Government, and far less one of the same character as that which it had passed. The fact of the matter was that although he had again and again denounced the evils which had attended the licence of the Press, he had not found himself in a position to propose any measure for dealing with those evils, because there had been great difficulties in the way, and because, being a thick-skinned man, he thought it better to bear the evils to which he was subjected than to fly to others which he did not see. The passage which had been telegraphed over as having been written by him was in reality written by Mr. Buckland, and submitted by him (Sir George Campbell) as Lieutenant Governor, to the Viceroy, with the remark that although he did not agree with all contained in it, yet he must admit that it had a considerable basis of truth. For himself, he undoubtedly said that something ought to be done. Turning to the general question before the House, the hon. Member said it involved the whole character of our government in India, and whether that government was to be conducted on despotic principles, or on free principles, for each of which views much could be said. He had been, for the most part, brought up in what might be called the despotic school, which believed that the people of India, not being yet fitted for free institutions on a large scale, it was not possible to graft at once, on an unfree stock, those institutions which had grown up gradually in the countries of Europe. That question of the Press presented itself to his mind in a practical and utilitarian aspect. He was inclined to suppose that the prestige of our Government in India was a good deal founded on the belief in the minds of the Natives that our power was irresistible, that it would not brook contradiction or opposition; and that view of our power was detracted from by the immense licence with which the acts of the Government were criticized by an unbridled, and, in some respects, a licentious Press. He had observed that in the Native States there was an entire want of that prestige in the Government which was founded on the belief that opposition to it was useless. Oude was not long ago a Native State, and the Zemindars thought opposition to the Government almost a point of honour. In the Sikh territory a similar state of things had once prevailed; but in the British possessions, on the other hand, they had established a belief in the uselessness of resistance to the Government, with the result that force was never needed. His own experience had been gained first in recently acquired provinces, and latterly in Bengal, where he had been much struck with the contempt that had been bred of familiarity. In fact, he had been partly confirmed in his impression that if there was to be a free Press, it would be necessary to double the Army, and that would materially affect the finances of the country. Formerly his great objection to free institutions in India had been that they were likely to destroy the belief in the irresistible power of the Government; but his later experience in the government of Bengal had somewhat modified those views. He had been shocked to find that an old woman defied the whole Government and necessitated the employment of military force, yet of late years the people of Bengal had shown the most wonderful obedience to the law when it was actually passed. He especially referred to recent Bills for local taxation, and a census of the people. There was then a good deal to be said in favour of legality in India; and, although there might be a transition stage in which our prestige might vanish, and our Government be treated with something of familiarity and contempt, he still thought there was a great deal to be said on the other side, and that it was quite possible that legality would prevail, and that free institutions might, in due time, be grafted upon our Indian rule. The result of his somewhat wide experience having been to leave him in great doubt upon this question of a free Press in India, he was not in a position to criticize severely any attempt to deal with such a difficult question; but he emphatically condemned the hasty precipitancy with which that attempt had been made. It was a question which required to be dealt with most carefully and dispassionately, and one which the Indian Government, smarting under the attacks made upon it, should have referred to the Home Government, rather than have stolen a march, as it were, and forced the hand of the Government at home under what were little short of false pretences. There was no urgency in the matter, and the extracts which had been sent home, so far from showing that the licentiousness of the Press was increasing, tended rather in the contrary direction. A good many extracts from the Vernacular Press were quoted in the debates in the Indian Council; but he observed that no dates were given, and the worst by far were from a newspaper published in Holkar's dominions, and not affected by this law. Looking at the extracts from Bengal during the past 18 months, however, he could say that they were no worse than what was written in his time—indeed, they were not half so bad. In his opinion, the Government had failed to show that an emergency existed, and, therefore, their action was, in this respect, entirely unjustifiable. It seemed to him that the hands of the Secretary of State had been forced by a telegram from India. This was not an isolated case in which this was done; it had become very much a system of late prevalent in India. The hands of the Home Government were forced by an alarming telegram, then the thing was done, and when the real state of the case was discovered, it was too late to undo the mischief. He was unable to see any justification for the distinction between the English and the Vernacular Press. If there was any difference between the two, the papers published in English were by far the most outspoken and licentious of the two. *The Hindoo Patriot,* for instance, was edited by an Englishman, who had been patted on the back by successive Governments; but it never lost an opportunity of making Englishmen appear ridiculous in the eyes of the Natives. At one time it made the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) a hero; but it had now discarded him for the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), whom it described as a very dazzling fellow indeed. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had said, the extracts read were rubbish of a puerile description. It was mere braggadocia. It did not mean anything serious. If a sailor at Liverpool beat his wife and gouged out her eye, he was held up as a specimen of the English; if an English jury returned a silly verdict, it was held up as a sample of English intelligence. This was, no doubt, calculated to bring the British character into contempt; but there was no wish in all this to upset the British Government. If they dealt with the Native Press, he contended they ought to deal with English papers of the character of *The Hindoo Patriot.* He strongly objected to the appointment of the Press Commissioner, who seemed to be a political agent whose duties were to suppress the Vernacular Press and "nobble" the English Press. He looked with great apprehension on a system of that kind. Having had considerable experience in these matters, he felt constrained to state the course he should like to see followed. Whatever opinion they might hold as to the advantages of despotism in India as compared with free institutions, they had proceeded too far to go back. At all events, they could not very far retrace their steps, and the Act in question being the reversal of a system which had long prevailed, he looked with great doubt upon its policy. On the other hand, he could not but think that something ought to be done in the matter, so that the vices of the Indian Press—rubbish and puerile though they might be—could be readily restrained. They should not destroy the liberty of the Press; but he thought they should apply a more speedy and summary punishment of a slight character to the case of Press offences of a minor character, and that, without the paraphernalia of a State trial, there should be some provision for a warning without publication in the *Gazette;* and if the warning, after being given a second or third time, was disregarded, the offender should be liable to punishment after a summary trial before a magistrate. He objected to the penalty for the use of language calculated to create antipathies between different races. It was a dangerous thing to shut the mouth of the Natives, and to say to them—"If you complain of Europeans, you are creating antipathies, and must be punished." A comment on the conduct of an official in his public capacity might be fair and reasonable, and even valuable, and yet the writer would be subject to punishment under the provisions of this law. That machinery was far too great, so far as the suppression of minor offences was concerned; while, if it were not put in force, it would prove a scandal to Indian legislation, and the conductors of the Native Press would soon find that a law existed to which there was no intention of resorting. This was a state of things which could not but be attended with mischievous results.

Mr. SMOLLETT said, that the subject introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was of interest to all who, like himself, had passed a great many years of public service in the East. The Motion related to an Act passed by the Legislative Council in Calcutta in March last. That Legislative Council aped the forms and manners of the House of Commons; but it carried out its business with more rapidity than they did in that House, for obstruction was neither tolerated nor even connived at in Calcutta. The Act they were now considering went through all its forms in one day, and was passed in one sitting; and he believed it became the law of the land that same afternoon, the sanction of the Viceroy having been accorded to it. Precipitate legislation like that would seem to imply great emergency in India, or some danger in Calcutta. But there was no danger. The fact was that Lord Lytton was anxious to get away from the heat of the plains to his retreat in the Himalayas, and hence the emergency. But although it was passed in great haste, it would not be true, and should not be inferred, that the Act was passed without consideration. The subject had been under consideration for two or three years, and, in fact, in 1877 and 1878 every high functionary in India was required to state his opinion on it in writing, and did so. The Act was intended to restrain the dissemination of seditious writings through the Vernacular Press, and it required that upon the publication of any newspapers in India, the owners might—not should—be required to make a deposit to secure that the journal should be conducted with propriety, and the Government had the power of forfeiting the deposit, which was not to exceed £200, and to suppress the journal, if it was found that after two warnings it continued to disseminate sedition or treasonable writings against the Government. Such an Act was, in his opinion, an absolute necessity of our government in the East. If carried out with propriety and moderation, and not entirely whittled away, it would, he could not help thinking, be a great success. In his judgment, a thoroughly despotic Government as the Government of India was, tempered by a perfectly free Press, was an anomaly and a condition of government which never could succeed. The Government was conducted by a handful of Europeans, who were conquerors, aliens in blood and religion; and the endeavour to carry on an arbitrary government in India, tempered, as he had said, with a free Press in such a country, constituted a condition of affairs which must prove mischievous and dangerous. The only wonder was that an experiment of this character could exist for 40 years, and that a free Press in India had done so little mischief. There were reasons why it did not create great harm in the past, and he would now refer to some of them. He admitted that when this system of government was introduced by Lord Metcalfe, and approved by Mr.—afterwards Lord—Macaulay, a gentleman who knew nothing about India, the establishment of a perfectly free Native Press did not give the smallest cause for anxiety to the rulers. He admitted that our present position in India was very secure, because we had there a well-appointed Army of 60,000 or 70,000 European troops, which could be, by means of the railways, sent with rapidity from one part of India to another. We were secure, also, because we had disarmed a large mass of the Native population who were likely to be turbulent. When, in 1857, under Lord Canning, an attempt was made to shackle the Press, it was said, and with truth, that it was not the Native but the English Press against which the measure was aimed. The English Press of that day denounced the Governor General as "clemency Canning," and endeavoured to force on him a most repressive policy—a policy of vengeance and massacre, from which his heart revolted. That was the reason why the Press was shackled at that time. But the reason why the Native Press never gave much trouble immediately after its emancipation was simply this—there was no Native Press in India at all in 1835. The Native Press had been of excessively slow growth. There was a high charge for its transmission through the Post Office, for they had not then got to a halfpenny and a farthing stamp. But things were altered now. In 1835, the extent of our territorial power in India was not half what it was at present. We had not then, most nefariously he thought, confiscated the Province of Oude. That was done by Lord Dalhousie—and that was the beginning of our great troubles in India. We had not conquered and annexed the Punjab; we had not confiscated the possessions of the Ameers of Scinde—most excellent gentlemen, who governed their country much better than the Government of Bombay did; we had not declared Nagpore escheated to the British Government for want of heirs; nor had we annexed Satara; we had not, in 1835, deprived the Nizam of one-third of his territories by seizing on Berar, all of which had been done in a nefarious and discreditable fashion. All these countries existed in their integrity in 1835, and some were perfectly independent States. In those times, statesmen like Sir John Malcolm, Sir Thomas Monro, and Mount Stuart Elphinstone spoke of these States as the safety-valves of British India; because Natives of ambition and eminence, of a turbulent disposition, could find a wide field for distinction in civil and military employment, and there they had ample opportunities for acquiring power and wealth in those great countries. But all that was changed now. Natives were excluded from high employment in the British possessions. Schools were now opened, and Universities were endowed; but they forgot that school-boys grew up to be men, and the men as well as boys were thoroughly discontented, because, after receiving a good education, they found that they were altogether excluded from high appointments in the Civil, Military, and Diplomatic Services. Thus excluded, and thus discontented, they took refuge in the Press. The Press became more and more powerful, and had many more readers. What did they tell us in the Native Press? They told us what could not be denied—that we were intruders in the land; that our taxation was grinding, and was reducing the population to abject poverty; that our expenditure was excessive; that our taxation was constantly increasing; that our prestige as a nation had diminished—as he believed it had under a Liberal Administration. In one word, they plainly stated that they would gladly get rid of us if they could. No doubt, these were disagreeable truths, and we had submitted to this sort of criticism for a good many years. Recently, however, Lord Lytton had asked the Indian functionaries to give their opinion whether any and what change should be made in the law. He seemed to have appealed to the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell); but he had not been able to make up his mind on the subject. With one or two exceptions, the great functionaries appealed to had replied in one strain. They said that the Indian Legislative Body ought to restrain the dissemination of seditious writings by the Native Press, but in a very mild manner, by the Press Law now under discussion; for it was much better to repress those writings than to bring their authors, whether men or boys, to trial penally. The only exception to these declarations of all the official men in India came from Madras, where the Governor appeared to have a grudge against Lord Lytton. That answer was to the effect that nothing should be done with the Native Press. He had, on a former occasion, drawn the attention of the House to the manner in which the Governor of Madras, and the officials there, had set themselves to counteract the measures of Lord Lytton. These men, if not imbecile, wrote very much like imbeciles. They said things should rather remain as they were—that there was no reason to interfere with the Native Press—and that it was well we should know what they alleged against us. These people, like Mawworm in the play of *The Hypocrite,* "loved to be despised." That was the style of their reply. He had read the whole of the replies sent to the Viceroy's Government by the high officials consulted in this matter, but he would only quote one of them. Mr. W. Jones, a Bengal civil servant, writing from Berar, one of the assigned districts of Hyderabad, which we had seized and taken from the Nizam, and where he held the high position of Chief Commissioner, said, in substance, that recent unjust acquisitions in Berar had left there a wild legacy of hatred against the English name; that he had noticed springing up around him in India a feeling of nationality which was never observable in former times, and he largely attributed it to the fact that while, in former times, we governed India by separate Presidencies, and taxation, when it did press, was a local, and not a national grievance, now, under the Imperial *régime*, taxation was oppressive, and bore with equal weight on all portions of the population. Under these circumstances, Mr. Jones desired to see restrictions upon the dissemination of seditious libels by the Native Press. Mr. Jones was right, and he (Mr. Smollett) agreed with him. But, for his part, he would rather see what Mr. Jones did not propose—a reversal of our policy in India. He would like to see some of those unjustifiable annexations restored to their owners. He would like to see a great reduction in our public establishments in India, and he had shown that £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 annually could well be saved. With that reduction, there ought to be a great diminution of taxation instead of a great accumulation of further taxation. When Mr. Jones spoke of taxation pressing upon all classes, he had, probably, in view the great increase of the salt duties, and the imposition, six or eight months ago, in every part of India, of the licence tax, an import which had been received with great disgust in many quarters. It was these things which rendered the coercion of the Press necessary. But though he wished to see these things done, he saw no chance of their being done; for he could not impress his opinions upon the stolid gentlemen who filled the highest situations in the India Office. India was governed by Sir John Strachey and others; and while these men ruled, he saw no chance of diminishing the taxation of the country. And now, one word as to the difference made between the Native and the English papers. There was one objection to Act IX. of 1878, that it dealt entirely with the Vernacular Press, leaving the English Press perfectly free. He admitted the force of that objection; and the more so, because he believed that the difficulties of the Indian Government were often enhanced by the clamours of English journalism. The House must know that in 1859, the direct government of the Crown was established in India, and made known by a Royal Proclamation issued by Lord Canning in October of that year. The principal announcement in that Proclamation was a declaration that, in future, the rights and dignity of Native States would be maintained. Her Majesty pledged Her Royal word and honour that the policy of annexation was at an end; and that announcement gave great satisfaction to the Natives as well as to the Princes of India. But to the official mind annexation was always a favourite policy, and the repudiation of it was gall and wormwood to the Services—Civil and Military. Now, the English Press in India naturally echoed the sentiments of the English population, and that Press always advocated the suppression of Native rule. He would quote some few extracts from Anglo-Indian journals to show how they dealt with the Imperial policy. In the Calcutta paper—*Friend of India*—one of the most influential of Anglo-Indian journals, in October, 1860, the following comment on Her Majesty's Proclamation appeared—just 12 months after it was issued:—

> "Annexation is in abeyance for the hour, and it is right that Government should forswear all approach to it now. But the destiny of British power is in time to sweep the effete Princelings who now rule Hyderabad, Gwalior, Indore, Guzerat, and Travancore off the face of the Peninsula."

A journal published at Lahore, called *Indian Public Opinion*, supposed to be the organ of the authorities in the Punjaub, some years afterwards, wrote thus of the States of Kabul and Cashmere—

> "The key of India is as much Kabul as Cashmere, and whilst we should render the Rulers of the former country subservient to our interests, we ought, without any delay, to annex the latter. Expediency, the Maharajah's misgovernment, and his flagrant breach of the Treaty, justify, and in the interests of humanity and statesmanship demand, such an annexation."

The sentiments entertained by the ruling classes in India were echoed by the correspondents of the leading London journals stationed in Calcutta. For example, the well-informed Correspondent of *The Times*, writing from Calcutta in March, 1866, advocated wholesale annexation of Native States, because, he said—

> "Mutilations, the ravishing of women, torture, Suttee, and burying alive are the rule under all Native Governments."

In April, 1877, the same Correspondent alleged that the restoration of the Native State of Mysore to the heir of the late Rajah was opposed by the Viceroy's Government and to English opinion, because it was a retrograde step, although it was ordered by the Secretary of State, Lord Cranborne. He said that the restoration of Mysore would be

> "equivalent to the restoration of slavery in the West Indian Colonies,"

and that—

> "horrible oppression is inseparable from the rule of an idolatrous Hindoo or sensual Mussulman."

Now, he would not quote farther in this matter; he would only add that incentives to plunder and to annexation of this character when they were read in Native States were very damaging to British rule in India. They created great alarm and agitation; they led to a universal belief in the hollowness and insincerity of the policy of the Indian Government, and they increased the difficulties, always great, of the efficient administration by honest Viceroys. Holding those opinions, he regretted that some means had not been adopted to prevent the publication of such incentives. There were difficulties in the matter; but those difficulties were not insuperable, and they might be overcome if resolutely faced.

Mr. EVANS said, he would not have ventured to address the House if he had not had a great many opportunities, a few months before this Act came into operation, of conversing with English gentlemen—official and non-official—in all the three Presidencies, on the subject of the Vernacular Press. Some said the Vernacular Press of India was libellous, and even seditious, while others maintained that it was harmless and insignificant. The balance of opinion seemed to be in favour of the latter notion. As an hon. Gentleman opposite had referred to the state of Oude, he might mention that a gentleman who was well acquainted with the Natives in that part of India told him that, in his opinion, the Vernacular Press there was, on the whole, not only harmless, but useful. There was immense difficulty in India in ascertaining the true feelings and opinions of the people, and it seemed to him the Vernacular Press would have been of great service in overcoming it. Of the Government of our Eastern Empire, and of the different services connected with it, he had the highest opinion; and if they had simply said that the Vernacular Press had become seditious and unmanageable, and demanded repressive measures, he should have been inclined to say—"You know best, and it is not for me to dispute your views;" but he could not help thinking their judgment had been at fault when they decided to restrict the free expression of Native opinion instead of watching and profiting by it. The Indian Government, however, had not only stated what they meant to do, but had given their reasons, and it became the duty of the Members of that House to consider whether those reasons were good and sufficient. In his judgment, the hon. Member for Kirkaldy (Sir George Campbell) pronounced the strongest condemnation of this Act, when he said that during his service in India, although the Press was free, it had not become worse, but become better. Lord Lytton, to do him justice, seemed, in some respects, to have been acting against his own convictions; but of the majority of his Council, the description given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was, no doubt, true. One of them said that such journalistic licence as existed in India would not be tolerated anywhere else except England and America; but if that gentleman had had European experience, he would not have ventured to make such a statement. In Italy, for instance, the language indulged in by some newspapers was much stronger than any we were accustomed to in this country. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Smollett) had condemned the Act, because, he said, the same measure ought to be meted out to the European as to the Vernacular Press, and the quotations which he made from the former were much worse than any of the passages cited from the Vernacular Press in support of this measure. He regretted that in many instances the passages had been selected in such a manner as to give a wrong impression as to the real gist of the articles. For example, in one article complaint was made of a particular judgment given by the High Court of Justice, and it was said that there was no justice in the country. The quotation stopped there, and it might be supposed the writer meant that as long as the English remained in India the people would not obtain justice; and that, therefore, they should endeavour to get rid of the English altogether. The writer, however, called on the citizens of Calcutta to join together and endeavour to create an agitation on this subject; and, instead of inculcating sedition, he advised them to adopt the constitutional course of appealing to the Queen and to the British Parliament. Another article quoted in support of the Act expressed regret at the increase of drunkenness, and said it would never be put a stop to as long as the Government derived so large a portion of its revenue from the consumption of intoxicating liquors. This was gravely quoted as an illustration of seditious writing in the Vernacular Press, although the same thing was said every year far more eloquently and forcibly by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson). The truth was that it was almost impossible to find anything in the Vernacular Press of India which could be called seditious in the real sense of the word. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last said that strong measures ought to be taken to keep down the Press in India, and under a despotic Government he could understand the difficulties to which a free Press might give rise. But there had been for a long time liberty of the Press in India, and nobody could fairly maintain that there existed now, as a consequence, any special danger in that country. It was quite true that here and there, while he was in India, he heard of disaffection; but, upon the whole, he had been impressed with the feeling that the people were particularly loyal. With regard more especially to the Native troops, he had been told by officer after officer that if Her Majesty required 200,000 troops to assist her in carrying on war against Russia or any other Power, those troops could be raised without any difficulty. When such a state of things as that existed, he confessed to a feeling of bitter disappointment that the Indian Government should have thought it necessary to pass such a law as this. He could not agree with those who contended that the Government were justified in the course which they had adopted, and although no man valued more than he did our Indian Empire, and the line of statesmen and soldiers by whom it was created, he saw no reason why he should not vote for the Motion of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich; for no harm would, he thought, be likely to result from its adoption, and it was most desirable that what was done under this Act should be laid before Parliament.

MR. ONSLOW said, he had listened with pleasure to the moderate speeches of the right hon. Member for Greenwich and other speakers, and expressed a hope that the discussion might continue to be carried on in a spirit free from all Party considerations; because he considered it would not be for the advantage of India if, whenever her interests were under discussion, hon. Members were to allow Party spirit to prevail. The right hon. Gentleman, he might add, had, in his opinion, hit a blot in the Supreme Council of the Indian Government, when he spoke of its being composed of men having little or no English experience. Lord Lytton, a man for whom everyone entertained the highest respect, was in no degree conversant, he believed, with the management of affairs from his own personal knowledge either in the House of Commons or in the other House of Parliament, and the same remark applied to nearly all, if not all, the Members of his Council. At the same time, he wished to guard himself from the idea that, because a man had only received a diplomatic education, therefore he might not be just as fit to be Viceroy of India as one of more wide experience. He hoped, therefore, that in any appointments, such as that of Financial Member of the Supreme Council of India, which might hereafter be made, acquaintance with English political life would be deemed an essential qualification. In his opinion, there should be one, if not two, Members of that Council of English experience, in order to assist the Viceroy in his deliberations. Hon. Members must not, however, he contended, look at the question immediately before the House merely in the light of an English question, but should endeavour to place themselves in the position of those who were ruling alien races in India; for they must recollect that the people of that country were not homogeneous. Regarded from that point of view, the measure which was now complained of, instead of being adverse to the liberties of the Natives of India, would tend rather to their welfare and prosperity, to the suppression of seditious writing, which might produce a great deal of mischief; for he contended that any legislative Act having for its object the check of harmful literature must be beneficial to the various races over whom we had to rule. The right hon. Gentleman the Member of Greenwich objected to not having the offenders tried by a jury; but Lord Lytton had, in his opinion, conclusively shown that it was far better the propagators of sedition should be taken in hand by the Executive Government itself, and that the scandal of a trial, stirring up as it would the bad feeling of many, would be most prejudicial to good government. The right hon. Gentleman had also alluded to Mr. Paul, the Indian Advocate General, and had adverted to certain statements which that gentleman had made. He was sure Mr. Paul would not have used the language which had been quoted if he did not sincerely believe that libels were being circulated throughout the country; and there could be no doubt but that, in his opinion—and, he thought, in the opinion of those conversant with the peculiar temperament of the Indian mind—those libels and scurrilous extracts, if believed in—as it was evident it was the wish of the writers—could not tend to strengthen their rule in India. The articles which had been spoken of must be regarded not from an English point of view, but from the point of view of the effect which they were calculated to have upon the Natives of India. Many of the publications to which allusion had been made would not be considered seditious if printed in this country; but when hon. Members came to think of the impressionable character of the millions of the Native races of India, they could scarcely help feeling that what was not seditious in this country might be, and unquestionably was, very seditious in India. The Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman was, no doubt, somewhat mild; but if it was assented to by the House, it would, he was afraid, have a very bad effect on the Native Indian population, for it would be said by the writers of these articles—"Well, after all, the British House of Parliament thinks but lightly of this line of writing; we will go on, and write even stronger to excite public feeling against the ruling power." This, he thought, was no exaggeration of what would actually take place if the House agreed to the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman. An article might be scurrilous without being seditious, and what this Act sought to do was merely to prevent statements being inserted in a newspaper which would incite the Natives of India to rise against their Rulers. Could anyone deny that this was not the object of the Act, to nip incipient rebellion in the bud, and to put a stop to that which must, if continued without check, unsettle the minds of many of the most ignorant. Whilst admitting the full right of Parliament to criticize the actions of the Viceroy and the Indian Government, he strongly deprecated any endeavour, by passing the Resolution before the House, fetter the hands of the Viceroy and make him almost irresponsible for what he might do. There was no foundation for the assertion that this Act had been passed in a hurried manner, because the subject had been under the careful consideration of the Indian Government for several years past; and it was clear, from the Papers before them, that Lord Northbrook, the previous Viceroy, seriously contemplated making a move in the matter. The House ought also to remember that if this Act had been vetoed by Her Majesty's Government, there would have been nothing left for the Viceroy, and certainly some of his Council, but to resign. The measure had been approved by the Supreme Council and by the Legislative Council of India, and also by every Administrative and Executive officer in the country with the exception of the Duke of Buckingham; while the great majority of the Indian Council at home had also given it their support. In those circumstances, it would not be a wise act on the part of the House to agree to a Resolution which would have the effect of preventing the measure from being brought into operation as speedily as possible. If an Act passed by such a body of men, agreed to by officers all over India, and receiving the sanction of such a majority in the Council at home, were to be vetoed, he feared no Act passed by the Legislative Council in India could legitimately receive the sanction of the Secretary of State, for he supposed there was scarcely an Act passed which did not receive more or less adverse comment. The necessity for the Act was shown by the extracts in the Blue Books from these articles, which clearly tended to diminish the prestige of England in that country. It had been most gratifying to those who took an interest in India to read the accounts which had appeared in *The Times* recently, showing the loyalty of the Native population towards their Empress, and it would be most unfortunate if that loyalty were to be undermined, or attempted to be undermined, by articles of the character which had been referred to. He thought that hon. Members opposite failed to appreciate the difference that existed between the liberty and the licence of the Press. In England that distinction was clear; in India it should be made clearer still. He hoped that no measure would ever be agreed to which would restrict fair comment upon the conduct of our Indian officials. He would deprecate any action being taken against any Native newspaper for fair or strong comment against acts of the Government collectively or individually, nor, in his opinion, would any Viceroy object to such comments—strong opinion is one thing, but strong opinion having for its object the spread of discontent, and the endeavour to excite those who were ruled against their Rulers was quite a different thing. It was to suppress the latter kind of writing that this Act had, in his opinion, been most judiciously passed. At the present time British rule in India was far better for the country and was more popular than any Native rule had been, and he thought that care should be taken to prevent the publication of matter which would tend to undermine that popularity. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would not divide; but if he did, he hoped the House would, by a considerable majority, uphold the action of the Secretary of State.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE hoped that the reticence which had been shown in the course of this debate by the Members of Her Majesty's Government was an indication that they were not prepared to meet the Motion of the right hon. Member for Greenwich with a direct negative, but would concur to a certain extent in his views. Hon. Gentlemen who had spoken on both sides of the House had not expressed entire approval of the measure. The question before the House was, whether it was wise or expedient to curtail the freedom of the Press in countries where the Government was despotic; because this Act must not only affect India, but all other of our Colonies in which there was no representative Government. It practically took the Press from the purview of the law, and put it under the control of the Executive Government. Of course, the only justification for such a course could be the publication of articles which covertly or openly were designed and calculated to overthrow the Government. He thought it was unfortunate that the Secretary of State had not laid on the Table the Minutes by Lord Macaulay and Lord Auckland, Governors General of India. It appeared that in 1823 a system of licensing was established which continued till 1835. In that year it was abolished, the Vernacular Press being comparatively of very little importance. In the Minutes by Lord Macaulay and Lord Auckland, it was pointed out that there was at that time a system of manuscript newspapers; that there was a very large number of persons whose duty it was to collect information to write it in the manuscript papers, which were circulated in many parts of India; that in Delhi 130 persons were engaged in collecting, writing, and circulating that information; that these manuscript papers contained matter much more vicious than anything which appeared in the Indian newspapers; and that one result of a free Vernacular Press would be a gradual supersession of these manuscript papers. The manuscript papers, Lord Macaulay said, were filled with extravagant falsehoods and contained abuse of the Government. He had never before known so great a change as that involved in the Act in question effected with so little discussion. They had not been told why it was that in a single day the Government had passed this law, without any opportunity being given for the expression of public opinion in this country or in India for or against the measure. Nobody who had read the case attempted to be made out for the present measure in the Correspondence before the House could fail to have been struck with its extreme weakness. Having looked at the 150 extracts from Native newspapers, and spreading over a period of 18 months, which were supposed to justify that severe new law, he must say that the greater part of them consisted of mere rubbish, idle declamation, and rather scurrilous arguments; but of real sedition there were not more than four or five cases. Some of them contained complaints that the Natives were not employed in the Civil Service; others that some Englishmen maltreated Natives; others, referring to the Fuller case, said that Englishmen killed Natives; and others, again, alleged that Natives were treated as inferiors. Many of these complaints might be foolish or unfounded, but they could hardly be regarded as seditious, and they were even valuable, as showing us the state of the Native mind. One of the extracts quoted by Lord Lytton, presumably as justifying the application of that very severe law, represented the English as treading on the necks of the whole Indian population; while another alleged that the English themselves spoke of the decline of their military power and of the loss of their prestige, concluding with the remark that there was a great deal of truth in that statement. Sir Alexander Arbuthnot, on the introduction of that measure, also quoted a passage from a Native paper to this effect—

> "A history of the non-fulfilment of its promises by the British Government would be its whole history for the last 150 years."

There was, no doubt, much nonsense and extravagance in all that; but did it call for the passing of the stringent law now under consideration? It was, he thought, Cromwell who said his Government was not worth preserving if it would not stand paper bullets. So he would now say of the Indian Government, which he believed would stand paper bullets and something much stronger. He not only thought the change uncalled for, but he took exception to the measure on account of the invidious distinction it drew between the Native and the Anglo-Indian Press, the separation it made between the law and Executive, and the probability that it would bring about a conflict with the Indian Press which must give rise to the total suppression of the Press or the failure of the measure itself. In conclusion, although there might be some evils attending a free Press, yet the advantages it conferred far outweighed them; and, in his judgment, it would be a great mistake, in the interests both of England and of India, to sacrifice those advantages.

Mr. A. GATHORNE-HARDY said, that if he could not imitate the eloquence of the right hon. Member for Greenwich, he would, at least, try to imitate the tone in which he had introduced that question. A regard for the liberty of the subject and of the Press was not the exclusive property of any Party in that House; it was equally dear to them all, and all must admit that any restriction of the freedom of the Press was a drawback which could only be justified by the gravest reasons. The right hon. Member for Greenwich had given them the history of the liberty of the Press in India; but he was not correct in saying that it was established in 1835 by Lord Macaulay. The Minutes of Lord Metcalfe, Lord Macaulay, and other authorities, all showed that the liberty of the Press was not established in India—that certain restrictions which had never been put in force were being removed; and it was that reason which every one of those authorities gave for removing the restrictions entirely. The right hon. Member for Greenwich stated that he was loath to inflict any censure upon Lord Lytton, also admitting that that noble Lord was the friend of the Natives, and that all his sympathies were on the side of freedom. Lord Lytton himself, in his despatch, had expressed his regret that it should have fallen to his lot to diminish the freedom of the Press; and he could not help thinking that when the right hon. Gentleman had censured the conduct of the Governor General, he might have borne in mind that he had before him many considerations of which the right hon. Gentleman was probably unaware. It was worthy of notice, in passing, that in "another place," a noble Lord, who had been recently Governor General of India had not thought it necessary to bring forward any Motion on the subject. Now, the objections taken by the right hon. Gentleman were, as he understood them, four-fold. He had objected, in the first place, to anything being done, next to the particular course adopted, next to the manner in which the course taken had been followed, and, lastly, to the fact that it applied only to the Vernacular Press, and not to the Anglo-Indian as well. He would comment *seriatim* on those points, in order to defend the action of the Government. In the first place, it could easily be contended that on that preliminary question, there was an unanimous consensus of opinion. If he took the protest of three Members of the Indian Council, he found that that was practically their view of the question. Sir Erskine Perry, while supporting Lord Salisbury's views on the matter, thought that some action was necessary, and Sir William Muir had agreed with him; Sir Arthur Hobhouse, too, had quoted Sir James Stephen's words that, considering the licence allowed to the Indian Press, some remedy would have to be found. He had recommended more frequent prosecutions under the existing Acts, if he had not demanded more stringent measures, like the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell). Lord Northbrook also was in favour of some change, and of a summary prosecution by which the *éclat* of a long trial might be avoided. But what everyone had wished was to restrict, not to punish, to end the existing state of things, not to make martyrs; for, of course, it was notorious to all that hardly any Press prosecution ended satisfactorily. Sir Erskine Perry had suggested an amendment of the Press

Act with summary procedure and small penalties, arguing that that was the most proper mode of treating the offence. Great weight ought to be given to the opinions of those who had had special experience of government in India, and, with the exception of the Duke of Buckingham, the whole consensus of opinion was in favour of what had been done by the Government. And it was worth while pointing out what this consensus of opinion was. The Governor General sent a Circular round to all the Governors, and all the Residents and Commissioners at the Courts of Native Princes, and the course of the Government was approved—in Bombay, by Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Gibbs, the Hon. Mr. Ashburner; in Bengal, by the Lieutenant Governor; in the North-West Provinces, by the Lieutenant Governor, Sir George Couper; in the Punjab, by the Governor, Mr. Egerton; in the Central Provinces, by Mr. J. H. Morris, Chief Commissioner; in Burmah, by Mr. Thompson, Chief Commissioner; in Mysore, by Mr. Saunders, Chief Commissioner; in Assam, by Colonel Keatinge, Chief Commissioner; in Hyderabad, by Colonel Meade, the Resident, and Mr. Jones, Commissioner, and Mr. Bell, the Judicial Commissioner. In addition to all this, we knew that the Act was approved unanimously by the Viceroy and his Council, including the non-official members. One of the strongest opinions was expressed by Mr. Paul, Advocate General of the Government, of whom a friend in this country had said to him —"You may quote Mr. Paul with safety, for of all men I know he is least likely to approve any undue advancement of the Executive at the expense of the judicial body." Great stress was laid upon the haste and secrecy with which this Act was supposed to have been passed; but it was incorrect to assume there had been such haste. No doubt, when the matter came before the Council in the form of a Bill, it was passed with great rapidity; but, so far from there being haste, there had been great deliberation. The subject was mentioned in a despatch of Sir George Campbell, and the reply to it, dated August, 1873. Attention was drawn to it in a speech made at a Durbar held in Calcutta, on the 12th of August last, by Mr. Eden, who said—

> "I do not believe that any country in the world would have stood such writing as we have allowed for the last 10 years. Lord Northbrook took it up, and we all minuted on the subject; but there seemed to be a disinclination to move in the matter, and since then the editors of the most seditious papers have been praised and flattered—by the Bengal Government—till they have become actually reckless."

Therefore, during the Governorship of Lord Northbrook, the matter was under consideration, and Minutes were being written upon it. In a despatch dated the 9th of June, 1875, after commenting on the language of these articles, Lord Salisbury, in a despatch to the Viceroy, said—

> "In any event, I direct your Excellency's serious attention to the continued publication of this class of article by a portion of the Native Press."

In the answer to this despatch, it was said—

> "The questions of the tone of the Native Press, of the condition of the law, and of the propriety of altering it, present very grave difficulties, and we propose to take another occasion of expressing our views upon them."

The Minute of Sir Arthur Hobhouse, of the 18th of August, 1876, showed that the matter was then under the consideration of the Indian Council, even to the practical changes that had been made in the law. They next came to the speech of Sir Ashley Eden on the 12th of August, 1877, and on the 22nd of October to the Minute of the Viceroy. The expressions of opinion contained in the Blue Book extended over the whole period from the date of that Minute to the date of the telegram to the English Government, the 13th of March. The telegram stated that the matter was urgent, and when the Viceroy and his Council said so on their responsibility, it would have been a grave step for the Home Government to have refused their assent. If there was then to be legislation at all, it must be immediate, because, as the Viceroy said—

> "I am obliged to leave Calcutta on the 18th of March, and we could not legislate on such a matter at Simla.

As the Council was unanimous, there would have been no good in a lengthened discussion. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich seemed to think there was no urgency in the matter laid before the Government—namely, the excited feeling in India occasioned by the war in the East of Europe. Now, he could not imagine anything more calculated to create excitement in the bazaars in India than the war in question; and, although the wise, prudent, and statesmanlike precautions of the Government had prevented any likelihood of British prestige being diminished in the East, still the fact that excitement did exist at the time established a case of urgency for this measure. When the former Press Law was repealed in May, 1835, it was contemplated that the Government of India would be able to act promptly in case of emergency. On that occasion, Mr. Macaulay wrote—

> "No Government in the world is better provided with the means of meeting extraordinary dangers by extraordinary precautions. Five persons, who may be brought together in half-an-hour, whose deliberations are secret, who are not shocked by any of those forms which elsewhere delay legislative measures, can, in a single sitting, make a law for stopping every Press in India."

The Minutes of the Governor General and Mr. Prinsep contained similar views. As to the objection that this was class legislation, and that there ought to be no restrictions that were not imposed on the English as well as the Native Press, he was bound to admit that nothing but exceptional danger and exceptional circumstances could justify this legislation. The English Press addressed a very different audience from the Native Press; and although there would have been more show of fairness and impartiality if these restrictions had been imposed on both alike, the Government would not have been justified in imposing them on any part of the Press where they were not necessary. In 1856, they had a restricted Press during the Mutiny; since then the evil with which the Act dealt had been growing, and their duty was to stop it, not for their own sakes, but for the sake of those whom it might lead into danger. It would be rather hard if hereafter the Government had to punish men who had been led into seditious courses, when they had not endeavoured to protect them from the mischievous counsels of the Press which had led them astray. The Governor General had truly said that this was a danger of which only those on the spot could properly judge. It was all very well for them, sitting at home at ease, to laugh at the danger which the Indian Press might create; but they must all feel that the Press was a dangerous engine in the hands of an ignorant, vain, and sensitive people. The right hon. Gentleman had specially complained that the cognizance of Press offences had been taken into the hands of the Executive Government; but surely that was some security that the power would not be used except as a matter of State policy? The instructions which had been given showed the great caution which would be exercised, and the jealousy with which it would be watched. He sincerely hoped this Act would be a dead letter, from its not being necessary to put it in force, owing to the improvement it would effect in the conduct of the Native Press; but, if it were necessary to put it in force, and if it were abused, no doubt that House was the final Court of Appeal; and there was no danger that any abuse under it would not be brought under the attention of Parliament. To insist, however, that every Paper and every part of the action of the Executive in every case must be laid on the Table, notwithstanding the disclaimer and temperate language of the right hon. Gentleman, would be tantamount to a Vote of Censure on the Governor General of India. The Governor General deeply regretted the necessity of this measure, and the House itself would be untrue to its great mission if it did not deeply regret the necessity of laying shackles on the Native Press of India; but the necessity for it had been shown by Native opinion itself, and that House would act unwisely if it did not sanction what had been done. In conclusion, he sincerely hoped that the House would pause before it inflicted a stigma on the Indian Government which it did not deserve.

Mr. FAWCETT said, that the extreme gravity and importance of this question led him to make a few observations. Lord Cranbrook had stated within the last few weeks that one of the most experienced Administrators of India had declared one of the great difficulties of governing that country to be the want of means of ascertaining facts connected with the social condition and political sentiment of the people, and that one of the most valuable means of learning such facts was afforded by the

Native Press. In striking contrast with this statement was the remark made by Lord Napier and Ettrick, who spoke with the authority of a considerable Indian reputation, in asking in "another place" for certain statistics of mortality, that it was all the more the duty of the Government to produce those statistics because now they must remember that the Native Press was silenced. By comparing these statements, they would see the great importance of the step that had been taken. There were two distinct questions before the House—the Act itself, and the manner in which it had been passed. Grave as was the mischief likely to result from the Act itself, it was small in comparison with that which must result to the future good government of India, if the manner in which the Act had been passed were allowed to be drawn into a precedent. The way in which the Act had been passed had forced the hands of the Secretary of State against his will, and it had ignored the authority of the Council just as if it did not exist, and in India no opportunity was given to the non-official Members of the Council at Calcutta to express their opinions upon the Act. Some of the non-official, and especially some of the Native Members, he believed, never had any notice that the Act was going to be passed. The hon. Member for Canterbury (Mr. A. Gathorne Hardy) referred to the Governor of Bombay, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjaub, the Commissioner of the Central Provinces, and others, as approving the Act. But the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjaub condemned, in the strongest possible terms, one of the salient features of the Act—namely, the distinction between the European and the Native Press. The hon. Member for Canterbury had laid great stress upon the statement that these officials approved of the Act; but did they not disapprove of the manner in which the Act was passed? Did the Viceroy say to the Council that he was going to suspend the Constitution and do an un-Constitutional thing? No. There was not a single sentence in the Blue Book, from beginning to end, which would show that the officials outside the Legislative Council approved the high-handed manner in which the Act was passed. What was the position in which the Governor General placed the Secretary of State? The Secretary of State was placed in the dilemma either of not taking notice of the Viceroy's plea for urgency, or of giving his sanction to an Act he had never seen, and sanctioning an un-Constitutional proceeding. On the 13th of March the Secretary of State received a telegram from the Viceroy, alleging, as one of the reasons for urgency, that he was obliged to go to Simla on the 18th of March; but one would have thought that such a message would have been sent, not as an excuse for suspending the Constitution, but for declining an invitation to a dinner. He did not wish to make any attack on Lord Salisbury, or say an unnecessary word against anyone; but he wondered that, when Lord Salisbury received that telegram, he did not send a message back to say that it would be better to wait at Calcutta a time longer to consider this matter. Some of the most illustrious men who ever ruled over India—Lord Wellesley, Sir John Metcalfe, and others—had stopped in the plains of Bengal all the year round, and what they did could be done in these times; and he wondered the Secretary of State did not send word out to the effect that it would be better to wait for 10 days more at Calcutta than to suspend the Constitution or do an un-Constitutional act. It was only necessary to read the despatch of Lord Cranbrook to see how his hands and the hands of his Council were tied. Anyone who read that despatch carefully—anyone who could read between the lines—would see that Lord Cranbrook did not like to incur the responsibility of disapproving the Act, as it would lead to the resignation of the Viceroy; but, as far as possible, he whittled the mischief of the Act away, and took the sting out of it. He believed it was perfectly notorious that every Member of the Council of the Secretary of State except two expressed themselves in opposition to that which the Viceroy had done; and the only reason they did not carry their opinions to the legitimate conclusion was that the resignation of the Viceroy would have been inevitable. The plea of urgency rested on three excuses. The first, that the Viceroy must go to Simla on the 18th of March, was so ridiculous and frivolous as to be contemptible. The second excuse was a most perilous one. It was, that the mind of the people of India was greatly disturbed by what was happening in the East of Europe, and that they believed the power of England was shaken. There was not a tittle of evidence for any such unfortunate conclusion. An official who had just returned from India, and was now a Member of the Secretary of State's Council, referred to that as a most unfortunate excuse, and said, from his own experience, that India was never quieter or more secure than at the time the Act was passed. The third excuse was that if the Act had been discussed, there would have been considerable dissatisfaction in India. Was there ever a more unfortunate plea? Were those who urged it so shortsighted as to suppose that the Act would not be discussed by the people after it had passed, and that it would not have been better to have dissatisfaction before the Act was passed than after it? With regard to the Act itself, there were two things to be considered—in the first place, its exact provisions; and, secondly, the exceptions which the Act contained. With regard to the penalties to be enforced, the Duke of Buckingham said they were going to insist, at the discretion of the local authorities, that every Native publisher should enter into a bond of £200, which might be forfeited without trial. The Duke of Buckingham said this would injure those whom we ought not to injure, and not those whom we wished to restrain. It had been supposed that the action of Lord Cranbrook, in disallowing that part of the measure which established a censorship of the Press, greatly mitigated the severity of the Act. In one sense, no doubt, it did; but in another respect it had an opposite effect, inasmuch as nobody could publish a vernacular newspaper unless he possessed sufficient capital to enter into a bond of £200; and, considering the extreme poverty of India, this would be an extreme hardship. The hon. Member for Canterbury had asserted that all the officials in India approved the Act, and had laid stress on the opinion of the Governor of Bombay, who, in point of fact, approved that portion of the Act which the Secretary of State had disallowed, while he disapproved that portion which was to be retained in operation. The most indefensible feature of the Act was the distinction which it made between the European and the Native Press; and that portion of it was condemned by the opinions which had been expressed by Lord Metcalfe, Lord Macaulay, Sir Arthur Hobhouse, the Duke of Buckingham, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjaub, and Sir Richard Meade. The distinction would create throughout India a sense of injustice, and it was therefore to be condemned on the ground of sentiment. It was to be condemned, perhaps, still more on the ground of reason, because their action would be laughed to scorn unless they were prepared to extend it further. For what would be the absurdity of their position? A seditious article might be published in a European paper in India, and if it were copied into a Native paper it would be impossible to prosecute the Native paper, because it could be urged that the original publication of the article had been allowed to go unpunished. Under an Act passed in a Native State a Native paper was prosecuted for publishing a certain article; but the fact that the article had previously appeared in a European paper, to which the present Act would give immunity, caused the proceedings to fall to the ground. Therefore, we must either repeal the Act or else extend our legislation to Native and European papers alike. The distinction that had been made between the Native and the Anglo-Indian Press was without precedent. It had been constantly stated, by the hon. Member for Canterbury, that what they were going to put down in India was sedition. But the Government themselves treated as a crime, not sedition, but the expression of dissatisfaction with the Government. If that were to be treated as a crime, rendering the proprietor or editor of a paper liable to be prosecuted, we should be trying to stop free discussion, free criticism, and fair and proper remarks on the acts of the Government. They had been told by a high authority in the House of Lords (Lord Napier and Ettrick), that in a single year no less than 5,000,000 of human beings had been swept away by famine, and that some at least of this enormous loss of life was not due solely to physical circumstances, but to erroneous resolutions formed by the Government, and by persons appointed to authority for the discharge of which they were not fitted. When these things were said in the House of Lords and telegraphed to India, did they think that the people were so downtrodden and dumb that they would not express their dissatisfaction with the Government? Let them consider the price they were going to pay for this Act. When it suited the purposes of the Government they relied upon the Native Press. So important, recently, were considered the views of the Native Press, that the present Viceroy telegraphed over a column of extracts filled with extravagant eulogy about the Empress of India and the sagacity of the Government in employing Native troops in Europe. If they relied on those extracts in one direction, why should they not rely on them in another? Why should they not rely on the Native Press when it gave expression to dissatisfaction? What would be the value of the opinions of the Native Press when they were expressed under the fear of a prosecution? Sir William Muir declared that, when Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, he was thankful for the aid he received from the Press in enabling him to understand what were the opinions and wishes of the Natives; but it would be in vain in future to look for that aid, because they had made the Press absolutely dependent. That seemed to him to be a serious price to pay. He ventured to say that throughout that debate, and the Papers which had been laid on the Table, there was not a tittle of evidence to show that the law in operation in India before this Act was passed was not amply sufficient to put down any sedition which might have been written in the Native Press. The Motion, so far as it went, would do some good, but he was bound in candour to say that it was somewhat inadequate to the occasion. He fully recognized the responsibility of one who held the great position which the right hon. Gentleman occupied before the country, and his moderation in not challenging the policy of the Government of India; and therefore no one would be more ready to admit than he (Mr. Fawcett) was that the right hon. Gentleman had erred on the right side. But, in voting for the Motion, he wished it to be distinctly understood that he availed himself of the only opportunity afforded him of condemning this Press Act, and, still more, the manner in which it had been passed. There was nothing worse than the perpetual unrest which was now witnessed in the Government of India. Instead of calmness and confidence, they had hysterical impulses, showing that they were frightened by dangers which he did not believe existed. It was said the Indian people were among the most Conservative in the world. Then there could be nothing worse than to irritate them by unnecessary changes. If he thought for a moment that the passing of the Act was necessary for the purpose of strengthening our rule in India, no one would be more ready to support it than he should; but because he believed we could not consolidate our position there, but rather materially weaken it by such legislation, seeing the discontent and dissatisfaction which it would cause, he would vote for the Motion of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, he desired, in the first place, to mention one or two matters in order to guard himself from being supposed to acquiesce in the opinions which had been expressed with respect to them. His right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich, in the very moderate speech which he had made that evening, mentioned some objections which had been made to the working of the Act of 1858. Now, that was a question which he should be prepared to discuss at the proper time; but he did not think it was necessary to deal with it at the present moment. The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) had also stated that the Government of India was every day becoming more independent of the Secretary of State. So far, however, as he knew, the very reverse was the case; but that, too, was a point which he would, with the permission of the House, pass over. In coming to the speech of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich, he was glad to be able to express his concurrence with him in regretting that any necessity should have existed for the passing of this Act. The liberty of the Press was a matter so intimately associated with the feelings of Englishmen that any curtailment of it, however temporary, however slight, or however necessary it might be, was a matter to be deplored; and he ventured to express a hope that the day might not be very far distant when the circumstances of India would be such as, in the opione. It was, that the mind of the people of India was greatly disturbed by what was happening in the East of Europe, and that they believed the power of England was shaken. There was not a tittle of evidence for any such unfortunate conclusion. An official who had just returned from India, and was now a Member of the Secretary of State's Council, referred to that as a most unfortunate excuse, and said, from his own experience, that India was never quieter or more secure than at the time the Act was passed. The third excuse was that if the Act had been discussed, there would have been considerable dissatisfaction in India. Was there ever a more unfortunate plea? Were those who urged it so shortsighted as to suppose that the Act would not be discussed by the people after it had passed, and that it would not have been better to have dissatisfaction before the Act was passed than after it? With regard to the Act itself, there were two things to be considered—in the first place, its exact provisions; and, secondly, the exceptions which the Act contained. With regard to the penalties to be enforced, the Duke of Buckingham said they were going to insist, at the discretion of the local authorities, that every Native publisher should enter into a bond of £200, which might be forfeited without trial. The Duke of Buckingham said this would injure those whom we ought not to injure, and not those whom we wished to restrain. It had been supposed that the action of Lord Cranbrook, in disallowing that part of the measure which established a censorship of the Press, greatly mitigated the severity of the Act. In one sense, no doubt, it did; but in another respect it had an opposite effect, inasmuch as nobody could publish a vernacular newspaper unless he possessed sufficient capital to enter into a bond of £200; and, considering the extreme poverty of India, this would be an extreme hardship. The hon. Member for Canterbury had asserted that all the officials in India approved the Act, and had laid stress on the opinion of the Governor of Bombay, who, in point of fact, approved that portion of the Act which the Secretary of State had disallowed, while he disapproved that portion which was to be retained in operation. The most indefensible feature of the Act was the distinction which it made between the European and the Native Press; and that portion of it was condemned by the opinions which had been expressed by Lord Metcalfe, Lord Macaulay, Sir Arthur Hobhouse, the Duke of Buckingham, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjaub, and Sir Richard Meade. The distinction would create throughout India a sense of injustice, and it was therefore to be condemned on the ground of sentiment. It was to be condemned, perhaps, still more on the ground of reason, because their action would be laughed to scorn unless they were prepared to extend it further. For what would be the absurdity of their position? A seditious article might be published in a European paper in India, and if it were copied into a Native paper it would be impossible to prosecute the Native paper, because it could be urged that the original publication of the article had been allowed to go unpunished. Under an Act passed in a Native State a Native paper was prosecuted for publishing a certain article; but the fact that the article had previously appeared in a European paper, to which the present Act would give immunity, caused the proceedings to fall to the ground. Therefore, we must either repeal the Act or else extend our legislation to Native and European papers alike. The distinction that had been made between the Native and the Anglo-Indian Press was without precedent. It had been constantly stated, by the hon. Member for Canterbury, that what they were going to put down in India was sedition. But the Government themselves treated as a crime, not sedition, but the expression of dissatisfaction with the Government. If that were to be treated as a crime, rendering the proprietor or editor of a paper liable to be prosecuted, we should be trying to stop free discussion, free criticism, and fair and proper remarks on the acts of the Government. They had been told by a high authority in the House of Lords (Lord Napier and Ettrick), that in a single year no less than 5,000,000 of human beings had been swept away by famine, and that some at least of this enormous loss of life was not due solely to physical circumstances, but to erroneous resolutions formed by the Government, and by persons appointed to authority for the discharge of which they were not fitted. When these things were said in the House of Lords and telegraphed to India, did they think that the people were so downtrodden and dumb that they would not express their dissatisfaction with the Government? Let them consider the price they were going to pay for this Act. When it suited the purposes of the Government they relied upon the Native Press. So important, recently, were considered the views of the Native Press, that the present Viceroy telegraphed over a column of extracts filled with extravagant eulogy about the Empress of India and the sagacity of the Government in employing Native troops in Europe. If they relied on those extracts in one direction, why should they not rely on them in another? Why should they not rely on the Native Press when it gave expression to dissatisfaction? What would be the value of the opinions of the Native Press when they were expressed under the fear of a prosecution? Sir William Muir declared that, when Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, he was thankful for the aid he received from the Press in enabling him to understand what were the opinions and wishes of the Natives; but it would be in vain in future to look for that aid, because they had made the Press absolutely dependent. That seemed to him to be a serious price to pay. He ventured to say that throughout that debate, and the Papers which had been laid on the Table, there was not a tittle of evidence to show that the law in operation in India before this Act was passed was not amply sufficient to put down any sedition which might have been written in the Native Press. The Motion, so far as it went, would do some good, but he was bound in candour to say that it was somewhat inadequate to the occasion. He fully recognized the responsibility of one who held the great position which the right hon. Gentleman occupied before the country, and his moderation in not challenging the policy of the Government of India; and therefore no one would be more ready to admit than he (Mr. Fawcett) was that the right hon. Gentleman had erred o[illegible] the right side. But, in voting for t[illegible] Motion, he wished it to be distinc[illegible] understood that he availed himself of the only opportunity afforded hi[illegible] still condemning this Pres[illegible]ich it had been more, the manner in [illegible]hing worse than passed. There was n[illegible] the perpetual unrest which was now witnessed in the Government of India. Instead of calmness and confidence, they had hysterical impulses, showing that they were frightened by dangers which he did not believe existed. It was said the Indian people were among the most Conservative in the world. Then there could be nothing worse than to irritate them by unnecessary changes. If he thought for a moment that the passing of the Act was necessary for the purpose of strengthening our rule in India, no one would be more ready to support it than he should; but because he believed we could not consolidate our position there, but rather materially weaken it by such legislation, seeing the discontent and dissatisfaction which it would cause, he would vote for the Motion of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, he desired, in the first place, to mention one or two matters in order to guard himself from being supposed to acquiesce in the opinions which had been expressed with respect to them. His right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich, in the very moderate speech which he had made that evening, mentioned some objections which had been made to the working of the Act of 1858. Now, that was a question which he should be prepared to discuss at the proper time; but he did not think it was necessary to deal with it at the present moment. The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) had also stated that the Government of India was every day becoming more independent of the Secretary of State. So far, however, as he knew, the very reverse was the case; but that, too, was a point which he would, with the permission of the House, pass over. In coming to the speech of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich, he was glad to h[illegible] to express his con[illegible] with him in regretting that any necessity should have existed for the passing of this Act. The liberty of the Press was a matter so intimately associated with the feelings of Englishmen that any curtailment of it, however temporary, however slight, or however necessary it might be, was a matter to be deplored; and he ventured to express a hope that the day might not be very far distant when the circumstances of India would be such as, in the opinion of the responsible Government of that country, would justify the restoration of that liberty. In such sentiments, he might add, no one concurred more completely than the present Governor General of India. No man could have read the speech which the noble Lord addressed to his Legislative Council without feeling persuaded of the sincerity with which he deplored the necessity of having to enter into the discussion of this subject. He lamented in eloquent terms the irony of fate which compelled him, who by association and instinct was inclined to enlarge rather than to restrict the liberty of the Press, to initiate this kind of legislation, of which complaint was now made. Those whose recollection carried them back a generation further would know full well that the father of the noble Lord was one who had laboured more than anyone else in that House in the endeavour to promote what he conceived to be the welfare of the Press. Entertaining those opinions, he ventured to say that the fact that Lord Lytton had arrived at the conclusion that some such action as that which was now the subject of discussion must be undertaken was the very strongest *primâ facie* evidence of its necessity. The objections taken to it appeared to him to resolve themselves very much into those to which he was about to advert. It had been said that the Act itself had been based on insufficient grounds. The action of Lord Salisbury in approving it had been condemned, and it had been made matter of complaint that it had been made applicable to the Vernacular and not to the English Press. His right hon. Friend had criticized the form of the Act, and the mode of passing it, and he had commented upon its future working. Now, during the last few years we in England had been, various times and in different degrees, undoubtedly excited by the events which were passing in South-Eastern Europe and by the possibility that this country might be obliged to take part in the contest which was going on in that quarter. If that was so with us, could it be wondered at that some such feeling might have existed also amongst our fellow-subjects in India — excitable, ignorant, and credulous as they were, and liable to be misled by the wild remarks likely to circulate amongst the bazaars? It was at that particular moment that some portion of the Native Press of India, which at all times, if it continued to write in the manner in which it had recently written, would have been objectionable, assumed a very different character. His right hon. Friend had criticized the extracts upon which the Act was based, and cited the authority of the Duke of Buckingham. But what was the object of the Governor General in communicating these extracts to the local Governors? It was that each might express his views as to the action of the Native Press within his own district, and to say how far he deemed legislation to be necessary in order to curtail that action. While, therefore, the opinions of the Duke of Buckingham were deserving of every consideration, when it was found that in the Presidency of Madras there was practically no Native Press of any importance, and that, consequently, there was no such need of interference, he did not think the authority of the noble Duke could be so great in this matter as those who had the opportunity of observing the conduct of the Native Press. He would not, he might add, venture to express to the House any opinion of his own as to the extracts on which the Act was founded. It was impossible for us in England to realize the character of those extracts, or the impression which they were calculated to make on the Native population. But what did those in India, who were best able to express an opinion, say upon the subject? The House had heard the opinion of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) on the subject cited. He had explained his reasons for having somewhat altered that opinion; but he would point out to the hon. Gentleman that what he had written was of the strongest possible character, and that his official view was one which naturally had very great influence. He would also appeal to another witness who had been referred to by the hon. Member for Hackney, and e more readily because he had dis- proved the exact terms of the Act. alluded to Sir William Muir, who, sp king of the Native Press, said—

> “
> frequettacks upon the Government have been
> version characterized by unscrupulous per-
> (especially in Bombay in the last few years
> downright disloyalty. ometimes by articles of
> such hurtful misrepThere must be a limit to
> tions; and I quite

agree with Sir George Campbell that the Government should have in its hand a more certain and summary curb.

Again, the Government of India, in their statement of the objects and reasons by which the Bill was accompanied, said—

> "A section of the Vernacular Press has of late assumed an attitude of fixed hostility to the Government. That it does not confine itself to criticising particular measures or the acts of individual officers on their merits, but attacks the very existence of British rule in India, and that the evil has been steadily growing, and has now attained a magnitude which calls for the application of some strong means of repression, are facts patent to all who read the Native papers."

They then went on to say—

> "It is thus essentially necessary, in the interest of the public safety, to take early steps to check the spread of seditious writings."

Well, the Governor General of India, entertaining those opinions, felt that the time had come for him to act. The subject had been very long under consideration; it had been recently pressed upon his attention as one which would not bear to be very much longer delayed, and it was pointed out to him that his inaction in the matter was interpreted by the Natives, not as showing strength, but as an evidence of weakness, and that it had been openly stated that the Government were afraid to act. Under these circumstances, the Governor General conceived that the measure was justified as a political measure based upon the necessity of the case. It was then submitted to his noble Friend Lord Salisbury, and here these further considerations should be borne in mind. Lord Lytton had been supported by the unanimous approval of his Council; his action in endeavouring to repress the licentiousness of the Native Press was approved by all the local Governments, with the exception of the Government of Madras. In these circumstances, he asked his right hon. Friend to say if he really conceived that when an Act came home backed by such authority as he had stated, his noble Friend could for a moment refuse his sanction to it. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) said—"Oh, yes; but it was extorted from him by telegraph." But he would remind the hon. Member that it was not the first time the subject had been considered. Over and over again it had been under consideration. It had not come as a new subject to England, and his noble Friend felt that it was necessary he should give his assent to the Act. But, then, the hon. Member for Hackney said that that was done without the consent of the Council. But the hon. Member knew that it was provided that in cases of emergency immediate action might be taken; and, surely, he would admit that, in the circumstances in which it was sent home, it was a case which his noble Friend might well decide to be a case of emergency? Well, the sanction of his noble Friend having been given, the Act was passed in a single sitting; and he ventured to think that anyone who admitted that it was desirable the Government should at all possess the power of passing legislation at a single sitting must admit that the occasions on which that power should be exercised must depend upon the circumstances and pressure of the moment. The matter had been fully considered by the Legislative Council, and they thought it desirable to take advantage of the events that were passing to secure a strong measure, and one that would be effective for the purpose they had at heart. He might remind the House that in 1875 Lord Salisbury had occasion to remonstrate with the Governor of India on the subject of the Indian Tariff Act, which was passed at a single sitting, and as to which a debate arose in the other House of Parliament, and many noble Lords sitting opposite to the Government expressed strong opinions as to the manner in which Lord Salisbury had acted. Lord Lawrence, however, speaking with high authority, declared that he would rather the Governor General of India should occasionally be subjected to the veto of the Secretary of State, than that he should give up the power of initiating and passing legislation when he saw an imperative necessity for doing so. Well, the Press Act, having been passed in India, was sent home for the consideration of his noble Friend the present Secretary of State for India (Lord Cranbrook), and the House was aware that he disapproved a certain portion of it, and of the despatch of his noble Friend no disapproval had been expressed in that House. The House should know that Lord Lytton, having received it, had cordially accepted it in the spirit in which it was written; and had telegraphed to his noble Friend that he had read it in that spirit, and had at once taken steps for the repeal of those clauses to which exception had been taken. Now, what did the Act do? It prescribed two different modes of proceeding. First, an extremely simple one—the taking of steps by civil action for the recovery from the offending newspaper proprietor of the amount of the bond which the Government were authorized to call upon him to enter into. The next was one to which attention had been principally directed, the giving of a warning to the newspaper proprietor, and if that warning were disregarded, then the taking of more stringent measures. In this the Government of India endeavoured to act on the precedents of English legislation, and principally they followed the precedent of the Act passed by his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich—the Irish Peace Preservation Act of 1870. His right hon. Friend said that that was an entirely different case, for that it had nothing to do with disaffection or sedition. Well, on that matter the memory of his right hon. Friend deceived him; for if he looked at the speech of his Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Chichester Fortescue), in introducing the Bill, he would see it was precisely on that ground he justified the introduction of the measure. Well, the Government of India had endeavoured to make the Act as mild as was consistent with efficiency. It was, in fact, rather an enabling Act than anything else. It aimed not to punish, but to prevent, the commission of crime; and when his noble Friend the Vice President of the Council (Lord George Hamilton) was charged with having made a mistake in saying that the Act actually reduced the existing penalties, he replied that it did in fact do so. At present all that could be done to check a seditious newspaper was to prosecute its proprietor; and the penalties were so severe that it was undesirable to exact them, unless it was absolutely necessary to do so. The recent Act provided an alternative mode of procedure of a simple and easy character, and one much better adapted to the class of offence to be dealt with. But it was said, Why did not the Government prosecute under the law of sedition? To that he could give no better answer than was furnished in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman's Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1870. As a matter of fact, we all knew perfectly well why the Government of India did not prosecute under the law of sedition. To do so would be to give unnecessary *éclat* to the proceedings, and to make a martyr of the offender; and if the prosecution failed, it would be productive of much more mischief than if it had never been undertaken at all. For these reasons the Government had thought it desirable not to institute a prosecution under the law of sedition, unless absolutely obliged to do so. Then it was said, If this Act is desirable, why not apply it to the newspapers published in English? The answer to that was perfectly obvious. The English newspapers were not now written in the same style and tone as the Vernacular Press. On this point, the opinion of Mr. Ashley Eden was worthy of attention. He said—

> "The Press must be treated on its own merits. Had the English Press of India been in style and tone what it was 20 years ago, I, for my part, should have no hesitation in voting for its inclusion in the present Bill. But I know nothing that has improved more of late years than the tone of the Anglo-Indian Press. It, no doubt, attacks Government measures and Government officials, and often very undeservedly; but it is not this sort of criticism to which Government objects or desires to control. On the whole, the English Press of India, whether conducted by Europeans or Natives, bears evidence of being influenced by a proper sense of responsibility and by a general desire to discuss public events in a moderate and reasonable spirit."

Sir Alexander Arbuthnot, speaking on the same subject, said

> "Throughout the last 20 years the English Press has been, on the whole, a loyal, and, notwithstanding many imperfections, a valuable instrument and aid to the Government; while for many years past, and especially in recent years, a section of the Vernacular Press has been chiefly remarkable for its disloyalty. It must, moreover, be borne in mind that the publications of the Vernacular Press are circulated among a class of the population far more ignorant than those classes which are reached by the English papers, and are, therefore, calculated to be much more mischievous in their effects."

It might be added, as another reason for making a distinction between the English and the Vernacular Press, that seditious statements published in English could be easily understood and contradicted before they could do any harm. With regard to the enforcement of this Act, he, for his part, earnestly hoped it would not be found necessary at all. That was also the hope of the Government of India. Up to the present time the Act had not been put in force, with the exception of one case, which took place under a misapprehension; and, what was more, he could confidently express a belief, on the part of the Government of India, that if the conduct of the Native Press continued what it had recently been, there would be no occasion for putting it in force. All competent observers agreed that the passing of the Act had been marked by a very distinct improvement in the tone of the Native Press. It was not that they refrained from criticizing the Government, or from speaking freely. There had been an absence of those particular seditious sentiments once so common. He, for one, did not for a moment deprecate the value of ascertaining, by means of the Native newspapers, the undercurrents of feeling that permeated Indian society. He believed, on the contrary, that Native criticism of Government action was valuable; and so long as this criticism aimed at the improvement of the institutions of India, the Indian Press certainly would not be interfered with. He could not help reading to the House an extract from what was said by Mr. Chichester Fortescue, in introducing the Peace Preservation Act. It was as follows:—

> "All newspapers, no matter of what complexion of politics, no matter how extreme the opinions of their editors may be, as long as they keep within the bounds of legal and loyal discussion, will be entirely free from any danger or risk from the operation of these provisions."—[3 *Hansard*, cc. 103.]

That was a very proper definition of the way in which this Act should be worked. So long as the Press remained loyal in its character, it certainly would not be hindered from indulging in the freest possible criticism. His right hon. Friend, however, asked the House to put what he called a check upon the Government of India. With the right of publicity the Government had no desire to interfere, nor could it well interfere effectively with it if it would. The right hon. Gentleman referred with approval to the opinion of the Duke of Buckingham, that the Native seditious newspapers ought to be treated with contempt; but, at the same time, he proposed to lift them into a position of great importance by having their proceedings reported to Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman was afraid that if his Motion were rejected the Government of India might be induced to work the Act more harshly than would otherwise be the case. But he would ask the right hon. Gentleman if he had also considered what would be the effect in India if the House were to accept his Motion? Would it not have the effect of weakening the hands of the authorities in India? If the Motion were agreed to, it would immediately be said by the Natives—"It is quite true that your Act has not been repealed; but Parliament has said that it will not trust you, and that it will require you to lay before it the particulars of every case in which you act, in order that it may form an opinion as to the propriety of your action." Another effect of the acceptance of this Motion would be to transfer the decision of these cases from the Government of India, who had full knowledge of all the facts, to Parliament, which would have no special information on the subject. Moreover, it would also give to each case that *éclat* and notoriety which the Government were especially desirous to avoid, and would thereby increase the sale of the offending newspaper. On the other hand, he thought that much good would result from having this Act thoroughly discussed. The measure was not open to the objection that had been taken, that it was liable to be abused by the local officials because it could not be put into force except with the consent of the Governor General of India. That was an important safeguard which had been altogether overlooked by the right hon. Gentleman, which would prevent the provisions of the Act from being abused. Again, it was no doubt desirable that the Parliament of this country should be informed from time to time of what was being done under the Act. Now, the object the right hon. Gentleman desired to attain was practically attained under existing legislation. There was an Act which required that statements should annually be laid before Parliament as to the material, moral, and social condition of India; and he presumed that the conduct of the Press of India, and the steps which might be taken by the Government to restrict that Press, would come within the provisions of that Statute. To some extent it had been the practice to include in the annual statement matters relating to the Press of the country, and it could be extended if that were thought desirable. To present the subject to Parliament as a separate Return would be merely to challenge criticism of Government action in a form which it was not desirable to encourage. The right hon. Gentleman had expressed his satisfaction at the conduct of Lord Lytton, and his confidence that what he did in the future would be worthy of all that he had done in the past. The House, he believed, generally approved of the despatch of the Secretary of State (Lord Cranbrook), which showed the spirit in which he was disposed to urge the Government of India to work the Act. In these circumstances, he hoped that the House would be satisfied with the despatch and with the discussion that had taken place; and, so far from weakening the hands of the Government of India, would give it, in the trying circumstances in which it was placed, an active and adequate support.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he was aware that the hour to which the debate had been protracted rendered it desirable that he should not trespass unnecessarily upon the attention of the House; but in view of the course taken by the Government in refusing to accept the more than moderate Resolution of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), and after the statement contained in the most able speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. E. Stanhope), that it was not the intention of the Government to place before Parliament in a separate Return the proceedings consequent upon the passing of the Act, he hoped the House would allow him to point out the results that would probably follow if that Resolution were negatived. It was not immaterial, in viewing the matter, to consider the circumstances under which the Act had been passed, and the way in which it had received the approval of the Secretary of State (Lord Salisbury). Tracing, as briefly as possible, the history of the matter, there appeared to be a complete agreement that for years past the position of the Native Press in India had attracted the attention, and, perhaps, the consideration, of the Government of that country. There were traces in the Papers before him that the Indian Government had, since the year 1873, from time to time sought counsel and advice of those from whom it was right to seek such assistance; but he could not find, by any of the extracts from Native publications which had been placed before the House, nor from the speech of any hon. Member pronounced in the course of the debate, that during the last year, or during the last month, there had been any aggravation or increase of the acts complained of. Whatever was complained of at that moment had existed for months and years past. The extracts placed before the House were, for the most part, written 18 months ago; they were made from newspapers that had since ceased to exist; they pointed to no case of disaffection, and he would say, that after examining a number of extracts proportioned to the number of newspapers from which they were taken, no one could suggest that in the month of March, 1878, there existed any greater cause for anxiety than had existed for years before. But what course had the Government of India pursued? It had proceeded, cautiously and secretly during the previous year, first to make a memorandum, and then to make a representation to the local authorities in India, of the course intended to be followed with respect to the Native Press. With regard to the urgency alleged to exist as a reason for the passing of the Act, the only suggestion that occurred in support of that view was that the Governor General was about to leave Calcutta, and upon that one fact alone rested the unfortunate procedure of carrying that measure in so unsatisfactory a manner. The Governor General, in expressing his view as to the necessity of carrying the measure in a way that would avoid opposition, said, as distinctly as he could, that if the measure became an accomplished fact, and was declared to be in the interest of public safety, it would probably be accepted with less objection than if it formed the subject of previous excitement. It was for the House of Commons, and for the country generally, to consider whether the whole object of this was not that the Act should become an accomplished fact before anyone could proceed to examine its provisions, before any discussion should take place, and before the public opinion in India and this country as to the necessity for legislation could be expressed. It was to explain the necessity for that mode of procedure that the suggestion had been made with regard to Simla. The Governor General said—"We have prepared a Bill, and I propose to pass it at a single sitting on the plea of urgency, and afterwards to report our proceedings in detail." This course—which was most fatal to the confidence that ought to exist between the two countries—had been deliberately adopted by the Government of India, and sanctioned by the Government of this country. It appeared that the plea of urgency had developed in a most strange manner. On the 13th March a telegram was sent to this country by the Indian Government, and was received on the 13th or 14th March. The duty of the Secretary of State, which, as prescribed by the Statute of 1858—21 & 22 *Vict.*—was that he should in ordinary cases consult with his Council. [Mr. E. Stanhope: No.] He said in ordinary cases, and he thought this an ordinary case. He admitted that in cases of extreme urgency—such as the outbreak of war—there should be given the power of dispensing with the assistance of the Council; but he protested against the present being considered as a case in which the assistance of the Council should have been dispensed with. His hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State suggested that if the Indian Government said that urgency was required the Council was to bear no portion of the responsibility of what was done in India; but he (Sir Henry James) ventured to think that the question as to whether the Secretary of State should consult his Council or dispense with their assistance, must rest upon the judgment of the Secretary of State, and not upon the wording of a telegram. But what was done in the present case? Sir Erskine Perry said—

> "When the telegram of the 13th of March was received in this country, Lord Salisbury circulated it amongst such Members of the Council as were at the Office."

Now, that must have been on the night of the 13th or morning of the 14th of March. Only two remarks were made—one highly approving the measure, and the other suggesting that it required grave consideration. The approval of the English Government was sent by telegram, and must have arrived early on the morning of the 14th March. The Legislative Council were summoned, and on that very day the Act was put in force virtually throughout the whole of India. By what promise had the Viceroy obtained that assent in England? He said, that the chief provisions of the Act would take effect only in those parts of British India to which they might be specially extended by the Governor General in Council, and cease to have effect in those parts where the Governor General so directed. But on the same 14th day of March an Order was issued, announcing that in the exercise of powers for the better control of the publication of Oriental newspapers, the Governor General in Council was pleased to extend the same to Bombay, Bengal, the North West Provinces of Oude, and the Punjaub; and so, having promised that if assent was given the Act should only take effect in case of special urgency, on the very same day that assent was received and on the day the Act was passed, that Act was applied virtually to the whole of India. Was that an example to the Natives of India that we were dealing with them fairly, and in a way that we should wish ourselves to be dealt with? The Natives of India could not have known of the Act being passed secretly, and without the opportunity for a voice to be raised against it; while on the 14th March, when they read that Proclamation, they were to be told that on the same day, in Council the Government of India had, without previous announcement, thought it necessary to take that step. Must not the people of India have asked, What have we done? Have we proved ourselves disloyal subjects of the Queen? Was it wise, when they were asked to sacrifice their lives if necessary to show their loyalty to the Queen, and for the good of our country, to tell them in the same breath that we considered it a matter of policy and consistent action towards them that their opinion should not even be consulted before the passing of the Act? When we refused to trust these men, who were to be subject to the law—who had no voice in any legislative Assembly, and were consequently deprived of the liberty of expressing their opinion upon the law about to be

imposed upon them—did we not tell them that while we distrusted them we also feared them, and that while we regarded them as disloyal, we also regarded them as so powerful that we did not dare to meet the expression of their opinion? What law did we impose upon the Indian subjects of the Crown? Speaking generally, it was a law that placed them beyond the law, and by the imposition of which we made a confession of weakness much to be deplored. We told them that our much vaunted English justice was so weak and insufficient that it could not encounter the criticism of the Press, and that its administration in India was a failure. Again, was it advisable to tell them that they would not be dealt with as Englishmen, by being summoned before a tribunal, but tried simply by the will of the Governor General? The law was without precedent in the legislation of this or any other country that had ever possessed a free Press. He could not conceive that any precedent had existed, even during the most arbitrary periods of the most arbitrary Governments, for the passing of such an Act, which was not intended to prevent the mere publication of evil writing but the existence of newspapers altogether. The Governor General now had the power to prevent the publication of any newspaper in the Native tongues of India. By sanctioning that Act, we had handed over to the arbitrary will of the Governor General the power to prevent the publication of any newspaper even by the most well
appreciate the fact in India. The Under
when he said all that was not appear to
that the local authorities should the Act
the permission of the Governor General was
call upon any editor to give a bond for the payment of a sum of money as security for his good behaviour. If that was the case, what was the use of the Act? If, as the Under Secretary of State said, you could only try to enforce the bond, what was the use of such defective machinery? The Act provided that a sum of money, practically unlimited, should be deposited before the publication of a newspaper would be allowed. The local authority might choose to call upon an editor to go to the police office and deposit 10,000 rupees before he could publish his newspaper. Was there any example for such legislation—legislation which the Executive Government had sanctioned by telegram without consulting its Council, and which the Under Secretary of State described as well worthy of the approbation of the House? Although such deposits were, of course, prohibitory, there was, however, a way by which a person could, so to speak, contract himself out of the operation of the Act. Lord Cranbrook, it was said, had done something to mitigate the effect of the Act, and he (Sir Henry James) was sure that his intention was to do so; but he had, in reality, rendered it much harsher in its operation, because, until he took exception to the censorship clause, any Native who wished to enter into the speculation of newspaper publication could say—"I will not publish until my articles are approved," thereby getting rid of the effect of that clause. But now the Secretary of State for India said he should not have an opportunity of contracting himself out of the deposit and out of his liability; he must now deposit the money; and the mitigation of which they had heard so much amounted only to an unintentional aggravation. The Natives of India now knew that they could publish no newspaper without the permission of the Governor General. He asked the House to consider what had been the effect of that legislation. Formerly they had only to contend with an evil limited both in area and effect; there were few newspapers which no one would say produced sedition with much effect; they were dealing only with a small class—it might be of disaffected men; but, since the passing of the Act, they had to deal with well-affected men, amongst whom more disaffection would be produced by the
secret and hurried passing of this mea-
pap than could be produced by news-
Mem writing in 100 years. Let hon.
from bers read the Petitions presented
be n Poonah and Calcutta; and it would
w seen at once that the Petitioners were
a ell-affected men, who stated a griev-
ance, and complained that one law was
th ministered to the English subjects of
The Queen and another to the Natives.
and y set forth their grievances clearly
that moderately, pointing out that whilst
tioned gislation existed the best inten-
would b criticism on the Government
prevented, and that they could

*Sir Henry James*

not rest satisfied as long as the spirit of such legislation was directed against them, and their loyalty assailed by an unjust and unequal measure. A hard blow was struck at the possibility of Native loyalty by the effects of legislation neither just in itself nor in its distribution. The hon. Member for Canterbury (Mr. A. Gathorne Hardy) had laid down a grave principle in saying that it would not be right to place before the House the Papers relating to the action of the Executive in carrying out the Act. It was meeting the Motion of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone) with a strange argument to say that Parliament ought not to know what was taking place; but would the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that he would not allow the proceedings taken under the Act to be made the subject of a Report at the India Office, and so to be laid upon the Table of the House? To refuse that would be to tell the Natives of India that Parliament should know nothing of the working of an Act arbitrary in its terms and arbitrary in its application, and which placed absolute power in the hands of one man—the head of the Executive Government. He respectfully pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman that he should avoid the grave responsibility of refusing to Parliament a knowledge of the way in which the Act was being enforced; for the effect of that course would be felt in the times said to be approaching, when they might have to appeal to the Indian subjects of the Crown for a proof of that loyalty which could have no foundation if it was not rooted in an equality of laws and their just administration.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I shall not trespass at length upon the time and patience of the House; and after the excellent speech of the Under Secretary of State for India, I shall not enter upon much that has been laid before us in the course of this debate. There are, however, one or two points, especially in the observations of the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down, upon which I will say a very few words. In the first place, let me point out that I think the hon. and learned Gentleman has done some injustice both to the Governor General and to my noble Friend the late Secretary of State (the Marquess of Salisbury), in the account which he gave of the transactions which preceded the passing of this Act. It would appear, from the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman, that this was a matter which had been for some time under the consideration of different Governments in India; that it had been laid aside; and that suddenly, upon a particular day in March, the Governor General (Lord Lytton) had thought it necessary, by telegraphic message, to request Lord Salisbury to give authority for the passing of an Act which had hitherto never been contemplated; that immediately on receipt of the telegram, omitting his duty of consulting the Council of India, Lord Salisbury had telegraphed back his consent, and that upon the same day the Governor General had acted. I do not think that this is a fair representation of the real state of the case. As a matter of fact, I must say that the necessity of taking some measure for the purpose of regulating and repressing the excesses of a certain portion of the Press in India had been under the very serious consideration of the Government of India, in various forms, as far back as the year 1873. I can personally recollect that it engaged the consideration of this Government and the Government in India many years before that time. But in what form did it arise under the Government of Lord Northbrook? It arose in a very peculiar manner, because it was the desire of Lord Northbrook actually to proceed against the publisher of a newspaper for the use of language which appeared to be of a most mischievous and objectionable character. But why were those proceedings not taken? An hon. Member asks, why was it necessary to pass a new Act when the law as it stood was stronger than that proposed? According to the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James), the law as it stood was stronger than the Act. [Sir HENRY JAMES: No.] I think my hon. and learned Friend said that the power of subjecting to penal servitude in force under the then existing law was stronger than the powers given to the Governor General by the present Act. The difficulty in which Lord Northbrook's Government found themselves placed was this. In consequence of the severity of the punishment inflicted in the shape of penal servitude, and in consequence of the difficulties which would present themselves to obtaining a verdict from the jury who would try the cases, it was determined by Lord Northbrook's Government not to proceed, because they thought a failure to obtain justice by a prosecution would be greater than the injury would be of allowing a mischievous and seditious article to be published. Therefore, the fact is this—that under Lord Northbrook's Government for some time there had been growing a feeling, which was gradually becoming more intense, that it was necessary for something to be done; and it certainly does appear, from the telegram sent on the 13th of March, that these considerations were pressing themselves upon the Government of India by the increasing seditious violence on the part of the Native Press. And without having reference to any particular action going on at that particular moment, anyone who knows what the state of opinion was throughout the world at that time with reference to the disturbance of South-Eastern Europe, and with reference to the possible complications of the foreign relations of this country, must be well aware that it was a time when seditious writing of the character to which reference has been made was not unlikely to be exceedingly troublesome and necessary to be repressed. Therefore, it was in consequence of that, that Lord Lytton thought it right to make an appeal to the Secretary of State, and said—"We are going to pass this Act in a sudden and unexpected manner." "Well then," says the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton, "when Lord Salisbury received that information, he was bound by law to have consulted his Council." I beg to inform the hon. and learned Gentleman that Lord Salisbury was not bound to do anything of the sort. Lord Lytton and his Council proceeded under the Act which was passed three years later than the Act to which the hon. and learned Gentleman directed our attention. They proceeded under an Act by which the Government of India is regulated—the Act of 1861, called the East India Councils Act. And it is the right, according to that Act, and it is the natural business of Governors General in Council, to pass such laws as are thought necessary, and to transmit them to England, where they are submitted to the Secretary of State to consider whether they ought to be agreed to or not. It was not at all necessary for Lord Lytton to have communicated with Lord Salisbury before he introduced this Bill. What he did was to communicate with Lord Salisbury and ask his opinion in order that there might be no confusion afterwards, and in order that in taking this important step he might be well assured and satisfied of the way in which it would be received. But he was not bound to make that communication to Lord Salisbury, and Lord Salisbury was in no way bound to consult his Council. He acted in a way which I undertake to say was perfectly legal, and which, under the circumstances, was the only way in which it was possible for him to act. I am not prepared to say—no one in all this debate has even attempted to say—that the passing of this Act, and the necessity which has arisen for this Act itself, are not matters which are fair subjects of discussion and which are not matters of regret. My noble Friend the present Secretary of State (Lord Cranbrook) has expressed that which Lord Lytton had expressed in eloquent language—the regret he felt that any such measure should be deemed necessary; and it is only under the pressure and consciousness of an extreme necessity that such a law has been passed. Lord Lytton himself, in language which has been quoted—language of the most eloquent and touching description—expresses his regret that he, of all men, should have been called to have taken such a step as this. No one can fail to read in the despatch of my noble Friend (Lord Cranbrook) the same expression of extreme regret that it should be necessary to sanction any legislation of the kind. But, after all, we must bear in mind what it is that we are doing, and for whom it is that we are doing it. We are legislating in the case of an Empire where the conditions of life, of society, and of policy, are very different from those in this country; and you have, under every circumstance, to consider what the conditions really are under which those are placed for whom it is necessary to legislate. And it is absolutely impossible to apply those considerations which would arise in the case of English legislation. What has been done has been done under a sense of necessity; and I think it is perfectly obvious that both Lord Lytton and his Government, and my noble Friend the Secretary of

State and his Council, will, in the application of this Act, deal with it in a manner most cautious and most jealous, and with the greatest possible care to infringe, as little as possible, upon the liberty of the Press. Under these circumstances, what is the position in which we are placed by this debate? My right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich has called attention to this subject in a speech to which everyone has done justice, and which has impressed a tone of moderation upon the whole debate, which I think is a matter for great congratulation. I think it would have been serious neglect if this matter had not been brought under discussion in Parliament. I think what has been said has been well said, and the opinions on both sides have been put forward very well. But what is the practical conclusion to which the Motion leads? for that is really the point to which we ought now to direct attention, and upon which I think we can hardly so readily agree as we are disposed to agree in speaking of the tone and manner of the discussion. My right hon. Friend asks the House to agree to a proposition which pledges us to an Address praying

> "That Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to give directions that all proceedings which may be taken by the authorities under the Indian Vernacular Press Act be reported to the Secretary of State and laid before Parliament from time to time."

And I think the general impression which has been created by my right hon. Friend's own remarks, and by the speeches of others, is this — that each individual case of proceeding under that Act shall be specially reported to the Secretary of State, and shall be specially and separately laid before Parliament, with a view to its discussion by Parliament. Well, if that be done, it will materially change—change in a vital manner—the relations between this House and the other House of Parliament and the Government of India. There is no sentiment which has been more frequently expressed in relation to the Government of India than that the Government of India ought to be carried on in India. Well, that is a sentiment subject to very considerable qualifications. No doubt the relations between the Secretary of State and the Viceroy, the effect of the telegraphic communication, the necessary interest with which this House and the other House of Parliament take in matters going forward, renders it very difficult to accept such a statement as that without qualification. But I think this, at all events, we may lay down. The administration of India—of the government of India, at all events—ought to take place in India, however we may exercise here, either directly or indirectly, the pressure of the Secretary of State's influence over the general principles of government, over the laws which are passed, and the general resolutions adopted. The application of the law in particular cases, the administration of the law, must be, if worth anything, left to those who are on the spot and who have to administer it. And I can conceive nothing which would more thoroughly weaken the hands of the Governor General, and the authorities in India, and which would more completely destroy their influence, than the establishment of a principle by which every act of the Government in India, in the way of Press prosecutions, is to be reported to the Secretary of State for the purpose of being laid before Parliament and be open to be discussed. I do not think my right hon. Friend will desire to press matters to that point; and yet it is very difficult, if we accept his Resolution as it stands, and with the construction which it bears, and which has been placed upon it by those who took part in the discussion, to stop short of that conclusion. There is no wish whatever—on the contrary, the wish will be the other way—there is no wish whatever to keep back from Parliament, or from the people of the country, the proceedings of the Government of India in these matters. It would be a fallacy—as it was pointed out by my hon. Friend the Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs—to attempt that; because there can be no doubt that any such action as that of giving warning to a newspaper in India, or the forfeiting of a bond, would be immediately made public to all the world by the newspaper itself, or by the newspapers in India. It would be known all over this country within 12 or 14 hours after the deed had taken place. There can be no secrecy in the matter. Well, I think you may also take for granted—and, whether it is taken for granted or not, I am fully prepared, on behalf of my noble Friend the Secretary of State for India, to undertake that he will give the most careful instructions to the Government of India to keep him fully informed of all proceedings that they may think it necessary to take under this Act. There can be no question whatever that that would be his natural desire, and it would be in accordance with the practice of the India Office; but if there is any doubt on the point, I am perfectly ready to undertake that it should be done, and instructions sent to the Government of India to keep the Secretary of State fully informed upon all proceedings which may be taken by the authorities in India under the Vernacular Press Act. As to their being specially reported from time to time, as each proceeding takes place, I think that would be impossible; but I do not think there would be any difficulty in including them in the annual Reports on India, and then any hon. Member could call attention to those cases. Well, then, under these circumstances, what is really our position? I think we are all practically agreed in regretting that it should be necessary to put in force the restrictions of the present law. I think most of us are of opinion that in the step taken the Government of India have only acted under a sense of strong necessity; that the Secretary of State in Council has acted in a manner which is perfectly right and proper in allowing the Act, at the same time giving a caution as to the manner in which it is to be exercised. We are all prepared to say that the proceedings under this Act should be carefully watched, and there will be plenty of opportunities for this House and the public to become acquainted with it. Under these circumstances, I would venture to suggest to my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich the difficulty he himself suggested at the beginning of the evening as to what may happen if a division is taken upon his Resolution. That is a difficulty which, no doubt, would be felt, and which, I think, it is unnecessary to come to. The right hon. Gentleman says a division against his Resolution may seem to imply, upon the part of those voting against it, a desire to suppress any complaints against this measure. On the other hand, I would say a division of that character would be one which would seem to imply, on the part of those who vote for it, distrust of the Government of India, and distrust of the action of the Secretary of State. I think we should be acting wisely to pursue the course which has always been honourably and prudently adopted by this House, whatever Party is in Office—to endeavour, as far as possible, to keep Indian affairs apart from the contests of Party in the House. That is the reason why it would be undesirable that we should have more than a discussion upon the facts of a case of this sort; and I think that is the reason why we should on the present occasion abstain, as far as possible, from a division on the Motion.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I will endeavour to go straight to the point, in order that the House may understand clearly the position in which it is placed. In the first place, as to the case of urgency, I cannot help calling attention to the speech of the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Smollett), who said frankly, that which cannot be doubted, that there was no danger in India at all, and that the case of urgency depended upon this—that the Viceroy wishes to retire from the scene of legislative business to his residence. So much for the case of urgency. Just look at the way in which the Government have left this question. We have had a speech from my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. E. Stanhope), who said, as might be expected of him, everything which was to be said on behalf of this measure, and said it in the best way. If there had been anything to add, it would have been furnished by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Now, I wish to call the attention of hon. Members, who are asked to reject this Motion, to the position in which the Government have left the question. Neither the Representative of India, nor the Leader of the House, nor any one who has opposed the Motion, has cited from any Indian newspaper one single extract, or one single declaration, to show the inciting of this disaffection. The Under Secretary of State for India went as far as prudence justified, and, with much discretion, did cite the language of the Viceroy, and, undoubtedly, the Viceroy describes the disloyalty of a portion of the Press. The Viceroy has sent us the extracts on which he founded the charge; the Duke of Buckingham read those extracts, and said they were rubbish. We have read those extracts; and we cannot find anything which justifies this serious charge of inciting disaffection. The Government, too, have read those extracts; and, although challenged during the debate to do so, they have carefully refrained from citing any one as matter which tends to disaffection. They would rather fall back upon the opinion of the Viceroy, with the grounds for which we are acquainted, and which we, and apparently the Government, also find to be totally insufficient. Now, what is this Act? It is an Act under which a local magistrate, with the sanction of the local Government, and by a rule of the Viceroy—which, by the way, may be altered by different Viceroys in their discretion—this local magistrate may require any proprietor of a newspaper to enter into a bond for any sum he chooses to name. A provision more astounding in its character no one in this House has ever heard; and no precedent for such a proceeding can be found, as far as I know, in any legislation in Ireland or in any other country. But having named the sum for which the proprietor of the paper is to enter into a bond, the magistrate may require him to deposit the whole of that amount. Therefore, not only has the proprietor to give a bond, but he is to be liable to be called on to deposit the sum, to which there is no limit whatever. But not only that: if a proprietor of a paper does that which the officers of the Government disapprove, he to is receive a notice, and, upon a second notice, the Government has power absolutely to confiscate the whole of the capital and material with which he carries on his trade, as well as the money which has been required as a deposit. Sir, is it conceivable that such an Act can have been passed, and can have been in a certain sense defended in this House—with great moderation of language and temper, but still defended—when not a single passage from an Indian newspaper has been cited after all the inquiry we have had? There has been nothing before us to show that any portion of the Native Press endeavours to incite the people to insurrection. I am bound to say that, in my opinion, the apology my Motion requires—if it requires an apology—is to the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett). It is a Motion which has been reduced within the bounds of, as I think, the utmost moderation. And now let us see how it has been treated. My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer puts upon it a construction which I have not put upon it, and which I am not aware any one in this debate has put upon it. He puts this construction upon it—that we shall require the details of every case to be laid before the House separately. Sir, the form of the Motion has been adjusted most carefully, for the purpose of obviating any such construction. What we ask for is that a regular Report of the Secretary of State—under precisely the same conditions as every other Report of the Secretary of State—shall be laid before the House, and that it shall be made as the Secretary of State pleases. By all means let him exercise a full discretion. I agree with my right hon. Friend that there is no reason in the world—and it is not in the terms or spirit of the Motion—that every one of these proceedings should be reported. If there was any number of them, we should trust the Secretary of State to group them together as he may think fit, and present them to Parliament in such a shape as shall keep Parliament informed, with something like contemporary regularity, what is the nature of the proceedings in India. But I was grievously disappointed with the offer made by my right hon. Friend that the information asked for should be included in the annual Report from India. No doubt, Sir, an annual Report is sent from India; but to what year does that Report refer? It is something like the Budgets of Continental countries, which, long after the money is spent, and every substantial arrangement concluded, make their appearance, and which may be of great historical and antiquarian interest, but of no practical importance whatever. I hold in my hand the latest of these Reports. We are here on the 24th of July, 1878, and this latest Report from India is for the year 1875-6. It follows, therefore, that if any proceedings take place during the present year in consequence of the Act which has unfortunately been passed, if the gracious, and, I have no doubt, well meant offer, of Her Majesty's Government were accepted, and then, in the coming months of this year, some unfortunate newspaper were confiscated in India, the House would have an opportunity of considering the facts not later, probably, than in the year 1881. If they were disposed to give us the assurance that in the course of the Session, at their own discretion as to time and grouping, the proceedings should be made known to Parliament, I would not press them further. But I am quite sure they will not think it unreasonable on my part if I decline waiting until 1881 for proceedings which took place in 1878. Therefore, I have no choice but to divide the House upon a question which I am sure the House will see to be one of great importance.

Question put.

The House *divided* : — Ayes 152; Noes 208: Majority 56.

AYES.

Allen, W. S.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Balfour, Sir G.
Barclay, J. W.
Bass, A.
Bass, H.
Beaumont, Colonel F.
Beaumont, W. B.
Bell, I. L.
Blake, T.
Brassey, T.
Bright, J. (Manchester)
Brooks, M.
Brown, J. C.
Burt, T.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, Sir G.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Cave, T.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Chadwick, D.
Chamberlain, J.
Chambers, Sir T.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Clarke, J. C.
Clifford, C. C.
Cogan, rt. hn. W. H. F.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Conyngham, Lord F.
Corbett, J.
Cotes, C. C.
Courtney, L. H.
Cowan, J.
Cowen, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Cross, J. K.
Davies, D.
Delahunty, J.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Downing, M'C.
Duff, M. E. G.
Duff, R. W.
Dundas, J. C.
Earp, T.
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Admiral hn. F.
Errington, G.
Evans, T. W.
Fawcett, H.
Ferguson, R.
Fletcher, I.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, Sir C.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, W. H.
Gordon, Lord D.
Gorst, J. E.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gourley, E. T.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grant, A.
Harrison, C.
Harrison, J. F.
Hartington, Marq. of
Havelock, Sir H.
Hayter, A. D.
Herschell, F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Holms, J.
Holms, W.
Hopwood, C. H.
Howard, hon. C.
Howard, E. S.
Ingram, W. J.
Jackson, Sir H. M.
James, Sir H.
Jenkins, D. J.
Kay - Shuttleworth, Sir U.
Kingscote, Colonel
Laing, S.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leeman, G.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Leith, J. F.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lush, Dr.
Macdonald, A.
Macduff, Viscount
Mackintosh, C. F.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Arthur, W.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
Maitland, J.
Marjoribanks, Sir D. C.
Marling, S. S.
Martin, P.
Monk, C. J.
Morgan, G. O.
Morley, S.
Mundella, A. J.
Mure, Colonel
Murphy, N. D.
Noel, E.
Nolan, Major
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Byrne, W. R.
O'Clery, K.
O'Conor Don, The
O'Donnell, F. H.
O'Gorman, P.
Palmer, G.
Parker, C. S.
Peel, A. W.
Pennington, F.
Perkins, Sir F.
Philips, R. N.
Playfair, rt. hon. L.
Plimsoll, S.
Potter, T. B.
Ralli, P.
Ramsay, J.
Rathbone, W.
Richard, H.
Roberts, J.
Rylands, P.
Samuda, J. D'A.
Samuelson, B.
Sheridan, H. B.
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Smith, E.
Spinks, Mr. Serjeant
Stacpoole, W.
Stafford, Marquess of
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stewart, J.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Taylor, P. A.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Walter, J.
Waterlow, Sir S. H.
Whitbread, S.
Whitwell, J.
Williams, B. T.
Wilson, I.
Wilson, Sir M.

TELLERS.

Adam, rt. hn. W. P.
Kensington, Lord

NOES.

Agnew, R. V.
Alexander, Colonel
Allsopp, C.
Arkwright, A. P.
Arkwright, F.
Ashbury, J. L.
Astley, Sir J. D.
Bagge, Sir W.
Balfour, A. J.
Baring, T. C.
Barrington, Viscount
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bates, E.
Beach, rt. hon. Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bective, Earl of
Benett-Stanford, V. F.
Bentinck, rt. hon. G. C.
Beresford, G. De la P.
Biggar, J. G.
Birley, H.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Boord, T. W.
Bourke, hon. R.
Bousfield, Colonel
Bowen, J. B.
Bowyer, Sir G.
Broadley, W. H. H.
Brooks, W. C.
Bruce, hon. T.
Bruen, H.
Bulwer, J. R.
Burghley, Lord
Cameron, D.
Cave, rt. hon. S.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaplin, Colonel E.
Chaplin, H.
Christie, W. L.
Churchill, Lord R.
Cordes, T.
Corry, hon. H. W. L.
Corry, J. P.
Cotton, W. J. R.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, rt. hon. R. A.
Cust, H. C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Deedes, W.
Denison, C. B.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Douglas, Sir G.
Drax, J. S. W. S. E.
Dunbar, J.
Dyke, Sir W. H.
Dyott, Colonel R.
Eaton, H. W.
Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, G. W.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H.
Emlyn, Viscount
Estcourt, G. S.
Finch, G. H.
Floyer, J.
Forester, C. T. W.
Fraser, Sir W. A.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Freshfield, C. K.
Galway, Viscount
Garnier, J. C.
Gathorne-Hardy, hn. A.
Gathorne-Hardy, hn. S.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.

Giffard, Sir H. S.
Giles, A.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gordon, W.
Gore-Langton, W. S.
Grantham, W.
Greene, E.
Gregory, G. B.
Hall, A. W.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hamond, C. F.
Hardcastle, E.
Hay, rt. hn. Sir J. C. D.
Helmsley, Viscount
Herbert, hon. S.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hick, J.
Hildyard, T. B. T.
Holford, J. P. G.
Holker, Sir J.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Home, Captain
Hood, Captain hon. A. W. A. N.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Isaac, S.
Johnson, J. G.
Jolliffe, hon. S.
Kavanagh, A. MacM.
Kennard, Colonel
King-Harman, E. R.
Knowles, T.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Learmonth, A.
Lee, Major V.
Legh, W. J.
Leighton, S.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Leslie, Sir J.
Lewis, C. E.
Lindsay, Col. R. L.
Lloyd, T. E.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, rt. hon. J.
Macartney, J. W. E.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Majendie, L. A.
Makins, Colonel
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
March, Earl of
Marten, A. G.
Master, T. W. C.
Mellor, T. W.
Merewether, C. G.
Miles, Sir P. J. W.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Monckton, F.
Montgomerie, R.
Montgomery, Sir G. G.
Moore, S.
Moray, Colonel H. D.
Morgan, hon. F.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Naghten, Lt.-Colonel
Noel, rt, hon. G. J.
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S.
O'Beirne, Major
Onslow, D.
O'Sullivan, W. H.
Paget, R. H.
Parker, Lt.-Col. W.
Parnell, C. S.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Pennant, hon. G.
Plunket, hon. D. R.
Polhill-Turner, Capt.
Powell, W.
Power, R.
Praed, C. T.
Praed, H. B.
Price, Captain
Puleston, J. H.
Read, C. S.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ripley, H. W.
Ritchie, C. T.
Rodwell, B. B. H.
Round, J.
Russell, Sir C.
Ryder, G. R.
Sackville, S. G. S.
Salt, T.
Sanderson, T. K.
Sandon, Viscount
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, M. D.
Selwin - Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Sheil, E.
Shute, General
Sidebottom, T. H.
Somerset, Lord H. R. C.
Stanhope, hon. E.
Stanhope, W. T. W. S.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Starkie, J. P. C.
Stewart, M. J.
Storer, G.
Sullivan, A. M.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Thornhill, T.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Torr, J.
Walker, O. O.
Walker, T. E.
Warburton, P. E.
Watney, J.
Watson, rt. hon. W.
Welby-Gregory, Sir W.
Wellesley, Colonel
Wethered, T. O.
Whitelaw, A.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Wilson, W.
Winn, R.
Woodd, B. T.
Wroughton, P.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.

TELLERS.
Folkestone, Viscount
Verner, E. W.

Question proposed,

"That the words 'Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive,' be added, instead thereof."

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON desired to make an explanation. By a mistake, he had got into the wrong Lobby, and voted against the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, although he had intended to support him.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, he, too, had been labouring under a misapprehension. He was very glad to find himself in the same Lobby with the Government, considering that they were supporting the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell). But it now turned out that the Government were only voting in that way in order to defeat the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, and having carried out that little bit of strategy against the right hon. Gentleman, he (Mr. Sullivan) hoped they would not raise the slightest objection to the adjournment of the debate. Many Irish Members had not spoken in the debate, but that was not because of any want of sympathy for the Resolution, or interest in the subject, but because they failed to catch the Speaker's eye. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sullivan.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER protested against one expression used by the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down—that in reference to the little strategy of the Government. The vote was taken under circumstances which gave the Government no option. A Resolution was proposed which the Government could not accept, and an Amendment was proposed which the Government could even less accept. It was impossible to vote either for the one or the other, and they took a course which was the usual one under such circumstances, voting first against the one, and then against the other. The vote was taken against the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, and he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was sorry that any hon. Members should have been misled; but he could not see how the voting could have been altered. He hoped the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) would not think it necessary to press his Motion for adjournment.

Mr. DILLWYN thought that the voting had not been in Order. At present, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dungarvan was the only one before the House, and if that were negatived, the only Question before the House would be the word "That."

Mr. BIGGAR said, he had voted in the majority under a misapprehension. He was not in the House when the Question was put; but finding that the hon. Member for Dungarvan was named as a Teller for the "Noes," he thought the Government were going to support the Amendment, and hence he voted with them.

Mr. J. COWEN said, he had voted in the minority because he approved of the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. But he could not, in any way, see the necessity for adjourning the discussion. Already there had been a lengthy discussion on the question, and the adjournment, even if agreed to, could serve no good purpose, as they could not expect, at such a period of the Session, when Business was in such a backward state, that another day would be set apart for the discussion. He suggested that the House should divide on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dungarvan.

Mr. COURTNEY hoped the hon. and learned Member for Louth would persevere with his Motion for adjournment. If they divided on the Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, the result would be altogether misleading. The Motion would be sure to be rejected by an overwhelming majority, and that would be represented to the people of India as being the judgment of the House of Commons, although it certainly would not be.

Mr. HERSCHELL regretted the course which had been pursued in taking the division. He should have thought it would have been far better to have first voted against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, and then to have taken a division on the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. The course which the Government had taken was to his mind unusual, and had led to a good deal of misapprehension.

*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, the vote had been taken in the usual and proper way.

Mr. DODSON said, the proper course to have taken was that suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell). When it was proposed to leave out words in an original Question in order to add certain other words, it was understood that in voting for leaving out the words in the original Question, they were supporting the Amendment for which they thereby made an opening. Although the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department shook his head, he (Mr. Dodson) deliberately repeated what he had said. The course the Government had taken had been misleading and inconvenient, and as a result, when they negatived the Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, there would still be the word "That" before the House, upon which further Amendments might be moved.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said, he voted with the Government under the impression that they were supporting his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan. Although he made several inquiries as to whether the Government were supporting the Motion or Amendment, he could not get an answer.

Mr. J. S. GATHORNE-HARDY said, if the course recommended by the hon. Member for Chester (Mr. Dodson) had been taken, it would, at first sight, seem that the Government were supporting the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. So far as his experience went, he had always seen the same course adopted.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he did not at first intend to challenge a division. Although he thought his Amendment more in accordance with the circumstances of the case than the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, yet he thought the right hon. Gentleman should receive the undivided support of the Liberal Benches. He confessed that it never entered his mind that at the last minute the Government might choose to support him against the right hon. Gentleman. He need hardly say he was deeply grateful for the support he had received, although it had somewhat puzzled him as to how he could have merited such attention. He was quite unable to express any opinion on the Question of adjournment, and he would leave it to his Friends to say whether they would persevere in that Motion or not.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON did not rise to continue the discussion as to the mode of voting. It was quite possible that there might have been inconvenience whichever course the Government adopted. Undoubtedly, there had been inconvenience caused by the course adopted that night, and, according to their own statement, many hon. Members had gone into the wrong Lobby. Under the peculiar circumstances of the case, this must have been so; because, if the hon. Member for Dungarvan had wished to persevere with his Motion, he would have been bound to have voted with the Government, whose majority would have been increased by the Gentlemen holding the same opinions as the hon. Member. However, he (the Marquess of Hartington) did not want to pursue the subject any more. What he rose to say was that he did not see what object could be served by adjourning the debate. It would be impossible to resume the debate for the time which so important a subject demanded; there had been a full discussion that evening, and a very small number of Members wished to address the House. On every ground, he thought the best thing to be done would be to dispose of the remaining Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question,

"That the words 'Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive,' be added, instead thereof,"

—put, and *negatived.*

## POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL.

Lords' Reasons for insisting on certain of their Amendments to the Bill *considered.*

MR. MELLOR moved—

"That this House doth insist on its disagreement to the Amendments made by The Lords to the Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill, to which this House hath disagreed."

The hon. Member remarked that these Amendments, if adopted, altogether did away with one remedial object of the Bill, which, by finally repealing and modifying the 23rd clause of the Poor Law Act of 1876, was to relieve trustees and managers of friendly societies from the vexatious regulations they were now subject to, and also to remove the liability which was imposed upon them by the Act of 1876, to pay over to Poor Law Guardians, for the maintenance of pauper members, the benefits which were intended for the member's own, as well as for the support of the family when suffering from sickness, and leave the Guardians to recover the expenses incurred by the Union from the pauper's family, by proceeding under the general Acts relating to the relief of the poor, which rendered everyone, who was able, liable to contribute towards the support of a pauper relative. There was nothing in the Bill to enact that property belonging to a pauper should not be available for his maintenance, nor were the provisions of the Bill inconsistent with, or contrary to, the principle which ought to regulate relief from rates levied upon others. These were the reasons assigned by the Lords in support of their Amendments; but it should be borne in mind that weekly contributions from the funds of a friendly society could not be considered or described as property, as a man could not mortgage or assign them to another, nor could they be looked upon as assets in liquidating his debts, for their payment was contingent on the duration of his sickness. The Lords, therefore, had misunderstood the Bill, and he moved to send it back to them that they might, on re-consideration, do an act of justice to large bodies of their countrymen by passing the Bill, not in its mutilated form, but in the form in which it left the House of Commons a short time ago.

Motion *agreed to.*

*Resolved,* That this House doth insist on its disagreement to the Amendments made by The Lords to the Bill, to which this House hath disagreed.

## COMMONS REGULATION (EXPENSES) BILL.

On Motion of Sir MATTHEW RIDLEY, Bill to amend the Law respecting the Expense of regulating Commons, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir MATTHEW RIDLEY and Mr. Secretary CROSS.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 273.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Wednesday, 24th July,* 1878.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Indian Native Troops (Transport and Employment Abroad), Mr. Onslow and Sir Patrick O'Brien *added.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Jurors Remuneration * [274].

*Second Reading*—Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) * [268]; Elders Widows' Fund * [226].

*Committee*—Contagious Diseases (Animals) [204] —R.P.

*Considered as amended*—Highways [261]; Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland) * [237].

*Withdrawn*—Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment * [55]; Tenant Right (Ulster) * [54].

## *QUESTION.*

### PARLIAMENT—NEW WRIT FOR CLARE COUNTY—PRIVILEGE.

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

MR. E. JENKINS said, with reference to the question raised on the previous day with regard to the vacancy in County Clare, he wished, as a matter of Privilege, to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He wished to explain, with regard to the Committee resolved upon last evening to inquire into the circumstances of the holding by Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, the Member for Clare County, of the Attorney Generalship of the Colony of Victoria, that the decision of the Select Committee might affect two or three Members of the House. It was very well known that the hon. Members for Sheffield and Pontefract and himself had held offices under a Colonial Government, at the same time occupying seats in that House, and the decision of the Committee might have an unexpected effect. He, therefore, asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it would be possible so to extend the scope of the inquiry as that the circumstances might be inquired into under which Members of that House representing Colonies were permitted to retain their seats while receiving pay from those Colonies?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I have not had time to consider the matter very fully; but my impression is that it would be better to limit the inquiry of the Committee to the particular point that is before it. I do not think that the inquiry will be likely to raise the question in which the hon. Member is interested; but that is a matter which, if necessary, may be made the subject of inquiry. I think it would be preferable to keep to the objects for which the Committee is appointed, considering the time of the Session?

MR. E. JENKINS said, that it might be suggested to the Committee that there were precedents for persons keeping their seats in that House and still holding office for the Colonies.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Oh, no doubt.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 204.]

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 22nd July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 68 (Communication of Orders from and to Ireland).

MR. PEASE moved, as an Amendment, in lines 16 and 17, to omit the words "Order in Council and every." He thought his object would be best explained by reading the clause as it now stood. It was as follows:—

> "With a view to uniformity of action, every Order in Council and every Order of Council made under this Act shall, with all practicable speed, be communicated to the Privy Council, or to the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council, as the case may be."

He was of opinion that uniformity of action, although it professed to be the object of the clause, would not be secured by it at all. The Orders of Council and Orders in Council were to be communicated from one country to the other — from Great Britain to Ireland, and from Ireland to Great Britain—but there was nothing in the Bill, so far as he could see, that produced that uniformity of action which was so essential in the Orders of the

Privy Council in order to insure the successful working of the Act. Consequently, what would be an Order in England would not be an Order in Ireland, and what would be an Order in Ireland would not be an Order in Great Britain. He was sure that his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) would not attribute to him any desire whatever to throw discredit upon the administration in Ireland; but it appeared to him, in this case, that they should have in every possible way the same rules applying to Ireland as to England, and especially the regulations which his hon. Friend opposite proposed to bring in with regard to markets and fairs. Under the clause there would be two jurisdictions, and under those jurisdictions the restrictions applicable to Great Britain, might not be extended to Ireland and the Channel Islands—one of those restrictions being that infected animals should not be permitted to be taken inland unless they were examined and passed by a Privy Council Inspector at the port of debarkation. Having established these very salutary regulations, it might happen in Ireland that there was no inspection at the port of embarkation. He desired to call the attention of the Committee to the very strong evidence given on this point by almost every witness who came from Ireland who was examined before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill during the present Session. Among the witnesses was the hon. Gentleman the Member for Carlow (Mr. Kavanagh), whose opinion upon any question of the kind would carry very great weight with it. In Question 43, the hon. Member was asked—

> "Will you just state whether you approve of the part of the Bill in which there is a distinction made between Ireland and Great Britain?"

He said, in reply—

> "The first great difference I found in the Bill between Ireland and Great Britain is this—that the working of the Bill is not confided to the same authority in both countries. In England it is intrusted to the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, in which case we have a highly scientific and experienced authority, working, I may say, under the eye of Parliament, and represented in Parliament by a Minister. I do not want to abuse the institutions of my own country; but, as regards Ireland, I must say I am afraid the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council is a very starved Office, with hardly any Staff, and quite insufficient to carry out the provisions of the Bill; and, save in so far as the Chief Secretary for Ireland is a Minister in that House, they could hardly call it represented in Parliament. Part IV. of the Bill applies to Ireland only; but Part IV. makes the really active part of the Bill, which is Part II., apply to Ireland. Another difference that I observe, which I must say is, I think, a very important difference, is that, though the Act requires that in England the local Inspectors should be professionally qualified veterinary surgeons, it does not require that that should be the case in Ireland."

Further on the hon. Member was asked by Viscount Cardwell—

> "You are very anxious that the same rules that apply to England should apply to Ireland?—Yes. You would object very much to Ireland being treated as in any sense a foreign country in regard to its relations to England?—Yes."

He (Mr. Pease) did not wish to weary the House with quotations, because one-half of the evidence in the Blue Book was in the same direction. Mr. Featherstonehaugh, who called himself a very large farmer indeed, was asked—

> "Do you imagine, if the whole of the Veterinary Department of Ireland were put under the English Privy Council in order that we should have qualified practitioners in Ireland, that there would be an objection to pay for those qualified practitioners?—Certainly not; I think it would be a very good thing; and I am certain that they would be willing to pay for it; at all events, the most respectable would."

Then, again, Mr. Cullen, a landowner and extensive grazier in Ireland, was asked—

> "Is it your feeling that it would be desirable to place the whole subject of the cattle trade in Ireland under the English Privy Council?—Quite so; I should be very glad if that was done."

Mr. Verdon said—

> "I say that the whole Veterinary Department of Ireland is an insufficient Department. To assimilate the administration of the Veterinary Departments of the two countries thoroughly, the head of both Departments should be here, and he should exercise a general supervision over the conduct of the Irish Department. One advantage of that would be this—that in England we have a Minister responsible to Parliament; in Ireland we have not. We have a Department responsible to nobody, undermanned and underpaid."

Again, Mr. Gerard, on being asked—

> "Would you have all the regulations put under the English Privy Council?" replied—"Most decidedly.—Do you think it essential that the Inspectors should all be qualified veterinary surgeons?—I do."

He (Mr. Pease) would not trouble them with any further quotations upon this point. Personally, he was not in favour of having everything done immediately from the Privy Council Office at home, because he felt that it would be placing the authority too far away from the seat of action. It appeared to him that there should be a Privy Council Office in Ireland, worked from the Privy Council Office direct in England, and being independent entirely of the action of the Lord Lieutenant in Council. At the head of an independent branch of the Privy Council in Dublin there might be a competent veterinary surgeon, who thoroughly understood the question, and took a deep interest in the matter, who would be placed in Ireland with a competent staff of Inspectors under him, and who would communicate and act directly with the Privy Council. Such an officer would thoroughly understand the matter, and would be in a position to lay down the best and most proper regulations, and those most suitable for the Irish trade. After all, all the provisions requisite for the stamping out of disease would be readily carried out when they had the full consent and the willing hearts of the people who were to be affected by them. It was under these circumstances that he had been induced to bring the Amendment before the Committee. He had only the one object in view—that they should have one jurisdiction in both countries, and that they should not be liable to have Orders in Council issued by the Lord Lieutenant differing from those issued by the Privy Council in London. If his hon. Friend opposite (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) could not accept his Amendment, which he daresay was somewhat unprofessionally drawn, he thought the Committee ought to require a strong assurance on the part of Her Majesty's Government that it was their intention, having made the clause applicable to both countries, to see that the working of the Act in both countries was identical, so as to insure that the provisions of the Act, were practically carried out by those who understood the interests and working of Irish agriculture. He begged to move the Amendment he had placed on the Paper.

Mr. SYNAN said, that, of course, he had little or nothing to say in regard to the intentions of his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham. He gave credit to every hon. Member of that House for being actuated by the best intentions; but he could not help looking upon the proposition of his hon. Friend as an attempt to pass over the Privy Council of Ireland altogether, and to treat it as if it were a petty corporation, to be dealt with under this measure in the way in which the Privy Council in London might deem most fit. It might be, as the hon. Member doubtless would say, that this was not intended in any way as an insult to the Irish Privy Council; but he contended that that would be the consequence of acceding to the Amendment. If legislation of this kind were to be permitted, it would be better to abolish the Privy Council of Ireland altogether, as had often been attempted on that side of the House, and that it should not be allowed to exist as an Executive Government. According to the argument of his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease), the Irish Privy Council was incompetent to carry out the provisions of a common Act of Parliament, and to shape the cattle trade of Ireland even with the Orders in Council before them. But upon what was it that such an argument was founded? It was founded on this. It was admitted that the Orders of the Privy Council could not be applied directly to Ireland, and the hon. Member proposed that outside the Privy Council in Ireland there should be a Privy Council Office—that it should, in fact, be attached to the Privy Council in England; that that Office should judge of the particular circumstances of Ireland, and carry the Bill into effect by special Orders. Now, for what purpose, he would ask, did the Privy Council Office exist in Dublin, if it were not for the purpose of shaping the Orders in Council, and making them suitable to the condition and circumstances of Ireland. It was not necessary, nor did it exist for any other purpose; and if uniformity of action was wanted, that uniformity of action would be as well secured by the present Irish Executive, as by the establishment of a Privy Council Office attached to the Council in London, acting independently of the Irish Council. If all that was required was to adapt the Orders in Council to the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, surely that could be done quite as well by the Establishment now in existence as by the creation of a new Office, and without the additional expense which the creation of a new Office would involve. He understood that his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham admitted that an Irishman ought to be at the head of the Privy Council Office in Dublin; and, if so, why not leave things as they were? The proposition of his hon. Friend could only be based upon an argument that the Irish Privy Council Veterinary Department in Dublin was incompetent. If that were not so, it would be just as easy for the Privy Council in Ireland to strengthen it, as for the Privy Council in England. If there was any weakness in the Department, that weakness could be supplied by the Irish Privy Council. He was astonished at an argument such as that, which admitted that an Irishman was to be employed, and yet a separate Office be constituted, passing by the Office in Ireland already existing, and declaring that the Lord Lieutenant and the Council under him were incompetent to shape a clause to meet the circumstances of Ireland. They had been told from the opposite side that they were the bucolic Party, and that they stood, on intellectual grounds, above such low matters as the regulation of the cattle trade. It was said that disease was imported into England from Ireland. What were the facts of the case? What did the Returns show with respect to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland. The Returns from England for 1876 in regard to pleuro-pneumonia showed that in that year there were 5,253 cases in England and Wales. What were the Returns from Ireland? With 1,000,000 cattle more than England and Wales, the cases of pleuro-pneumonia were only 2,379, or less than one-half. They said that Ireland was the cause of bringing disease into England, and yet in this country there was double the amount of disease that existed in Ireland in 1876, and more than double in 1877. This was still more apparent in the Returns of the cases of foot-and-mouth disease. In England, in one month—the month of March—there were 3,170 cases; while the Returns for Ireland for the whole year only showed 174 cases of foot-and-mouth disease. Yet Ireland was a country that required to be governed directly from the Privy Council Office in England; the Privy Council of England were to have an Office in Dublin, and the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council of Ireland were to be insulted. At the head of the Office in Dublin an Irishman was to be placed; but, at the same time, the Office was not to be treated as an Executive, but it was to be insulted and set aside. He contended that such an insult ought not to be offered from one country to another, except for an object. His hon. Friend the Member for South Durham stated that his intention was to secure uniformity and regularity of action; but his intention rather appeared to be a continuation of the attempt, which seemed to have been adopted, of setting the Irish Members sitting on that side of the House and those sitting on the other side by the ears. He hoped they would refrain from falling into the trap. As long as he remained a Member of the House he would not tolerate such an insult as this, and, under these circumstances, he should resist strenuously the proposal of his hon. Friend. The clause itself professed to provide uniformity of action, and the rules and regulations laid down by Orders in Council were to be adapted to the circumstances of the country by the Privy Council in Dublin. That Privy Council was, in his opinion, quite as competent to carry out the provisions of the measure as any Privy Council Office they could establish in Ireland. A Privy Council Office already existed in Ireland; and if it was weak, let it be strengthened. He had placed an Amendment on the Paper himself, to provide that veterinary surgeons should be appointed by every local authority in Ireland, and selected for that purpose by their knowledge and skill. He would not go into that question now; but it showed, he thought, that he wanted to strengthen the hands of the Department. He wished, however, to do that without insulting the country; whereas the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham sought to do the same thing by an insult to the country.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he had listened to the arguments of the hon. Member for the county of Limerick (Mr. Synan), and could understand the warmth which had been imported into them. At the same time, he felt that the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease), in moving the

Amendment, had no wish to insult the sister country, or the Privy Council which formed a part of the Executive of that sister country. [Mr. PEASE: Hear, hear!] He understood that the hon. Member for South Durham hoped to be able by the Amendment to carry out more fully one of the recommendations of the Committee—that, as far as possible, uniformity should prevail in the regulations that were to be put in force throughout the whole of the United Kingdom. But he thought his hon. Friend, on consideration, would see that the Privy Councils, established as they were in both countries, would, undoubtedly, under the Bill have that object in view. He believed that his hon. Friend, on further consideration, would also feel that as long as they continued the government of Ireland in the way it was at present carried out—as long as they had it managed and conducted by a Lord Lieutenant, established there working the system of government under him—so long it would be utterly impossible to separate one particular branch of that Executive, and to deal with it from the Central Authority in London, instead of dealing with it, as they did with all other parts of Ireland, through their deputed Ruler or Governor representing England. The object which the Government had in view in this clause was expressed in the very first words of the clause. It was "with a view to uniformity of action" that they proposed the clause. They believed that the Lord Lieutenant and his Privy Council in Ireland were as anxious to carry out an Act of Parliament as the Privy Council in England could be, and that they would coalesce with the Privy Council here in the working of the Act and in the spirit in which it was conceived and with the object it had in view. He firmly believed that they could as safely trust the Privy Council in Ireland to assimilate these Orders by its own action with the Orders thought to be necessary for the common interests of the United Kingdom, as they could trust the Privy Council in this country so to legislate for Ireland itself. There would be this further advantage in dealing with the Privy Council in Ireland—that they would leave the matter to a body working with them with the same object in view, and the same interests, and with more accurate local knowledge than that which would be possessed by the Privy Council itself of the ways and habits of the Irish trade. In the Act passed last Session, it was indicated that uniformity of action was the object they had in view; and, as far as it could be specified in an Act of Parliament, their object now was to guide the action of the Privy Council in Ireland, and with a clear direction on the face of the clause, he could not for a moment conceive that the Privy Council in Ireland would do otherwise than assimilate as far as they possibly could, with a knowledge of the circumstances of their particular country, the Orders of Council issued for carrying out the Bill here with the Orders intended to effect the same object in Ireland—namely, the stamping out of these diseases. He believed that no words could express more clearly the intentions of the Act, and as long as the government of Ireland was carried on under the system which at present prevailed in that country, so long they could not avoid the necessity of trusting to another Department of the State equally capable of carrying out the views of Parliament as their own.

MR. ARTHUR PEEL thought there was a great deal to be said for the Amendment which his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease) had proposed, and that if there was not actually the same jurisdiction in both countries, there should be uniformity of jurisdiction. The hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury said the object of the clause was to secure uniformity of action. It was quite obvious that if there was not the same action in Ireland, the whole object of the Act would be vitiated, and that if disease was not effectually stamped out in Ireland, there would be much more danger of getting infected animals from Ireland than from cattle coming from Spain or Portugal. He could not exactly explain his meaning without referring to Clause 70, which might land them in a difficulty in regard to securing uniformity of action between the Privy Council in England and the Privy Council in Ireland. He wished to call the attention of the Committee to Sub-sections ii. and iv. of Clause 70. The clause gave power to the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council to make such Orders in Council as they might deem fit from time to time—

"(ii.) For defining their qualifications and powers, and regulating their duties; and (iv.) for extending and applying to any local authority the provisions of Part II. relative to pleuro-pneumonia, as regards the declaration of infected places, and slaughter and compensation, or the provisions of Part II. relative to foot-and-mouth disease, as regards the declaration of infected places."

It appeared, therefore, that the Privy Council in Ireland need not, unless they thought fit, apply Part II. to Ireland. He saw that the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) shook his head. He would, therefore, let that pass, and admit that the Privy Council in Ireland had power to extend the provisions of the Act or not, as they thought fit; but what became of the next section of the clause—

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the provisions of Part II., mentioned in this section, shall not extend or apply to any local authority, unless and until they are so extended and applied by Order in Council under this section."

If the Committee would look at the foot-and-mouth disease regulations, on page 9, they would find that these clauses were extended to the local authorities, and that the bringing into effect the operation of the clauses did not rest altogether with the Privy Council, but the power might also be exercised by the local authority. They might, therefore, find themselves in this position—that while in England it was incumbent on the local authorities to carry out the provisions in regard to foot-and-mouth disease, in Ireland the Privy Council might withhold their authority, and not make it incumbent on the local authorities to carry out the regulations that were absolutely necessary for stamping out foot-and-mouth disease in Ireland. He wished respectfully to call the attention of the Secretary to the Treasury to the position they would be in if they did not have this uniformity of action on the part of the two Privy Councils.

MR. KAVANAGH said, that as the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease) had referred to the evidence which he (Mr. Kavanagh) had given before the Lords' Committee, he wished to say a few words. The hon. Member said that his object was to secure uniformity of action between the two countries; but he (Mr. Kavanagh) hardly knew that the Amendments of the hon. Member were necessary in order to carry out that object. It was already the object of the Government that uniformity of action should be secured. He might add that, as far as his evidence went, before the Committee of the House of Lords, as to the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council in Ireland, he had no wish to insult either the Veterinary Department or the Privy Council, or to cast any imputation upon them. He was, however, bound to say this—that unless the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council in Ireland was very materially strengthened, it could not carry out these regulations. That was what his evidence before the Lords' Committee was intended to point out; but he was unable to say whether he expressed himself clearly on the point or not. He said, further, that he thought it would be advisable if the whole administration of the Act were placed under one jurisdiction—namely, the Privy Council. His intention and object in saying that was to show that he thought perfect uniformity of action between the two countries was absolutely necessary.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he had been rather surprised at the speech of his hon. Friend the Member for the county of Limerick (Mr. Synan). His hon. Friend seemed to consider that the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease) desired to delegate the authority of the Government in Ireland to the Privy Council in England. That was scarcely the fact, and the hon. Member for Limerick, if he would look through the evidence given before the Lords' Committee, would find that the hon. Member for South Durham simply quoted the opinion of the Irish witnesses. Indeed, it was the only thing in which the Irish witnesses appeared to be agreed. The hon. Member for South Durham had quoted the evidence of three or four witnesses, some of them graziers and salesmen, who knew a great deal about the cattle trade. Some were very strongly in favour of restriction, and others were not; but one thing they all agreed upon was that they would rather prefer the English Privy Council to the Irish Privy Council. His hon. Friend the Member for South Durham had quoted the evidence of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Kavanagh), Mr. Featherstonehaugh, Mr. Cullen, and Mr. Verdon. The Duke of Richmond himself called one witness, Mr. Reynell, a farmer from the county of Westmeath, who farmed about 1,800 statute acres, or about 1,200 Irish acres. He was asked—

> "Do you think it would be better if the English Privy Council undertook the duty?"

He replied—

> "Certainly, I believe it would. I should like to get men who know something about it, no matter where they came from."

Stronger than that was the evidence of Mr. Cuff, the honorary secretary of the Irish Cattle Trade Association. He was asked—

> "In order to make not only the law, but the administration of the law (which is even more important) identical, I suppose you would agree with many of the witnesses who have come before this Committee, that it would be desirable to place the administration of the law of Ireland as it is in Great Britain, under the Lord President of the Council."

His answer was very short, but very conclusive. It was, "I would;" and that was what the representative of the Irish Cattle Trade Association distinctly declared. It was a mistake to suppose that the proposition of the hon. Member was directed against the Irish Government. It was, as he understood, made simply and solely because the Irish witnesses thought it was the best way of stamping out the disease. He did not know that he was himself inclined to go as far as his hon. Friend. He thought there would be a good deal of administrative difficulty in substituting the English Privy Council for the Irish Privy Council; but they did want, and they were all agreed that, if they were to stamp out the disease, they must have quite as much action in Ireland as in England. He did not suppose that there could be any doubt about that. This was not only an Irish question, but it was also an English question; because if they were to get rid of disease in England by strong restrictive measures, and especially by applying measures to foreign cattle, they must take care that they did not get the disease imported from Ireland. He was not blaming or condemning what happened in Ireland in regard to disease; but it was a fact that there was a great deal of disease in Ireland. He held in his hand the last Return from the Veterinary Department in Ireland, and it was quite true that there was very little foot-and-mouth disease recorded; but there could be years picked out in England when there was very little foot-and-mouth disease, and he did not think when they were passing an Act which was not intended for this year, but for all future, that they could say there was no danger from foot-and-mouth disease. The Irish Return for 1875 showed that there were 31,873 outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in that year. Everyone would admit that pleuro-pneumonia was, after all, a more dangerous disease than foot-and-mouth disease; and these Returns showed that in 1877 the number of outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland was 1,251. Now, that really was a very serious matter, and he found in *The Manchester Guardian* of yesterday that there had been a case of a serious outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Lancashire, in which about 18 cattle had to be killed out of something less than 40, in consequence of the disease having been introduced from Ireland a few weeks ago. It was necessary, therefore, that they should insure strong action in Ireland as well as in England. The suggestion he would venture to make to the Government was this. It would involve them, he thought, in some difficulty to accept the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham, which would, in effect, establish one Privy Council for the two Kingdoms. He did not think the words "with a view to" were sufficiently strong. They did not really demand anything; but meant simply that, in order to secure uniformity of action, each side should tell the other what it was doing. The words referred to might, he thought, be replaced by the words "in order to secure uniformity of action" the two Orders were to be communicated. He thought it was quite as likely that the English Privy Council might take advice from the Irish Privy Council, as the Irish from the English Privy Council. He did not wish to do anything that would put one above the other. His hon. Friend the Member for Warwick (Mr. Arthur Peel) showed how very important this matter was, because they did find from the drawing up of the Bill that there was the greatest possible difference between the action of England and Ireland. The action of England was this—that the local authorities were to do certain things with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease. But the last section in the 70th clause distinctly said that the restrictions contained in the clause, with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, were not to apply to any part of Ireland, until the Privy Council in Ireland declared that they should so apply. He did not know whether that clause fully expressed the meaning of the Government; but, if it did, it might so happen that when foot-and-mouth disease made its appearance in any single county or any particular district in Ireland, considerable pressure might be put upon the Irish Government not to enforce the Orders in Council with regard to it, on the ground that whatever might be thought in England of the precautions that should be taken against the spread of that disease, the opinion in Ireland was that the remedy was worse than the disease. If the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease) were willing to accept the words he had suggested in lieu of his own Amendment, he (Mr. W. E. Forster) should propose that he should withdraw his Amendment, in order that the words "in order to secure" should be substituted at the commencement of the clause, for "with the view to secure" uniformity of action.

MR. KING-HARMAN said, that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. W. E. Forster), in endeavouring to show that a large amount of cattle disease existed in Ireland, had been compelled to go back as far as the year 1875 for his figures. It was true that in that year there had been a sudden outbreak of cattle disease in Ireland. In 1874, there had been very little of that disease in that country; but, in the following year, there had undoubtedly been a singular outbreak of it; but, by the wise measures of precaution and restriction taken by the Irish Privy Council, the extent of the disease had been brought down to its present limit of 150 cases per annum. No one could doubt the desirability of establishing uniformity of action in this matter in the two countries; but that uniformity should be attained by a system of levelling up and not of levelling down. He maintained that the action of the Privy Council in Ireland had, for years past, been far better and more successful than that of the Privy Council in this country. If we had adopted the Irish system, we should not have so constant an outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease as we had experienced, to the great loss of our cattle breeders. It was owing to the very stringent regulations that had been adopted in Ireland, and to the very careful manner in which they had been enforced, that cattle plague had never made its appearance in that country at all. He agreed with the hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Synan), that the Veterinary Staff in Ireland was exceedingly weak. That, however, was a reason for strengthening it, and not for transferring the powers of the Irish Privy Council to that of England.

MR. COGAN said, that as a Member of the Irish Privy Council, it was not his province to eulogize the action which had been taken by them with regard to cattle disease in that country; but he thought that the defence of their conduct might be founded on the results which had followed from it. The hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. King-Harman) had pointed to the most important fact that owing to the careful precautions which the Irish Privy Council had taken with respect to the importation of cattle, the cattle plague had never reached that country at all. He thought that the Irish Privy Council had not done anything that warranted their conduct in this matter being called in question, and he was satisfied that they were as sincerely desirous of putting down cattle disease of all forms as anybody else could be. He agreed entirely with the views of those who thought that there ought to be complete uniformity of action on both sides of the Channel, especially with regard to the regulations for the importation of cattle. If Ireland, England, and Scotland, were to be treated as a united country, uniformity of restrictions was most desirable; but that was all that ought to be required. Ireland had no right to ask for exceptional privileges in the matter; but, on the other hand, no additional restrictions should be placed upon her. He therefore hoped to receive an assurance from Her Majesty's Government that it was not intended to place an additional restriction upon the movement of cattle in that country, in addition to the local restriction by requiring inspection of Irish cattle at the port of either embarkation or debarkation. So long as the same regulations with regard to isolation and disinfection were adopted in Ireland as were enforced in England and Scotland, it would be most unfair to the former country to require such inspection at ports. The Duke of Richmond and Gordon was reported to have stated that an Irish county was to be treated on exactly the same footing as an English county by this Bill. That, however, would not be the case, if, in addition to the local regulations, inspection at the port of embarkation and debarkation were enforced. When the Royal Agricultural Society of Ireland passed a resolution in favour of the Bill, it was on the most positive understanding that the three countries were to be treated on a footing of perfect equality in this matter, and that inspection of any kind of Irish cattle at the ports was to cease, and that the local regulations were to be the same for all. He wanted to know why, if the local restrictions were the same in Ireland and in England, an additional restriction was to be enforced with regard to Irish cattle, which were to be conveyed by steamer on a voyage which occupied four hours only, which was not enforced with regard to Scotch cattle sent by railway from Aberdeen to London? What difference could in justice be made between them? If the local regulations were as carefully framed for the two countries as they ought to be, he could not see why inspection should be enforced with regard to the cattle of one, when it was not required with regard to the cattle of the other. It was only just that the Committee should know of the view which had been taken by the Royal Agricultural Society of Ireland on this subject; and he now wished to ask the Government to state distinctly whether it was their intention that inspection of cattle at the ports was to be continued? The remarks which had fallen from hon. Members in reference to the weakness of the Veterinary Staff in Ireland by no means justified the transference of the powers now exercised by the Privy Council of Ireland to that of London. He granted that that Department required to be strengthened and improved; but it was the business of the Irish Government to strengthen and improve it; and it would be most unfortunate if, under the provisions of this measure, an attempt were made to effect further centralization with regard to Irish institutions. He should view with great concern the adoption of any course in reference to this question which would be dangerous not only to the popularity of this Bill, but also to the good feeling which they were all anxious to see maintained between one country and the other.

Mr. CLARE READ said, that he was no particular friend of Privy Council regulations either in this country or in Ireland; but it had been proved before the Committee of 1873 that the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council at Dublin was not only under-manned, but that it was under-paid. He wished to see that Department strengthened and reformed. It was almost unconstitutional to suppose that the Irish Privy Council could not properly manage their own affairs. He should venture to point out that there was an immense difference between the local authorities in Ireland and in England; and also, of course, a large distinction between the local customs of the two countries. That was a fact that should be taken into consideration in carrying out this Act, because, otherwise, the Privy Council Orders for one country might be made to apply directly to both. For his part, representing a county which was more indebted to Ireland than any other for their store cattle, amounting to some 50,000 a-year, which she supplied, he was grateful to Irish Members for the assistance they had given in forwarding the Bill. No doubt it was the wish of the Irish dealer to export, as it was that of the English dealer to import, healthy cattle, because they obtained a better price for them.

Mr. ANDERSON said, that he had an Amendment on the Paper to the following effect:—"That the Privy Council should be bound to issue corresponding rules for England and Ireland as far as they should think necessary for securing uniformity of action;" and as its purport was similar to that of the hon. Member for South Durham, he thought that the two Amendments had better be considered together. The Castle Government were to be congratulated upon having secured so warm a supporter as they had done in the person of the hon. Member for Limerick

(Mr. Synan), one of the Home Rule Members. His impression had been that the Home Rule Members were not so fond of that memorial and badge of conquest—the Castle Government. As a rule, the hon. Member did not give his hearty support to that Government; but now he was loudest in defence of it. Although he (Mr. Anderson) himself did not greatly admire the Castle Government, still he thought that they should be congratulated upon having obtained the services of so able, enthusiastic, and energetic a defender. The only excuse that the Government and the supporters of the Bill had for putting such stringent restrictions upon the foreign trade was that they had given their promise that equally stringent restrictions should be placed upon the home trade in order that cattle disease might be altogether got rid of. But the moment restrictions were placed upon the Irish cattle trade, and Irish Members began to feel where the shoe pinched, they began to press for an exemption of fairs and markets from the operation of the Bill.

Mr. SYNAN said, that he rose to explain. His observations with regard to fairs and markets applied equally to England as to Ireland.

Mr. ANDERSON said, that what the hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Synan) had urged was that the exemption should be extended to fairs and markets, and he had not attributed to him language intended to confine the exemption to fairs and markets in Ireland. What he had said was that Irish Members were the first to feel the shoe pinch, and were the first to propose that fairs and markets should be exempted from these restrictions, while Scotch and English Members had not made such a claim. He believed that Irish Members were trusting to the well-known laxity of the Castle Government to have the provisions of this measure worked generally in their own favour. As the Bill was drawn, it was utterly impossible to secure uniformity of action in the two countries, and it was upon that ground that he had placed upon the Paper an Amendment of a similar effect to that of the hon. Member for South Durham. It was necessary for the preservation of English and Scotch stock that uniformity of action between the two countries should be maintained, or else that Ireland should be treated as a foreign country; and in order that that uniformity of action should be maintained, it was necessary that the action should be controlled be some central authority. There was no separate authority proposed for Scotland, and he was sure that keeping Ireland separate would prove to be a mistake. He hoped that the hon. Member for South Durham would go to a division upon his Amendment, and that greater stringency would be adopted in order to secure uniformity of action between the two countries.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he rose to appeal to the hon. Member for South Durham to agree to withdraw his Amendment, on the understanding that Her Majesty's Government would accept the substitution of the words proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) in place of those at the commencement of the clause. He was quite willing to accept those words, as being calculated to insure uniformity of regulations throughout the United Kingdom. He was sure that if the Amendment suggested by the right hon. Gentleman was calculated to effect the object they all had at heart, both the Government and the Irish Members would be only too happy to accept it. The necessity of continuing a separate Privy Council in Ireland was the natural consequence of maintaining a separate form of government in Ireland, and that was an answer to the observation of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson). The hon. Member, when he made his remarks, should have borne in mind the fact that Scotland was not ruled by a Lord Lieutenant, as the Representative of Her Majesty. When the present form of government in Ireland was abolished, that would be time to talk of having one Privy Council for the two countries. In the meantime, it was necessary to indicate by this Bill that the Privy Council in Ireland should be at liberty to adopt such regulations as would secure uniformity of action between the two countries.

Mr. PEASE said, that in proposing his Amendment he had no other object than to secure uniformity of action between the two countries, which he thought was essential to the prosperity of the Irish cattle trade. Everyone knew of the wonderful increase which had occurred of late years in both the quality and weight of Irish cattle coming into this country, and it was of the greatest importance to England and Scotland that every means should be adopted that would secure the importation of healthy Irish cattle. He was quite ready to accept the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) in place of his own, because he believed that it would fully meet the views of hon. Members who thought with him. He, therefore, asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he thought that it had been clearly established that some sort of discretion should be left to the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council of Ireland to act in this matter. He, however, did not think that the Amendment suggested by the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) met the exigencies of the case. Therefore, if the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease) were permitted to withdraw his Amendment, he (Mr. Chamberlain) should move to add at the end of the clause, the following words:—

> "And all such Orders shall be extended to Ireland in all cases where, in the opinion of the Lord Lieutenant and of the Privy Council in Ireland, they can be properly applied to Ireland."

By the Amendment, while allowing some discretion to the Lord Lieutenant and to the Privy Council in Ireland, he wished to give an indication in the Bill that it was the opinion of Parliament that uniformity of action between the two countries should be maintained. Hon. Members were, doubtless, aware that in the evidence given on the subject before the Committee of the House of Lords, there was this important distinction—that, whereas all the English witnesses were of opinion that it was necessary to take the greatest precautions to stamp out the foot-and-mouth disease, the Irish witnesses treated the matter as one of comparative indifference, and desired that the subject should not be dealt with in the Bill.

Mr. SYNAN said, he wished to explain that he had never said that no interference should be allowed with regard to the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, that the hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Synan) was in a great hurry to interrupt. He had never charged him with stating anything of the sort. What he had said was that the Irish interests before the Lords' Committee, and the agricultural interest, which was represented by the hon. Member for Limerick, had urged that the foot-and-mouth disease should be let alone as far as legislation was concerned. In England, the regulations with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and to foot-and-mouth disease were to be placed upon an equal footing; and, therefore, Ireland should be treated in the same way. The Committee had been asked not to fall into a trap set for them. Hon. Members opposite would, perhaps, not fall into the evident trap set for them by permitting the stringent regulations with regard to foot-and-mouth disease which were to be enforced in this country to be relaxed in the case of Ireland. In Gloucester they had been obliged to prohibit the importation of Irish cattle, owing to the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease amongst them. In these circumstances, therefore, if the hon. Member for South Durham withdrew his Amendment, he should press his own.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, after what had fallen from Irish Members in the course of the debate, he did not think that there was any difference in point of principle between them and the English and Scotch Members. What they all wanted was that England and Ireland should be treated exactly in the same way. What they wanted to secure in this country was that the regulations should be so perfect that cattle disease should be localized, and not allowed to spread throughout the country, and that was all that was wished to be done in the case of Ireland. He hoped that before the Bill was finished, something would be inserted in it which would insure that the Irish Veterinary Staff should be strengthened.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, that the clause dealt with one of the most essential features of the Bill. The part of Scotland which he had the honour to represent complained, not so much of the importation of disease through foreign cattle, as of the spread of disease brought into the country by Irish store cattle. He did not mean to contend, for a moment, that there was more disease in Ireland than in England or in Scotland. He did not put much value upon the statistics offered by the Privy Council, because those statistics depended greatly upon the stringency with which the regulations were enforced. What really took place was this. In Ireland—and farmers would, in many cases, do the same thing in England and Scotland—when a farmer found that one or two of his stock were affected with disease, he at once sent the remainder to market, and they, being bought by an enterprizing cattle dealer, were sent on board a steamer with other cattle to England or Scotland, probably carrying infection through the whole of them. It was most important, therefore, that there should be inspection at the Irish port of embarkation. In the North of Scotland the value of Irish store cattle had fallen £1 per head in consequence of the suspicion that attached to them that they were infected. The county which he had the honour to represent depended more than any other in Scotland on Irish cattle; and therefore it was that they were specially anxious that they should have the Irish cattle trade put into a more healthy condition than it was at present. He knew that Scotch farmers would be willing to pay £1 per head more for Irish cattle than they now did, if they had more confidence in their healthy condition. He was surprised to hear the observation of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Cogan), who was a Member of the Privy Council of Ireland, that inspection at the port of embarkation should cease. He considered it one of the great advantages that the cattle should be inspected before being put on board the steamer. If diseased cattle were to be mixed with healthy cattle on board steamers, the value of the whole cargo would be prejudiced and depreciated. If he were interested in Ireland, he should insist on the same rule being carried out in both countries—the cattle going from England to Ireland should be examined at the port of embarkation, and the cattle going from Ireland to England should be examined in the same manner. With reference to the observations which had been made regarding cattle from the North of Scotland, he wished to point out the difference between the North of Scotland and Ireland. He might say that the whole of the cattle that came from the North of Scotland to England came as fat cattle to be slaughtered; or if not as fat cattle, certainly not as ordinary store cattle, but as special breeding animals, and with regard to them there was a special disinfection of trucks to insure their healthy arrival at the place of destination. He hoped the Government, when they indicated their policy with regard to inspection at the port of embarkation, would be able to make such a satisfactory announcement as would shorten the discussion on Clause 70.

MR. BIGGAR said the Amendment suggested by the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) would have no practical effect, and it seemed to him that the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease), in accepting it, was very easily pleased. However, several questions had been raised as to Irish cattle and foreign cattle, to which it was his duty, as an Irish Member, to reply. All the Irish witnesses before the House of Lords, as far as he could remember, showed that any restrictions with regard to foot-and-mouth disease would do more harm than the disease itself. That was the practical effect of the evidence, and he entirely agreed with it. He was of opinion that foot-and-mouth disease should have been left entirely out of the Bill. Professor Gamgee said there should be no restrictions at all, and Professor Brown said they might stamp out the disease after a considerable time, but that the people would never submit to the restrictions required, and the result would be that the disease would be as bad as ever. Professor Gamgee, again, said that there were three zones of the disease—namely, in the mountains, in the lowlands, and in the town districts. In the mountains there was less disease, in the lowlands there was a middle quantity, and in the towns a greater quantity. The result of his (Mr. Biggar's) experience was entirely in the same direction, and he believed that Ireland was a healthier country than either Scotland or England, for the reason that the conditions of health were much better. For instance, in London, the disease was constantly in existence, and to make the same restrictions in all parts of Ireland that existed in the neighbourhood of London would simply be to throw obstacles in the way, and would do no good. One reason against the Amendment was that they knew, as a matter of fact, that a constant system of intriguing was going on with the Privy Council in London, and undue influence was brought to bear, in order to obtain a relaxation of the regulations. Now in Ireland they wished to avoid that evil. If influence was to be used, they thought it more desirable that the Irish cattle dealers should have the opportunity of using their influence with the Privy Council in Dublin, without being put to the trouble of coming over to a foreign body. That was, in his opinion, a very important matter. Of course, if the Bill was carried in the manner proposed by the hon. Member for South Durham, the very first thing the promoters of the Bill would do would be to urge, in vehement terms, the Privy Council to make the most stringent regulations on the cattle in Ireland—as stringent as against the cattle on the Continent. He would, therefore, oppose that or any similar Amendment. With regard to the question raised by the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), as to cattle suffering from pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease being imported from Ireland, he did not think the hon. Member had any right to talk about pleuro-pneumonia. Pleuro-pneumonia did not exist at all on the farms in Ireland. There was more of that disease in two cities in Scotland—namely, the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh—than there was in the whole of Ireland. He had it on the best authority that this lung disease existed extensively in Glasgow, and the same thing applied to all large towns; and if these extreme restrictions were to be applied to the whole of Ireland, the farmers would have a right to complain.

Mr. J. HOLMS said, he understood the statement of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) to be that pleuro-pneumonia existed to a small extent in Ireland; and that, therefore, there ought to be no restrictions in that country with regard to that disease. In his opinion, that was not the case, because the statistics showed that pleuro-pneumonia existed to a great extent there. In 1874, there were 829 cases; in 1875, 440; in 1876, 424; and in 1877, 2,379, out of which 1,984 had to be slaughtered.

Mr. RODWELL said, they were now dealing with one of the most important parts of the Bill. The experience which he had had, living in a part of England where they had a great number of Irish cattle brought, and speaking from personal observation, he was convinced that the Bill would be a nullity, and legislation a farce, unless they put Irish cattle on the same terms as English cattle. He could quite understand how it was that the evidence, which he had thought it his duty to read, was given by one of the spokesmen of Ireland with reference to foot-and-mouth disease—in Ireland they did not look upon that disease as so great a matter as they did in England. Their business was chiefly to export store beasts, and the effect of the disease on store animals was not nearly the same as on fat and dairy animals, and that would account for the view they took of the foot-and-mouth disease. But knowing the numbers of animals coming to this country from Ireland, and the amount of disease imported into England from Ireland, he trusted that the Government would introduce some fair and reasonable Amendment which would have the effect of putting Ireland on the same terms as England. Unless that was done, he thought that all attempts to stamp out this disease and get rid of it in Great Britain would be futile.

The O'CONOR DON said, he would venture to point out that the proposal before the Committee was that the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease) be withdrawn. He did not think that any hon. Member objected to that withdrawal. The hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) proposed to make another Amendment later on; and he ventured to submit that they should agree to the withdrawal of the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Durham, and then discuss the proposal of the hon. Member for Birmingham.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. W. E. FORSTER moved to omit the words "with a view to" at the beginning of the clause, in order to insert the words "in order to secure."

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: Agreed.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *substituted.*

MR. ANDERSON said, he did not wish to press the Amendment which he had on the Paper, as he believed his object would be much better met by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain).

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. CHAMBERLAIN moved to add, at the end of the clause, the following words:—

"And all such Orders shall be extended to Ireland in all cases where, in the opinion of the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council, they can be properly applied to Ireland."

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he could not help thinking that the Amendment would precisely defeat the object the hon. Member had in view. It would suggest to the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council that there were cases in which Ireland might be exceptionally treated, and the result would be much less uniformity of action.

THE O'CONOR DON said, he quite concurred in the view taken by the right hon. Member for Bradford. The words were not at all desirable, and, if adopted, it would be necessary that there should be reciprocity; to carry out which he would propose that all Orders adopted by the Privy Council in Ireland should be extended to England.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that what they really wanted was that as far as practicable there should be uniformity and reciprocity between the respective Privy Councils as respected the diseases scheduled under that Act. They had extended the definition of the term disease, so that it included any disease; and by the Amendment which the hon. Baronet proposed to introduce in the Schedule, they were going to enact that there should be slaughter except in certain cases where there was no reason to suppose that in the countries from which the cattle came disease was widely prevalent. It was not only necessary that the foreign countries should have laws designed to prevent disease; but it was also necessary, as a matter of fact, that disease should not be widely prevalent. Now, Ireland was in a different position from England, had a different Government and a different Privy Council; and, therefore, there existed altogether different rules. In Ireland disease was widely prevalent, especially pleuro-pneumonia, as had been shown by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Holms); and there was great difference of opinion as to foot-and-mouth disease, in regard to which many thought that no special measures ought to be taken. They were not to admit cattle from foreign countries, even where there were good laws, if much disease prevailed, yet from Ireland cattle were allowed to come in. What he wished to secure was that Ireland, for the purposes of that Act, should be so far as was consistent with the differences of local administration, under the same Government for the purpose of preventing disease; and he thought that instead of adopting the Government Amendment with regard to foreign diseases, it would be desirable to place Ireland under the same government as England.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he hoped the Committee would accept the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain's) Amendment, which must commend itself to the common sense and fair play of all men. They could not get rid of the Privy Council in Ireland, they could not make a nullity of the Lord Lieutenant, and what the hon. Member for Birmingham suggested was, that this Bill should contain an instruction to the Government of Ireland, that unless they could take upon themselves the responsibility of making exceptions in certain circumstances, the same rule should be applied as in England.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that this proposal was a modified form of Home Rule, and he was surprised that it should emanate from the hon. Member for Birmingham. It proceeded on the assumption that no communication took place between the Privy Council of England and the Privy Council of Ireland. Now, the object of the Bill, so far as he could understand, was to protect both countries against disease; but inasmuch as there was a large importation of Irish cattle to England—and no one would regret the diminution of that importation more than he should so long as it was healthy—the English, having suffered severely from the importation of disease from Ireland, sought some protection for their healthy cattle. He could not admit, for one moment, that there was such an absence of communication between the Privy Council of

England and the Privy Council of Ireland as the hon. Member appeared to suppose.

Mr. PEASE said, he hoped the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) would withdraw his Amendment. Whilst, at first sight, it was very much in accordance with the Amendment he had himself proposed, he concurred in the view taken by the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), that it would weaken the clause; because it pointed out at once that there was to be a distinction and a difference between the administration of the two countries. They had already inserted the words "in order to secure uniformity of action," and that, he apprehended, would be sufficient to attain the object in view.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he agreed with his right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. W. E. Forster), and with the hon. Member for South Durham (Mr. Pease). He really believed that the words proposed to be introduced by the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) would practically weaken the clause as now amended. What did those words imply? Not that the Lord Lieutenant should have a presumption in favour of adopting all the English Orders in Council; but that he should select such as, after consideration, he might consider applicable to the particular facts of Ireland. It started by suggesting that all the Orders were not applicable. He would rather leave it to the discretion of the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council of Ireland, under the evident instruction contained in the first words of the clause, to carry out in Ireland generally the Orders issued in England than suggest that only some of those Orders should be followed. If he were anxious to limit the clause, he should vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Birmingham; but being anxious that uniformity should prevail, he should urge the Committee to stand by the clause as it now stood.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, that all the Members of the Committee, or nearly all, were so evidently animated by the same desire that he should not be justified in pressing his Amendment against the opinion of the majority. Before withdrawing it, however, he should make an appeal to the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) as to whether he was quite certain that the object which they all had in view would not be better secured by the Amendment. He did not, he confessed, see much in the objection of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). Throughout this Bill, while much had been left to the discretion of the English Privy Council, they had been guided as to the mind of the House. And that was all he asked for with regard to the Irish Privy Council. He assumed that the Irish Privy Council would honestly endeavour to carry out what they saw to be the wish of Parliament; but, especially with regard to the important statement made by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), he thought it would be desirable to give the Irish Privy Council such an indication as could not be mistaken, because the hon. Member had said that there had been in the past, and would be in the future, active and strenuous exertions made to influence the minds of the Privy Council. [Mr. Synan: No, no!] The hon. Member for Limerick was interrupting him again, and appeared to know not only what he had himself said, but also what everybody else had said. The hon. Member for Cavan stated that strenuous exertions would be made by Irishmen upon their local Privy Council to relax the regulations in Ireland with regard to the foot-and-mouth disease. He should have thought it to be to the interest of English farmers to secure some such direction to the Irish Privy Council as he now proposed; but if it was the opinion of the hon. Member for South Norfolk that the clause would be better without the addition, he would leave it alone.

Mr. CLARE READ said, he was quite satisfied with the clause as amended by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford.

The O'DONOGHUE said, he hoped the Amendment would not be withdrawn. It certainly commended itself to him. It proposed to leave the Privy Council in Ireland a just discretion.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he hoped the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) would not withdraw his Amendment. The reasons assigned for its withdrawal were, to his mind, the very grounds and reasons for its retention. The Privy Council in England had a certain power of making rules and regulations, and they represented the elastic power of this Act. They could make rules or dispense with them. But the rules they made were applicable to Great Britain, and it might be that, in the opinion of the Privy Council in Ireland, some of them might not be applicable to the circumstances of Ireland. Why should there not be a power with the Privy Council in Ireland to meet such a case? He hoped the Amendment would not be withdrawn, but would be accepted in a spirit of fair play; and, if accepted in that spirit, he was quite satisfied that the Government of the noble Duke the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council in Ireland would not make any unfair relaxation whatever, but that they would be governed by the spirit of the Act, and would only make such modifications of the English practice as were absolutely necessary. He hoped his hon. Friend would uphold his Amendment.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, that after the opinion expressed by the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) he desired to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. BIGGAR said, he thought he was called on to reply very shortly to some of the observations which had been made. He must have expressed himself very incorrectly, if the hon. Member for Birmingham's representation of what he had said was the correct one. The hon. Member had mis-stated entirely, not what he did say, perhaps, but certainly what he intended to say. What he intended to say was that the Privy Council would be urged in a vehement manner to impose unreasonable restrictions on Ireland. If it were attempted to impose unreasonable restrictions in respect of Irish cattle, it would be desirable that the people should have an opportunity of being heard before the authorities in Dublin, with a view of convincing them of their unreasonableness.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

### *Local Authorities.*

Clause 69 (Constitution of local authorities; lands and borrowing) *agreed to.*

Clause 70 (Provisions applicable by Order to local authorities).

MR. W. E. FORSTER moved to omit Sub-section iv., as follows:—

> "For extending and applying to any local authority the provisions of Part II. relative to pleuro-pneumonia as regards the declaration of infected places, and slaughter, and compensation; or the provisions of Part II. relative to foot-and-mouth disease, as regards the declaration of infected places."

He did not know why this sub-section had been introduced. If the Committee looked back to Clause 65, they would see that it said Part II. should apply to Ireland, except where it was said it should not; and if they looked again to Clause 67, they would see it said that the powers of Part II. conferred on the Privy Council should be conferred on the Irish Privy Council. The object of Clause 70 appeared to be to give further powers to the Irish Privy Council, and he could understand that the first three sub-sections might be wanted on account of the different position of the Inspectors; but he did not see that Sub-section iv. was required at all. It appeared to him that every power that was possessed by the English Privy Council with regard to local authorities, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, was already given to the Irish Privy Council by the clauses which he had mentioned, and the retention of this sub-section in the clause might only tend to obscurity.

MR. BIGGAR said, that before the question of the omission of Sub-section iv. was put from the Chair, he had to move to leave out an earlier sub-section—namely, Sub-section iii.—

> "For fixing the periods for which they shall be appointed, and their remuneration and allowances."

These were matters which ought properly to come within the province of the local authorities, seeing that they were to be the paymasters. He would admit that if the remuneration and allowances of the Inspectors were to be provided out of money to be voted by Parliament, it would then be proper that the Privy Council should fix them as proposed by the clause. Such, however, was not the case. The local authorities were to be the paymasters, and he thought, therefore, that they should fix, not only the terms of the engagement, but the amount of remuneration. The local authorities, being the guardians of the ratepayers' money, had a primary right to the distribution of it, and, in addition, they were acquainted with the circumstances of localities. They knew, too, the sort of man they were likely to get for a certain price in their own neighbourhood. Under all these circumstances, he did not think the sub-section should be allowed to stand as it was. They knew, as a rule, that people were very liberal with other people's money, and he was disposed to think that larger salaries would be paid by the Privy Council than would be at all necessary.

Amendment proposed,

In page 38, line 7, to leave out from the word "duties," to the word "allowances," in line 9, inclusive.—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he could not agree to the Amendment which had been moved by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). The object and desire of the Committee was, he believed, to strengthen, as far as possible, the Veterinary Department in Ireland, and especially that branch of it which was referred to in this sub-section—namely, the Inspectors to be employed under the Act. He could conceive nothing more likely to weaken that branch of the Department than to allow the districts to starve, if he might so call it, the Inspectors who would have to carry out the Act. For these reasons, he hoped the Committee would adhere to the sub-section as it stood.

Mr. BIGGAR begged to call the attention of the Committee to the system which was established for England. He really could not see why a difference should be made in the case of Ireland. By Clause 40, it was enacted that every local authority in England should, from time to time, appoint so many Inspectors as they thought necessary, for the purposes of the Act, and should assign to them their duties, salaries, allowances, &c. What he contended for was this—that the local authorities in Ireland were quite as competent and trustworthy as similar bodies in England, and he could not see on what ground the authority and power of the former should be so much curtailed as compared with the latter. The Irish Poor Law Guardians thought it a great grievance that in very many instances they were forced to pay much higher salaries than they considered necessary. Now, those proposals altogether weakened the power of the local authority, and put them into a very invidious position, in which they could not exercise any control or influence over their own officers.

Mr. SYNAN wished to call the attention of the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment (Mr. Biggar) to the fact that the clause gave power to the local authority to appoint an Inspector, and that that Inspector must be a veterinary surgeon. The Government appeared to have had a difficulty in dealing with the question in Ireland; and, therefore, the power of the Privy Council, in particular cases, to over-ride the local authority in Ireland, might become necessary. For instance, if the local authority should refuse to appoint a professional Inspector, where it was in their power, power ought to be given to the Privy Council to over-ride the decision, and to appoint a professional Inspector where they could find a proper one. He, therefore, thought the hon. Member for Cavan would see that it was absolutely necessary for the Privy Council to have that power; but he remarked that the whole question would be opened again on his Amendment to the 71st clause.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury, whether the words of the sub-section were not supererogatory, as there were words in a previous sub-section which rendered them unnecessary?

Mr. BIGGAR explained, that the question of the Government appointing a veterinary surgeon was not referred to in the sub-section. The sub-section to which he objected did not propose to make any qualification, but only fixed the period for which the Inspectors were appointed, and the amount of their remuneration and allowances. He objected to the clause, because the Lord Lieutenant might appoint an Inspector with a special object, and the appointment might continue for a very long time after the object of it had ceased.

The O'CONOR DON said, he must confess that there was a great deal of force in what had fallen from the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). It seemed to him that the Bill and the clause were really making great distinctions between England and Ireland, and as they were told it was a Bill for securing uniformity, he confessed he could not understand on what ground the difference was made. All the local appointments in England under Clause 40, whether they were of veterinary surgeons or not, were to be made by the local authorities, and their salaries were to be fixed by the local authorities. But when they came to Clause 70, dealing with Ireland, all those points were to be fixed by the Privy Council. The hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Synan) proposed in the following clause an Amendment which would make the two countries, to a great extent, similar, with regard to the question of veterinary Inspectors. It would certainly be unreasonable, on the ground of uniformity, to leave the clause now under discussion as it was.

MR. GORST thought the hon. Member for Birmingham was perfectly right in his suggestion. The Committee had already given the Privy Council in Ireland the power to determine the terms and conditions upon which Inspectors were appointed.

THE O'CONOR DON said, that the Committee had done nothing of the sort, as they had not passed a single section of the clause. It might be that it would also be necessary to make an alteration in Sub-section ii.; but it was practically in the power of the Committee to leave out the whole of the clause, to postpone it, or treat it in any other way they thought fit.

MR. W. E. FORSTER really almost thought that the Secretary to the Treasury would promote getting on with the Bill if he were to postpone the clause. He did not see why the clause at all was wanted. If, however, it should be wanted in the Bill, the hon. Baronet might bring it up again on the Report. The Privy Council had already given power to carry out the scheme by Section 67.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he must point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the clause, having been already amended, could not be postponed.

Question put.

The Committee *divided* :—Ayes 47; Noes 102: Majority 55.—(Div. List, No. 233.)

MR. J. W. BARCLAY rose to move an Amendment in Sub-section iv., when——

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford had already proposed a Motion on those words, and the Question would have been put, but that the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) had proposed an earlier Amendment. It would now be his duty to put the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, which was to leave out Sub-section iv.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON confessed that he had had some doubts in his mind since the suggestion which had been made by the right hon. Member for Bradford, as to whether there was such an absolute necessity for the words in that sub-section. He should not like at the moment to pledge himself that no such necessity existed; but what he proposed was that they should withdraw the sub-section now from the Bill, and if he found, on consideration, that a necessity for it existed, he would ask leave of the Committee to re-introduce the words on the Report, and to justify them by the statement he would then make. He only wished to guard himself, should he find it absolutely necessary to re-introduce them; but, on the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, and after carefully reading the clause, he was not prepared to say, at that moment, that the case was not provided for in other parts of the Bill.

MR. KAVANAGH conceived the object of the Amendment to be simply to remove the discretion from the hands of the Privy Council, and he asked the hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) to pause before he accepted the suggestion.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that Sub-section iv. stood upon rather different grounds from Sub-section ii. Sub-section iv. would have the effect of preventing the provision relating to pleuro-pneumonia from applying to any part of Ireland without the express direction of the Privy Council. He did not think that would be very advantageous; but he believed the Committee were quite satisfied with the proposal of the Secretary to the Treasury.

MR. BUTT said, as he understood the two sub-sections, their effect would be this. In England, there were certain provisions in the Bill which took effect by the Bill itself. They imposed certain duties upon the local authorities and upon Inspectors the moment cattle disease broke out. If those sub-sections were struck out, the law would be the same in Ireland. If they remained in, he did not think there could be a doubt that the clause would be a dead letter in Ireland, unless the Privy Council chose to send down special instructions. It was a very different thing to say that the Privy Council was to control the action of the Inspectors. That they could do, both in England and in Ireland; but there was a large portion of the Bill which would be a dead letter, if the sub-sections were not left out.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, the real question was, whether the Bill was going to be made compulsory in Ireland as it was in England? Under the Bill, so far as they had proceeded, the Privy Council had certain discretionary powers as to extending provisions for dealing with disease. But there were in the Bill itself certain imperative duties, unqualified by the discretion of the Privy Council, laid upon Inspectors, in the first instance, and local authorities. Every local authority was bound to declare a place where pleuro-pneumonia existed an infected place, and they were also bound to slaughter animals infected with pleuro-pneumonia. There were some similar provisions with regard to foot-and-mouth disease which were also compulsory; but if the sub-sections were allowed to stand in the Bill, those provisions would not be compulsory in Ireland as they were in England, unless the Privy Council so determined. Upon that point, he agreed with what the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) had just stated, and he thought there ought to be no doubt or hesitation in the mind of the Committee with regard to it. If there was anything essential in the Bill at all, it was that the regulations and restrictions which were absolutely compulsory in England should also be compulsory in Ireland.

Mr. PELL thought the remarks of the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) were hardly complimentary to the Committee. He had repeated, not quite so well as the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Butt), the object of his remarks, and a part of it almost in the very words. Now, he had hardly made up his mind yet whether the hon. Member for Forfarshire was opposing the Bill, and joining with those who were throwing up a barrier to check its progress or not. He was inclined to think, from the observations he had just heard, that he was doing so; but he was hardly doing it in a fair and open manner. Some of his remarks made at the outset, he must believe were made with the object of improving the Bill and advancing it; but when the hon. Member really came to a repetition of the remarks made by the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Butt), which were certainly pertinent, when he got up immediately after the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman, and repeated what he had said, only toned down and diluted by an amount of Scotch paraphrase and parenthesis——

Mr. BIGGAR rose to Order, asking whether it was in Order for one Member to refer to another in a sneering manner?

The CHAIRMAN said, that the hon. Member for South Leicestershire was perfectly in Order.

Mr. PELL thought that the hon. Member for Forfarshire might remark, with reference to the intervention of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar)—"Save me from my friends." He was going to say that when the hon. Member did that to which he had referred, he thought they could only view him, and he hoped that his constituents would view him, in the light of an opponent of the Bill. If he had misunderstood the hon. Member's views—and he hoped he had not—he should be sorry to have said anything unjust. If the hon. Member really wished to see the Bill passed, then, in the interests of business, he thought it would be well if the hon. Member, at all events, did not repeat and dilute those remarks which they were always glad to hear from one who was able and competent to deal with the question.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER did not pretend to say whether the remarks were applicable or not; but if they really wished to get on with the Bill, he must say that it was desirable to avoid making personal remarks upon the conduct of hon. Members.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA agreed to a very great extent with what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) as to the effect of that clause. But he imagined that those who drew the Bill and assisted in drafting it had some good and *bonâ fide* object in making the distinction which was made by the clause; and he hoped that, in good faith to the large number of Irish Members, the hon. Baronet would stick to his Bill, and support the sub-section.

MR. BRUEN said, that the question he had to ask was, whether Sub-section iv. should be taken out of the Bill? They had had a proposition from the Secretary to the Treasury to withdraw those two sub-sections for the purpose of reconsidering them, and before he did so he should like to place the following consideration before the Committee. He imagined the effect of Sub-sections iv. and ii. was to give to the Privy Council the power of withholding from the local authorities certain official powers if they thought fit. He thought that was a very wise provision, because they must not forget that there had been cases in Ireland where the Boards of Guardians had not proved equal to the duties they had had to perform, and which had been dissolved by the Local Government Board, and their duties fulfilled by paid Commissioners. Now, if the power were taken out of the hands of the Privy Council, he, for one, should think that the Bill could not be carried out in Ireland; and he, therefore, hoped it would be passed through in its integrity.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY hoped the Committee would excuse him for again rising, but he thought it necessary to reply to the personal attack of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Pell). He was quite willing to admit—and he was sorry for it—that he could not address the Committee with the same terseness and eloquence as the hon. Member; but he endeavoured to do his duty to his constituents as well as he could, and it was for them to say whether they were satisfied with him or not. The hon. Member had expressed a doubt as to whether he desired to obstruct the Bill, or to improve it. Now, he would appeal to hon. Members on both sides of the House, whether he had not uniformly endeavoured to improve the Bill. He voted for the second reading, having, during the debate, expressed his opinion that the restrictions sought to be imposed with regard to home cattle were not sufficiently stringent, and all the Amendments he had moved were in conformity with the opinions which he then expressed.

MR. W. E. FORSTER wished to make one remark with regard to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Carlow County (Mr. Bruen). He rather gathered from the hon. Member's remarks that he supposed this clause was meant to give greater power to the Privy Council in Ireland over the local authorities than existed in England. That was a question into which he did not propose to enter. He could not say how far that might, or might not, be necessary. There might be great differences of opinion about it in Ireland. What he wanted to state was that as the Secretary to the Treasury had undertaken to withdraw Sub-section iv., and also Sub-section ii., and to bring them up on Report, if he found it necessary to do so, if he did bring them up on Report, he would have to do this. As they now stood, they gave power to the Privy Council in Ireland to prevent the Act from coming into operation in certain parts of Ireland. The sub-sections stated that they might define whether the local authorities were to apply them or not. Well, by Part II., they were to arrange what they had to do with regard to home diseases, and they were to give powers to the local authorities. If those powers were not given to someone in Ireland, the Act with regard to home diseases could not be enforced. If the Secretary to the Treasury thought it necessary, on account of the relation of the local authorities in Ireland to the Irish Government—about which he did not give any opinion—to keep some special power of that kind, it would also be necessary not only to give the Privy Council in Ireland the power to apply the Act all through Ireland, but to make it obligatory upon them so to apply it; or else, after having passed, as they supposed, a stamping-out Act for the two Kingdoms, they might find that the Privy Council of Ireland would not put it in force.

MR. SYNAN said, that by Sub-sections iii. and iv., power was given to the local authorities in Ireland to appoint Inspectors who were not professional men. The Privy Council wanted to reserve to itself the power of appointing professional men, supposing the local authorities said they would not appoint a professional man, because they could get a non-professional man at a cheaper rate. The Government proposed, under Sub-section iii., to fix the period for which these Inspectors should be appointed, and their remuneration and allowances. Was it right to give to the Privy Council in Ireland, where the local authorities had power to appoint non-professional men, the power of appointing professional men, and of fixing their remuneration and allowances? His hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Butt) was quite wrong in supposing that this power, if preserved, would make a hiatus in the Act. No; the local authorities in Ireland had the same power under Part II. of this Act as the local authorities in England. It was, therefore, for the Committee to say whether the Privy Council Orders should have this over-riding power or not. In his opinion, it was necessary for the efficiency of the measure. As, however, the Secretary to the Treasury had asked for time to consider the matter, he, for one, had no objection to give it him, and he thought that the debate on the point might be discontinued.

Amendment *agreed to;* Sub-section iv. *struck out* accordingly.

On the Motion of Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, Sub-section iii. and Part (2) were *struck out* of the clause.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

*Inspectors.*

Clause 71 (Qualifications and powers of Inspectors).

MR. SYNAN moved to omit Sub-section (1) from the clause. It would not be necessary for him to say much on this Amendment, as what he had to say had been in a great measure anticipated in the discussions which had arisen on this Bill. Its object was to give the same power to Ireland as was possessed in England, under the 40th clause, of compelling the local authorities to appoint professional Inspectors, and the question was as to the amount of remuneration proposed. Sub-section (1) proposed to give the local authorities in Ireland power to appoint as Inspectors persons who were not veterinary surgeons—that was, who were not professional persons. Under this power, the laxity of the present system would be continued. Those who were practically conversant with the subject would confirm him in the assertion that there had been several cases in which Inspectors who had had no professional training had ordered animals to be slaughtered on the supposition that they were suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; whereas, upon a subsequent inspection by a qualified man, it had turned out that there had been no pleuro-pneumonia at all. The effect of the present system, therefore, was to lead to laxity with reference to the extension of the disease, and sometimes to impose upon the local rates a burden for compensation, from which they ought to be free. What he desired was that the Privy Council should have power to appoint professional Inspectors, to fix their remuneration, and the proportion of it that should be supplied by the Treasury and the Cattle Diseases Fund for Ireland respectively. If the Committee objected to pay the money out of the Consolidated Fund, there was money in Ireland which would be applicable for the purpose. The question, then, was, should they give power to the Privy Council to appoint a professional Inspector under the circumstances he had mentioned? In his own county—Limerick—there were six Unions, and at present there was an Inspector appointed for each Union. By an amalgamation of these Unions, one or two professional Inspectors would be better than the present six, and would be a greater security for the public, the owners of cattle, and the local rates. If professional Inspectors were appointed under the amalgamated part of the Act, the abuses to which he had referred, of slaughtering animals which were not affected by pleuro-pneumonia, would be prevented. The question was whether this was practicable. He thought it was. In Munster there were three counties which had quite sufficient local professional gentlemen to be appointed, while in the province of Connaught there were but two. Still, others might be appointed by the Privy Council, if they would give them sufficient remuneration, half of which should be paid out of the public funds, it being a public question, and half out of the Irish Cattle Diseases Fund. The Government could send down an Inspector, if they thought it was necessary. But to send down an Inspector from Dublin to see any particular case—paying his expenses down and back, and remunerating him for his loss of time—would be almost or entirely as expensive as if a local man were appointed and fixed in the locality; because a local man so appointed would get all the veterinary business of the locality from people who had horses and cattle, provided he knew how to treat the diseases to which they were liable. He apprehended that there was no such scarcity of professional gentlemen as to preclude the Privy Council in Dublin from obtaining a sufficient number of them. If they were paid sufficiently, he believed they would have no difficulty in getting competent men. He, therefore, proposed to omit the following sub-section:—

> "(i.) The provisions of Part II., requiring local authorities to keep appointed veterinary inspectors shall not extend to Ireland; and the powers and duties by Part II. conferred and imposed on a veterinary Inspector shall in Ireland be vested in and discharged by an Inspector; but where a person appointed to be an Inspector in Ireland has the qualification of a veterinary Inspector under this Act he may be styled a veterinary Inspector."

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that, as he had had long experience of the veterinary profession, perhaps Her Majesty's Government would excuse him for saying that, if they intended that the rules which applied to England should apply to Ireland, it would be necessary that they should increase the efficiency of the staff of veterinary surgeons in Ireland. He knew from experience that the detection of disease did require a knowledge of pathology, which it was utterly unreasonable to expect in an uneducated man, or a man of no professional training. He was glad to see that Her Majesty's Government had, in many cases, grouped the districts, with the view to the appointment of one educated veterinary surgeon, under whom there would be subordinates. It would be unreasonable to expect the Government to go to the expense of providing such salaries as would insure the same proportion of veterinary surgeons in Ireland as in England. Veterinary surgeons expected to supplement their salaries by ordinary practice; and he was afraid that in Ireland their practice would not be sufficiently profitable to induce men, who underwent a course of at least three years' training, and spent a great deal of money in their education, to go there with the view of practising their profession. At the same time, willing as he always was to spare the public purse, he thought it would not be fair to the stockholders of Ireland that there should be a large number of unprofessional Inspectors. The lives of their stock, in many cases, depended upon the judgment of these Inspectors; and he hoped the Government would provide, either by grouping the districts, or by some other arrangement, to give a sufficient number of educated Inspectors, with a subordinate staff, to meet the requirements of the case. The evidence given before the Committee of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords was strongly to the effect that in Ireland the number of educated veterinary surgeons holding a diploma was really lamentable, and it would be still more so, considering the requirements which were about to be enacted.

MR. BUTT thought the question was a very simple one, and if the hon. Member for County Limerick (Mr. Synan) and the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Newdegate) had carefully considered it, they would have come to the same conclusion. This question was fully discussed two years ago, when a Bill similar to the present was passed through the House of Lords. In England, by the 14th section, every local authority was bound to appoint a veterinary surgeon as an Inspector. If it were not for this sub-section, every local authority in Ireland would be obliged to do the same; but that was impossible. They could not get veterinary surgeons in Ireland for every local authority, and therefore it was essentially necessary to modify the provision. By so doing they did not take away the power of the local authorities to appoint a veterinary surgeon. The farmers and magistrates represented in the Poor Law Board might appoint veterinary surgeons if they liked. The Privy Council had the power of amalgamating and consolidating Unions, and of obliging them as in England to appoint a veterinary surgeon. Was not that provision sufficient? He thought, at all events, it was rational, and that if they meant to pass the Bill, the less discussion they had on such unnecessary questions the better their object would be served.

Mr. KING-HARMAN strongly urged the Government and the Privy Council to bear in mind that of the few veterinary surgeons to be found in Ireland, nearly all of them devoted their time to the diseases of horses. There were not in Ireland, practically, any real cattle doctors, and it was his belief that if properly-qualified veterinary Inspectors were appointed, they would get a very large amount of practice from farmers who had cattle, and that this practice would go a long way towards remunerating them. He had within the last 12 months been thinking of taking over to Ireland a veterinary surgeon on his own account, for his own immediate neighbourhood, guaranteeing him a small stipend, as he felt sure that in time the farmers would be gainers by it.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON thought that, on the whole, the Committee had better pass the clause as it stood in the Bill, and he would tell them why. Their object was to get properly-qualified veterinary Inspectors where it was possible; but this clause was drawn on the assumption that, at the present moment, there was in some districts a scarcity of persons who were so qualified, and therefore Clauses 70 and 71 provided only for the appointment of properly-qualified persons wherever it was possible to get them. The Lord Lieutenant had power, under Clause 71, of grouping together a number of unions and of enforcing the appointment of a properly-qualified veterinary Inspector; and by an Amendment which he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) intended to make, he proposed to give the Lord Lieutenant power in such a case to remunerate such Inspectors out of the public funds instead of out of private funds. Clause 70, which had been already passed, gave power to the Lord Lieutenant to enforce the appointment of a properly-qualified veterinary Inspector where it was possible, and where the local authority neglected to do it. Under these circumstances, he thought the Government had gone as far as they could with regard to the appointment of these Inspectors. He believed the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council of Ireland would encourage the appointment of duly-qualified men as far as possible, and prevent the local authorities from neglecting their duty in this matter where they had the means of carrying it out.

Mr. WHITWELL urged that the Veterinary Staff should be increased and paid out of the mixed fund such a sum as might be reasonably satisfactory. He might call attention to the fact that on the Votes the other day, the whole expense of the Veterinary Department in Ireland was only £1,900, and the whole strength of the Veterinary Inspection was concentrated in one Veterinary Inspector at £300 a-year, and an Assistant Inspector at £120 a-year, or about 8*s.* 6*d.* per day. He believed that if they were to have the cattle which came from Ireland brought in a perfectly healthy state into this country, they must be prepared to vote a sum of money for their proper inspection by well-qualified persons. He was not going into the question of the amount of disease that existed in Ireland. Whatever it might have been, it might on some future occasion be considerably increased; and therefore it was necessary that before the cattle were sent over to this country they should be properly inspected. From Belfast, last year, there were 87,900 cattle, and 2,900 calves exported, and the only inspection that took place was performed by a single individual. He said, therefore, on behalf of the interests of the two countries, that we must be prepared to encounter more expense for inspection if Irish cattle were to be imported to this country in a healthy state.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA hoped the hon. Member for Limerick County (Mr. Synan) would withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. KAVANAGH said, that if there was not proper inspection by qualified veterinary surgeons in Ireland, the whole system would break down. He believed that the Veterinary Department, as at present constituted in Ireland, would be utterly unable to carry out the provisions of the Bill, and that it must be strengthened, as a mere act of justice to the Irish farmers.

Mr. BUTT thought they were confusing two things which were entirely distinct. There was no person who was more in favour of strengthening the Veterinary Department than he was. He thought the gentleman who presided over that Department was underpaid;

but that had nothing to do with the Amendment before the Committee. The subject before them was that of the local Inspectors appointed by the local authorities. He was exceedingly anxious that there should be in every port of embarkation a most efficient inspection by competent officers of all cattle coming to England, so that the Privy Council in England might dispense entirely with the re-inspection by the local authorities of the cattle on their arrival in this country. His right hon. Friend the Member for Kildare (Mr. Cogan) was not accurate in stating what occurred when the deputation waited on the Duke of Richmond and Gordon. He (Mr. Butt) was spokesman on that occasion, and they pressed on the noble Duke exactly what he was now pressing on the Government—the importance of having a very efficient inspection at every Irish port of embarkation. He, for one, would not consider it an insult to Ireland if the officers who were to conduct that inspection for the protection of England were appointed by the Privy Council of England, and perhaps the Irish people could then get rid of the difficulties that were caused by local authorities exercising their power, in some instances, in a manner that could not be approved. As to the question involved in the Amendment before the Committee, he believed the Government had gone as far as they could in providing veterinary surgeons as local Inspectors.

MR. W. E. FORSTER thought the Motion an important one, but agreed with the Secretary to the Treasury that the question had better stand as it was left in the Bill. He was exceedingly glad to hear the remarks of his hon. and learned Friend who had just sat down (Mr. Butt). If disease was really to be stopped, there must be inspection at the port of embarkation in Ireland, and probably also at the port of debarkation here. That statement was not, to his mind, prejudicial to uniformity of action. Uniformity of action was this—that whether in England, Ireland, or in Scotland, wherever animals were found collected together with the probability of spreading disease, there ought to be special inspection. If there was an export trade from England to Ireland, he would take exactly the same view; but they could not get over the fact that England was an importing country and Ireland an exporting country. When it was stated that the cattle plague never got to Ireland, it should be remembered that few animals, or none, were ever sent to Ireland. It was most important, not for England only but quite as much for Ireland, that there should be an attempt to find out disease at the ports when it existed; and the Privy Councils in England and Ireland ought to exercise the utmost care on this subject.

MR. KING-HARMAN begged the Committee not to be drawn into a discussion upon a question which was not properly before them, but to come to a decision on the Amendment.

MR. COGAN said, the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) was under some misconception as to the deputation to the Duke of Richmond and Gordon. The hon. and learned Member had evidently referred to a deputation that waited upon the noble Duke two years ago; whereas he (Mr. Cogan) alluded to a deputation during this present Session, when he believed the Duke of Richmond and Gordon to have stated that the object of the Bill was to treat any Irish county under the Bill in precisely the same way as an English county would be treated, and that if there were restrictions in Ireland, there would be similar restrictions in other parts of the Kingdom. There would be no uniformity if there were restrictions in one part of the Kingdom, which were not in another; and it was on the promise of the Duke of Richmond and Gordon that there would be uniformity and nothing beyond it, that the Royal Irish Agricultural Society expressed their approbation of the measure. He doubted very much if that approbation would otherwise have been given.

MR. MURPHY said, this incidental question that had been raised was really a very important one. To his knowledge, the port which he had the honour to represent—Cork—had a most efficient system of inspection, and he was so impressed with the consideration of the extraordinary benefits which must result to the Irish cattle trade from such scientific inspection that he must advocate it, if on no other than selfish grounds. He also thought the utmost care should be taken that the vessels in which the animals were shipped should be properly disinfected and ventilated, and that the space for each animal was properly measured off. Were arrangements of this kind uniformly carried out in every port in Ireland, there would be no possibility of the importation of disease into England. In 1876, when the Pleuro-Pneumonia Act for Ireland was passed, by which cattle were treated in Ireland in precisely the same manner as in England, he moved for a Return to show what number of cattle had been detained at the various ports of Ireland prior to their embarkation for England. These cattle were detained under Orders of which the Committee appeared, in discussing this question, to be perfectly ignorant. In 1873, Orders were passed requiring the examination of cattle by the veterinary surgeon. They did not come into operation until 1874-5, and in 1874 there were only 3 head of cattle stopped for pleuro-pneumonia, 2 head for foot-and-mouth disease, and 34 sheep. In 1875, 4 were stopped for pleuro-pneumonia, 74 for foot-and-mouth disease, and 147 swine were stopped. He mentioned this to show the supervision that then existed, and he might also mention what were then the regulations of the Board of Trade. No vessel was allowed to leave any port with cattle on board, unless with a certificate that the recommendations of the Privy Council had been absolutely complied with, that the ventilation was in every respect satisfactory, and that the vessel at the time of inspection had been completely cleansed and disinfected. He mentioned this because there was an evident misconception on the part of the Committee as to the precautions already taken in Ireland.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON urged the Committee to come to some decision on the clause before it. The Committee had been discussing for some time an issue which, however interesting, did not affect the question now to be decided, which was whether it was possible to insist that in every instance the local authority should appoint a veterinary Inspector. He thought the Committee would come to the opinion that wherever it was possible this would be done under the clauses which he had explained to the Committee, and that it was better to allow the clause they were now considering to remain as it stood for a time.

Mr. SYNAN said, his object had been served by the attention he had called to the necessity of strengthening the Veterinary Department in Ireland. If the Government said this proposal was impracticable, let it be so; but he thought it was only the question of the expenditure of more money.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON moved to insert, in page 38, line 34, after "thereto," the following words:—

"Or the Lord Lieutenant may, if he thinks fit, appoint a veterinary Inspector for the united district, on such terms and conditions with reference to contribution by the several unions towards the travelling expenses and allowances of the Inspector as the Lord Lieutenant thinks fit."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. SYNAN moved to add to the clause as amended—

"And how much of same (not exceeding one-half of such remuneration) should be paid out of the moneys provided by Parliament for the purposes of this Act or out of the general cattle diseases fund hereinafter mentioned."

If it was desired to strengthen the Department, it would be impossible to succeed by payments out of local rates merely.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the words would not fit in with the clause properly as it stood; and that, in consequence of the Government Amendment, it would have to be altered.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON explained, that the salaries of the Inspectors appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to districts grouped together would be paid out of the public funds.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. ARTHUR PEEL asked, whether it was intended that the Irish Privy Council should make a yearly Report like that of the English Privy Council, which was to be laid before Parliament?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, it was intended, by the provisions of the 52nd clause, that a Report from Ireland should be presented to Parliament.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Postponed clauses *considered.*

Clause 5 (Interpretation and construction).

MR. ANDERSON proposed, in page 2, line 33, to leave out the words "and all other ruminating animals." He said, he would like to know what "ruminating animals" were. He did not believe it was generally understood, and he was not able to instruct the hon. Gentleman if he had not got information. He doubted whether any other Member of the Committee could define the word "ruminating," and that only showed the absurdity of putting it in the Bill. He understood camels and goats and all sorts of deer might be included in "ruminating animals." There was some doubt about hares, and some authorities would even include squirrels. There being so much uncertainty, the simplest plan would be to leave the words out of the clause.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON could not consent to leave the words out. They might be slightly difficult to define, and there might be even some disputes as to certain animals which certain authorities considered ruminating, and which other authorities considered not to be ruminating; but the words would assist the Privy Council in dealing with a particular clause, under which they proposed to take powers with regard to animals introduced for scientific purposes to the Zoological Gardens. It might be quite possible—he did not say probable—that it would be necessary to deal with animals so imported, if there was evidence that they were likely to spread disease. The words were stated by the Privy Council to be necessary for the working of the Bill; therefore, he would ask the Committee to adhere to them.

MR. ANDERSON said, making the meaning of the definition clear would surely improve the Bill; but if the hon. Gentleman did not wish to have the clause more definite, he (Mr. Anderson) would not press the Amendment upon him.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. BIGGAR begged leave to move, in page 2, lines 37 and 38, the omission of the words "foot-and-mouth" in the definition of disease. Having read with considerable care the evidence given before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament, he had come to the decided conclusion that far more harm was likely to be done by the system of meddling and interfering with this disease than was likely to be done by the disease itself.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that in proposing to exclude foot-and-mouth disease from the Bill, the hon. Member was raising a question which had already been decided when Clause 22 was passed. It was out of Order to raise it again.

MR. BIGGAR proposed to give his reasons for a course which he had had no opportunity of taking before.

THE CHAIRMAN repeated that it would be out of Order to raise the question then.

MR. BIGGAR said, in that case, he would take an opportunity of raising the question on a further stage of the Bill. To postpone a clause, and then refuse to allow the different parts of the clause to be discussed, did not appear to him to be a practical way to settle a question.

THE CHAIRMAN ruled that the point was beyond further controversy. The same objection would not apply to the hon. Gentleman's next Amendment, which raised the question whether "sheep scab" would remain part of the clause; because, on that matter, the Committee had not previously expressed an opinion.

MR. BIGGAR said, he would not push the point any further. As to sheep scab, he could not express a very decided opinion, because the district with which he was connected was not a sheep-farming district. But the disease seemed to be looked upon as trivial in character.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the hon. Gentleman had not withdrawn his previous Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. BIGGAR proposed, in page 2, line 38, to omit the words "sheep scab." He wished to point out that the witnesses before the Committee had not attached much weight to that disease. Few questions were asked, and it appeared to be considered that there was little danger of farmers being so injudicious as to bring their sheep to market with this disease, because they would have to sell them at a reduced price, and it would pay them far better to keep them at home till they were cured.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE thought these words were unnecessary, after the words that were inserted in Clause 30, giving power to the Privy Council to extend the definition of disease. As the main sections of the Act were not intended to apply to these small diseases, he thought it would be better to leave the words out.

Mr. PELL hoped the Government would keep the words in the clause. This was an extremely tiresome and troublesome disease to deal with, and unless the Privy Council had power to make Rules and Orders in reference to its treatment, the community might be put to a great deal of trouble. This had been found to be the case in the Midland Counties. The disease was not by any means difficult to cure, but it was one which must be taken in hand in the proper way. This could only be done by giving the Privy Council power to make Orders.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON asked the Committee to retain these words in the Bill. The definition of disease contained in this clause enabled the Privy Council to do by Order that which they had done hitherto by Order. If the words were left out, the Privy Council would practically be prevented from making Orders dealing with this disease, if it became necessary to deal with it.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked, what was the object of the sub-section in Clause 31, giving the Privy Council power to extend the definition of the disease?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, as he understood it, the sub-section in question was necessary to meet any new and unknown disease which might arise.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN moved, in page 2, line 40, after Sub-section 5, to insert the words—

"(6.) 'Contact' includes the being or having been in the same shed, stable, herd, flock, or ship."

Unless the Amendment were accepted, it appeared to him that it might be almost impossible to prove contact, if that word were interpreted according to its etymological meaning.

Mr. GORST did not thing the definition at all necessary, because the Bill already gave the power to slaughter cattle that had been in the same shed, stable, herd, flock, or ship.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON could not accept the Amendment, for the reason stated by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst).

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Government, how it was intended to alter the clause to make it read better?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he would propose an Amendment, making the clause read that a veterinary Inspector meant a member of the Royal Veterinary College.

Amendment made accordingly.

Mr. NEWDEGATE asked, whether the insertion of the Amendment would qualify persons to act as Inspectors other than members of the College—that was, persons who had undergone examination, and obtained diplomas?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he did not understand it so. To be styled a veterinary Inspector, a person must be a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY moved, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 15, after "surgeons," to insert the words "or who holds the veterinary certificate of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland." He hoped the Committee would accept the Amendment. The holder of a diploma of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons might be also a veterinary Inspector in Scotland; but the same reciprocity was not shown to veterinary surgeons who held the diplomas of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland. That Society held a charter for granting diplomas, and he believed that students who held those diplomas took equal rank with those who held the diplomas of the Royal College. What had already been said as to the scarcity of veterinary Inspectors in Ireland constituted an argument for widening the scope of the definition in the way proposed by his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 15, after the word "surgeons," to insert "or who holds the veterinary certificate of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland."—(*Mr. James Barclay.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON could not accept the Amendment. The Veterinary College of London was a corporate body, with a recognized charter, and no injustice could arise to Scotland by reason of the clause standing as it at present stood in the Bill, because a clause in the Bill enabled veterinary surgeons to practice for veterinary purposes in Scotland on a diploma obtained from the Scotch Society; and, in order to practice in England, they would only need to obtain a certificate from the English College by the payment of a small fee. He asked the Committee to consider the wideness of the question that would be opened if the Amendment were accepted. It would have to be considered whether the Royal College ought to be entitled to sell diplomas for veterinary Inspectors. The object of the clause was to maintain the high status of the veterinary Inspectors, and it would be better that it should remain as it stood, so long as no practical hardship to Scotch surgeons was involved.

MR. NEWDEGATE pointed out that the Highland Society had retained the power to grant diplomas, whereas the English College had abandoned their right to grant certificates.

DR. LUSH was glad the Government resisted the Amendment, but thought a better definition might be inserted in the clause.

MR. MARK STEWART remarked, that this was a question of great interest to Scotland, where the veterinary surgeons were considered equal, if not superior, to those of the Southern country, and where the opinion prevailed that the certificate granted by the Highland Society was quite equal, if not superior, to the diploma granted by the Veterinary College. He wished to know what fee would be necessary to become a member of the English College?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON thought the fee varied from £1 to £7.

LORD ELCHO asked, if the fee was accompanied by any requirement to pass an examination? What was desirable was that whatever country these surgeons might come from they should be free to practice if properly qualified.

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING said, it appeared to him that the reading of the clause went to show that the practice was to be limited to one College. Now, there was a College in Dublin and a College in Edinburgh; and, surely, it was not intended to exclude those who were qualified because they had obtained their diplomas in Dublin or in Edinburgh. It would be necessary, he thought, to amend the clause by inserting the word "any." It would then read—"Being a member of any Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons." He hoped the hon. Baronet would see the necessity of his proposition.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, there was but one body who could grant diplomas in the United Kingdom, and that one body held examinations in London, in Edinburgh, and in Dublin. The question before the Committee was, whether those who had obtained a diploma in England should be placed on an equality with those who had not. That was the plain question. The Highland Society preferred to grant what were called "certificates," which were not diplomas. In England there was a power to grant certificates; but in order that the educational status might be raised, that power was abandoned, and the students were compelled to apply for diplomas. The difference was that the certificate did not insure to the public those qualifications which the diploma did.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON considered the remarks of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) really answered the question raised by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. J. W. Barclay). There was but one Society, and it held its examinations in England, Edinburgh, and Dublin. The diplomas granted by the Society to students in Edinburgh and Dublin had the same force as the diplomas granted in England. The Society was established to insure efficiency. If students who merely held certificates were to be let in it would be opening the door very wide indeed.

MR. MACDONALD conceived that to restrict the practice to one Society alone was trades unionism as much as any that had been carried on by the working classes. It struck him that the impost, or the fixing of fees, to be levied upon those who had certificates in Scotland was really objectionable. If persons were equal in skill, why should such a charge be laid down? It would be most unjust, and, as he had said, it savoured strongly of trades unionism amongst those who had succeeded in obtaining their diplomas. Were any class of the working men of this country to put forth such a Bill, they would have all the Becketts, all the Barons, and others, denouncing such a restriction. He hoped the Amendment would be pressed to a division.

Lord ELCHO said, they had heard from the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), and the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury, that there was but one body that granted diplomas to the United Kingdom of England, Ireland, and Scotland. They had also heard that what were called "certificates" were granted by the Highland Society of Scotland. He begged to say that that Society was established prior to the English Society—in fact, it was reckoned the parent of Societies of the kind. That Society granted certificates which entitled the holder to practise in Scotland. Was that to be permitted with or without a fee in addition to that paid to the body in Scotland? [Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson: Without a fee.] Then the certificates of the Highland Society were a sufficient qualification for practice in Scotland, and the holders were not required to pay any fee in addition to a branch of the general licensing body.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBESTON said, that if the Royal Society of England were to grant certificates, they would have the same force as those granted by the Highland Society.

Lord ELCHO said, that the holders of certificates granted by the Highland Society could not practice in England without payment of a fee. He wished to know why they could not? It seemed to him, as the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) had observed, a question of trades unionism, and nothing else. A Scotch licence that held good on one side of the Border did not seem to hold good on the other. It was a system adopted for putting money into the coffers of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

Mr. MARK STEWART said, there was a great number of veterinary surgeons in Scotland, of good education, experience, and ability; but who had no means, either of coming to England to practice, or of paying a fee if they did come. It was hard and unjust that these men, who had received their certificates long before this Bill was heard of, should be placed in a disadvantageous position to new practitioners, merely because, by being Scotsmen, they held their certificates from the Highland Society of Scotland.

Mr. SULLIVAN considered that the whole matter lay in a nutshell. It was either a matter of fee, or of knowledge. If it was a matter of knowledge, and students were not qualified, they had no right to practise anywhere.

Mr. NEWDEGATE asked to be allowed to explain again. There was but one diploma issued for the United Kingdom. Certificates of the Highland Society did not give the same security as diplomas for the efficiency of the man; otherwise they would only apply for certificates. The Royal Veterinary College, and not the Royal Agricultural Society, had the power of granting certificates like the Highland Society; but, for the sake of giving an additional security to the public, they did not exercise their power. The examinations for the certificates were not conducted in the manner that the examinations for the diplomas were—by the Examiners of the chartered body—and hence were not of the same character.

Mr. ANDERSON thought it was simply a question of skill. If there was a sufficiency of skill, it ought not to matter whether the examination had been gone through in England, Ireland, or Scotland. A principle of reciprocity ought to be established. It was absurd to say that those veterinary surgeons who were educated in England were not to be allowed to practise in Ireland and Scotland, or that those educated in Ireland and Scotland were not to practise in England. If there was not reciprocity, a system of trades unionism would be established.

Mr. WHITWELL said, it was extremely common in the North of England for members of the College of Surgeons of Edinburgh to be the only practitioners. If the clause was passed, it would be the means of disestablishing and disqualifying men who were acting there under certificates as at present granted.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that the clause would not disqualify anybody. It only required persons who sought to practise to comply with the rules of the Royal Veterinary College of Surgeons.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 124; Noes 160: Majority 36.—(Div. List, No. 234.)

MR. GORST proposed, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 33, to leave out the words "body corporate."

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he saw no present objection, but would express his opinion on the Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 33 (Prohibition of importation; slaughter or quarantine).

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that as he believed this clause would lead to considerable discussion, it would be best for the Committee to allow him to move to report Progress. The Committee would then have time to consider the clause, and would come into Committee with it fresh on their minds. He hoped the Committee would not occupy too much time in discussing the clause, but that they would pass it and the remaining clauses, and thus enable him to get rid of the Bill.

MR. CHAPLIN: Would the hon. Baronet state when the next Sitting of the Committee would be?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: Friday next, at 2.

LORD ELCHO said, that with reference to the division, some of the Members he understood had voted under the belief that, beside the payment of the fee, an examination would be required. He should take the opportunity on the Report of mentioning the subject again.

MR. NEWDEGATE, in answer to the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire, would tell him that there was an examination required, as well as the payment of a fee.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress, to sit again upon *Friday*, at Two of the clock.

## HIGHWAYS BILL—[BILLS 95-214.]

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt.*)

CONSIDERATION AS AMENDED.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. PAGET moved, in page 3, after Clause 7, to insert the following Clause:—

(Highway district rating not to apply unless ordered by county authority.)

"Section seven shall not come into operation in any county, unless and until the county authority of such county, by provisional and final orders, made in manner provided by the Highway Acts for forming highway districts, shall so direct."

What he wished to urge upon the House was that a new principle was introduced by the Bill, and he took exception, not so much to the principle itself, as to its application. He objected to a forced and compulsory district rating wherever the Highway Board existed, and good reason ought to be shown for such a proposal before it was agreed to. He had failed to find there was any demand for it, except, perhaps, on the part of a few local grumblers, who were connected with isolated cases. Those who knew the present system, and how it worked, were of opinion that it had better be left alone. It might be said that the policy of district rating had already been conceded in the Union Assessment Bill; but he contended there was no analogy between the two cases. Union assessment rating was introduced to redress a grievance; but there was no such grievance in connection with the question of district rating. It might be said that, as the use of roads went to all, their common use involved the necessity of a common charge. But was it a matter of fact that such use existed? There were thousands of miles of roads in these highway districts that were nothing more or less than mere occupation roads—roads for the benefit of a farmhouse or a small group of houses, and not for the benefit of the public; and there was no sufficient ground shown to make these roads liable to be repaired at the charge of the highway district. Another argument which might be used was that they ought to equalize the burden, making the roads equal throughout the country, the rich locality being brought in aid of the poor one. But if that principle was adopted, where was it to stop? There might be the case of a small and poor parish that required a large expenditure in regard to sewerage and water supply. Why should it not apply to its richer neighbours for help? In the county of Somerset they had got 3,000 or 4,000 miles of roads. These were in good condition, and he had heard no complaint of their management, neither had this highway district rate been asked for. Therefore, before it was imposed upon them, they ought to be allowed to say whether they wished it or not. Again, it might be said that this was a great boon, and that it was for their advantage that these highway districts should exist. Well, he merely desired by his Amendment to say that they should be allowed to refuse the boon if they did not wish it. There might be some cases in which the highway district rate might be fair and reasonable; but, in the majority of cases, he did not think it would be so. Do not let his Amendment be misunderstood. He accepted the principle of highway districts. He knew the value of the principle, and it had been in work for many years. What he objected to most distinctly was their having imposed upon them, whether they wished it or not, the principle of district rating. He also wished to say that he did not think it was at all likely that the adoption of this principle would lead to any saving of money. At the present moment, wherever a highway district existed, the surveyor was bound to give an annual estimate to the waywarden of the amount to be expended on the parish roads for labour and material; and if there was any excess over the ordinary expenditure, he could keep it under control. But all that would be at once got rid of by district rating, because it would no longer be the interest of the waywarden to keep down the expenses. All the State could fairly demand of them was that they should keep good roads, and that they should manage them well and economically. If they did this, in Heaven's name, what more did they want?

New Clause—(*Mr. Paget*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

*Mr. Paget*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he would not enter at length into a discussion of the question, because it was fully dealt with when the Bill was in Committee. All he would say was that his experience differed from that of his hon. Friend. If there were districts in Somersetshire to which this uniform rate would not be applicable, the magistrates should re-consider their districts. The benefit of highway districts was not to be measured merely by the question of economy, but by efficiency of management and common interests, and the object of the Bill was to spread the charges where that could legitimately be done. If any appeal could be suggested in difficult cases, he should be glad to consider the matter; but at present he must ask the House not to insert the clause in the Bill, because it would be antagonistic to all that had already been settled.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to point out to the hon. Member for the West Riding of Yorkshire (Mr. W. S. Stanhope), to the hon. Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. J. R. Yorke), and to the hon. Member for Richmond (Mr. Dundas), that the clauses which stand on the Paper in their names, being money clauses, ought to have been moved in Committee of the Whole House, and that they cannot now be put from the Chair. The same remark will also apply to a clause proposed to be moved by the hon. Member for Salisbury (Dr. Lush).

On the Motion of Mr. Sclater-Booth, the following Amendments were *agreed to*:—Clause 7, page 3, line 33, leave out "first," and insert "twenty-fifth;" in the same line, leave out "April," and insert "March." Clause 8, page 4, line 6, leave out "first," and insert "twenty-fifth;" line 7, leave out "April," and insert "March;" line 10, leave out "first," and insert "twenty-fifth;" same line, leave out "April," and insert "March." Clause 9, page 4, line 12, after "accounts," insert "of the highway authority;" line 20, after "accounts," insert "of the highway authority;" same line, after "parish," insert "and of their officers;" line 32, after "the," leave out "highways," and insert "highway;" same line, after "Act," leave out "1862," and insert "1864." Clause 13, page 6, line 21, after "Act," insert "and subject to its provisions;" line 28, after "expenses," leave out "of," and insert "incurred from and after the twenty-ninth day of September one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight;" line 29, after "paid," insert "to the highway authority of such area." Clause 16, page 8, line 1, leave out "an" and insert "a provisional."

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 3, after the words "sanitary district," to insert the words "or with greater portion of such district."—(*Mr. Hibbert.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. J. R. YORKE (for Mr. STANSFELD) moved, in Clause 20, page 8, line 39, after "extraordinary," to insert "temporary." His object was to raise the question which was embodied in the Amendment which Mr. Speaker had not allowed him to move.

Amendment proposed, in page 8, line 39, after the word "extraordinary," to insert the word "temporary."—(*Mr. Reginald Yorke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'temporary' be there inserted."

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH submitted, as a Question of Order, that it was not competent for the hon. Gentleman, by taking up the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Halifax, to raise a question as to which it had been ruled by the Chair that it could not be discussed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is clearly out of Order to discuss a clause which has been ruled cannot be put from the Chair.

Question put, and *negatived.*

And it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the further Proceeding on Consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

### JURORS REMUNERATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN, Bill to provide for the Remuneration of Jurors in Criminal Cases and on Coroners Inquests; and for the better Remuneration of Jurors in Civil Actions, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN, Sir HENRY JACKSON, Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, Mr. WHITWELL, Mr. BURT, and Mr. O'CONNOR POWER.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 274.]

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday, 25th July,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Debtors Acts Amendment (163).

*Committee*—Freshwater Fish Protection * (155-173); Weights and Measures (161).

*Committee — Report —* Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland) * (149-172); Commutation of Tithes (151); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance * (165).

*Report*—Epping Forest * (164).

*Third Reading*—County of Hertford * (154); Roads and Bridges (Scotland) * (157), and *passed.*

### HOUSE OF LORDS—STRANGERS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, he wished to ask the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees a Question of which he had given him private Notice—Whether, at the next meeting of the Committee appointed in reference to the Offices of Clerk of the Parliaments and Usher of the Black Rod, he would bring under its notice the regulations under which strangers were now admitted within the precincts of their Lordships' House, with a view to their re-consideration and enforcement? The strangers who were admitted to their Lordships' House were not merely persons of their own sex; indeed, the most important portion of them were ladies. The Rules under which they were admitted, from a period so long ago as 1849, in which year it was decided that Peeresses and unmarried daughters of Peers should be admitted to the Gallery of the House.

The only change which had been made since that time was in the year 1864, when it was determined that only one unmarried daughter of a Peer should be admitted on occasions when it was expected there was going to be a considerable debate. That Rule, so altered, stood till the present time; but under the regulations of their Lordships' House there were no means of enforcing these rules. These was only one doorkeeper appointed to take charge of the doors on both sides of their Lordships' House. To show the way this system worked, he could not do better than describe what took place on Thursday last. On that occasion it was well known that the Prime Minister was going to make an important statement, and, of course, the ladies trooped down to the House, not in scores, but in hundreds. There were no checks; they were permitted to enter the House so early as half-past 3 o'clock. Their Lordships might imagine the feelings of the one doorkeeper when he found himself confronted with legions of ladies, all determined to hear the Prime Minister. The result had been a considerable amount of dissatisfaction and complaint, as their Lordships must have heard. So much for the Ladies Gallery. The wives of the eldest sons of Peers had also complained that the modest box set apart for their entertainment was generally occupied by the time they arrived, and that they found themselves in a position decidedly inferior to the unmarried daughters of their Lordships. Perhaps, however, it was thought they had a certain amount of compensation for that in the fact that it was tolerably certain, in the ordinary course of events, their Lordships would give way to their eldest sons, and their wives would thereby find themselves in a position from which, at the present time, they were most rigidly excluded. The same sort of difficulty was felt on Thursday last in the Diplomatists' Gallery. When various distinguished diplomatists arrived, they found their seats occupied by persons who were not diplomatists, and who did not give way. They had, therefore, to leave the House, or to take up such inferior positions as they found themselves able to obtain. He must also call attention not only to what took place on that occasion, but to what ordinarily took place on the steps of the Throne. In regard to the steps of the Throne, there was no Order of their Lordships' House; but it was the immemorial practice that the eldest sons of Peers, Scotch and Irish Peers and Privy Councillors should be admitted to the steps of the Throne. But, as their Lordships must have seen, persons who belonged to none of these categories found their way there. He had himself seen distinguished dignitaries of the Church, Members of the other House of Parliament, and other persons who had no right to be there, congregated round the steps of the Throne. If they were to have Rules, would it not be well to have those Rules enforced? Would it not be advisable that Rules, dating 30 years back, should be re-considered by a Committee of their Lordships' House; and, when they had been revised, that proper means should be taken to make them effective, and so to prevent the confusion that had arisen not only last Thursday, but on many previous occasions, which their Lordships would remember? He begged to ask the noble Earl the Question of which he had given Notice.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE said, he was only Chairman of the Committee, but he would bring the matter before it if their Lordships wished him to do so. He did not see in what manner they were to enforce any regulations it might choose to make in regard to the countless number of ladies who came down to their House. There were no doubt considerable abuses in the way the privilege of entrance was exercised. A policeman might be of some advantage in stopping irregularities in regard to the use of the Diplomatic Gallery, for certainly to break into that Gallery and keep out the diplomatists was a very decided offence. But he did not see how they could employ the same means in regard to the Ladies' Gallery. Their Lordships had largely the remedy in their own hands. They could easily prevent all but such ladies of their families as had a right of admittance from coming down on such an occasion as last Thursday. He could only hope that the statement which had been made regarding the inconvenience that arose on Thursday last would have its effect upon those who, by their conduct, caused that inconvenience.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, the subject was one of considerable importance, for there could be no doubt that, even supposing the Rules were rigidly observed, there would still be a most enormous deficiency in the accommodation for those who naturally expected admittance. There was a common error that the side Galleries were set apart for Peeresses. The fact was, their Lordships might sit there and even address the House from those Galleries. It was only a matter of courtesy that anyone holding the Office he had the honour to hold, if he saw, after the House met, that those Galleries were not likely to be occupied by Peers, might order the doors to be opened for the reception of Peeresses. That was only a contingent privilege of admittance. He had many years ago proposed, and he now made the suggestion again, that the Galleries of the House might be made to accommodate two rows of seats up the whole length of the House. He was informed that this would add to the acoustic properties of the House, and would in no way interfere with the architectural symmetry of the building. It would make the Galleries much more comfortable.

**LORD TRURO** asked, whether it would not be well to admit to these Galleries only by ticket?

**EARL GRANVILLE** said, there was, no doubt, foundation for the complaints to which his noble Friends had referred. He did not see that there was much necessity to enforce strict Rules on ordinary occasions; but, on great occasions like last Thursday, there certainly ought to be something done. He was told that in several cases large numbers of the same family came down and succeeded in occupying places. It was a reasonable Rule that at such times only one daughter of a family should be admitted, and this Rule ought to be enforced.

**THE EARL OF HARROWBY** thought their Lordships ought to be thankful that things were no worse. There was an occasion on record—Horace Walpole told them of it—when ladies striving to gain admission, and getting in between two doors, kicked and screamed, and made such a noise, that the Lords were unable to carry on their proceedings for several hours. The ladies of the present day showed, at least, more decorum than to conduct themselves in that fashion.

## THE TREATY OF BERLIN—THE PORT OF BATOUM.—EXPLANATION.

**THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD**: Some remarks of a contradictory character regarding the port of Batoum were made lately in your Lordships' House by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) and myself. I made a statement on one authority; the noble Earl contradicted it on another. I have no doubt that we both thought we had the best authority for our statements; but both authorities being anonymous, I felt it my duty to appeal to the Hydrographer of the Admiralty. I have not the honour of his personal acquaintance, but I am told he is a gentleman in whom may be placed the most implicit confidence. He has favoured me with the following Memorandum on Batoum:—

> "Batoum can only be described as a bay, and not as a harbour. The area within which ships can anchor is limited to a circle of about 850 yards in diameter; but this area is further reduced by the very deep water, upwards of 45 fathoms, of the central part. The anchorage ground in any reasonable depth is thus confined to the shore segment of the circle, and certainly not more than three iron-clad ships could take up anchorage here, and swing clear, even with a limited amount of cable, and in fine weather. With reference to the statement made that the port has contained 13 men-of-war and a transport, this could only have been effected by the ships being placed parallel to each other at short distances, and their sterns secured to the shore, near the town on the western side of the bay. These are not conditions attached to free anchoring ground, and it could only be under very exceptional circumstances that such a squadron could be so packed, and even then with insecurity.
>
> "F. J. EVANS, Hydrographer.
>
> "July 25th, 1878."

I thought that an authentic document of that kind should be placed before your Lordships.

## THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.

Order of the Day for the Queen's Message to be taken into consideration, read.

**THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD**: My Lords, in asking you to consider the Queen's Gracious Message, I have to move—

> "That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to thank Her Majesty for the most gracious communication which it has pleased Her Majesty to make to this House of the intended marriage between His Royal Highness

Arthur William Patrick Albert, Duke of Connaught and Strathearne, Earl of Sussex, Duke of Saxony, Prince of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, third daughter of His Royal Highness Prince Friedrich Carl Nickolaus of Prussia, and to assure Her Majesty that this House, always feeling the most lively interest in any event which will contribute to the happiness of the Royal Family, will concur in those measures which may be proposed for the consideration of this House to enable Her Majesty to make a further provision for His Royal Highness on this occasion."

My Lords, the duty and affection which your Lordships' House, and I may say the country generally, have always felt towards the Royal Family are sentiments I need not at all dilate upon. They have their origin, I think, in two principal reasons—the one public, and the other private. The first is the conviction of the country that the sustained order of our national life, which characterizes this country, and which is the best security for the liberty and welfare of the community, is mainly owing to our Monarchical institutions; and the private reason is that I think the undisguised details which reach the people of the domestic life of our Royal Family are such as to excite the liveliest interest in the English people, who are always interested in the happiness of the hearth. The lady who is betrothed to our Prince is the daughter of an illustrious and Imperial House; but I believe that these splendid accidents have nothing to do with the union which is soon about to be solemnized. It is a union of the heart and of the affections. The time has gone by when the balance of power formed one of the clauses of Royal marriage treaties. With regard to that lady, I believe there are some noble Lords present who have had the advantage of making her acquaintance, and I know they will agree with me that I use no language of flattery when I say she is distinguished by her intelligence and her accomplishments, and for winning simplicity, both of thought and manner. The Duke of Connaught is known to us all. He sits amongst us as his Peers. He is known to the country for his spotless life. He is devoted to a noble Profession. He is not a soldier of parade, but of service. When the terrible contingency of war seemed to be hovering over this country, the Duke of Connaught was the first to express a hope that he might be allowed to be sent forth to defend the honour and the interests of his country. I am happy to think that this terrible contingency has now disappeared. That is a circumstance which will only add to the satisfaction the country will feel at this union. I, therefore, beg now to place in the hands of your Lordships the Address which I have moved.

Earl GRANVILLE: I should like to add a few words to what has fallen from the noble Earl opposite. I think I speak for those behind me, as well as for myself, when I say that I entirely concur in the sentiments he has expressed with regard to the loyalty of this country, and the value which the nation places upon our Monarchial institutions. In speaking of Royal or high marriages, the difficulty is to avoid unmeaning compliment towards the persons about to contract them. Now, my Lords, about seven years ago, it was my lot to propose to this House an Address somewhat similar to the present, in which Parliament was asked to make some provision for Prince Arthur, as he then was. At the time, I remarked very shortly that there was scarcely a young man of any class who had secured more completely the goodwill of those with whom he had associated, either in his own Family or Profession, or in the society in which he moved; and I alluded to the good service he had done the Royal Family by his demeanour in North America, which had largely aided in strengthening and maintaining the feeling of attachment borne by the people of the Dominion towards the Sovereign and this country. I venture to think that now, after the lapse of seven years, no one can say that they were words of flattery on my part; for the illustrious Prince has during that period fully maintained the good opinion of him which I then expressed. The noble Earl opposite has alluded to His Royal Highness's connection with the Army. The Duke of Connaught is one of the few persons serving in all arms of the Service; and in each one of each he has been equally appreciated, his popularity being especially increased by his demeanour and excellent conduct during his sojourn in the sister Kingdom of Ireland. I have not the advantage of a personal knowledge of the illustrious lady to whom he is about to be allied; but I understand, from what has been said, that the noble Earl's statement is entirely shared in by those who do know her. It is a great satisfaction to us to remember how much those Princesses who have become Englishwomen by marriage with the sons of our Sovereign have endeared themselves to the country of their adoption, and there is every reason to believe that the same happy result will be accomplished in the present instance.

LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA: As a military Member of this House, and as one who has seen something of the service of the Duke of Connaught, I desire to say that the opinion I have heard expressed by officers of all classes is that His Royal Highness, by his careful, punctual, and zealous performance of his duties in every branch of the Army, had shown his determination to make himself an efficient soldier for the service of his country. At Gibraltar, the officers there—never thinking that their words would be repeated here—spoke of him in the highest terms as a subordinate officer connected with the Adjutant General's Department—a post with which he identified himself so as to win the approbation, not only of the General commanding, but of every officer with whom he came in contact. I feel that your Lordships will pardon my occupying your time in saying these few words, to which I will only add that the conduct of His Royal Highness has afforded the brightest example to every young officer in the Service.

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message of Tuesday last *considered* accordingly.

Then an humble Address of thanks and concurrence ordered, *nemine dissentiente*, to be presented to Her Majesty thereupon; the said Address to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

## COMMUTATION OF TITHES BILL.

(*The Lord Henniker.*)

(NO. 151.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

LORD HENNIKER, in moving that the House do now go into Committee on the Bill, explained that the measure was a very short one. It passed the House of Commons without discussion, and had the approval of the Home Secretary, the Tithe Commission, the Ecclesiastical Commission, and the Queen Anne's Bounty Board; but as he had not explained to their Lordships the provisions of the Bill on the second reading, he would do so on the present occasion. According to the present law, an owner of building land could compel the tithe owner of such land to consent to the redemption of the rent-charge, the amount received was paid over to Queen Anne's Bounty Board and invested in Consols. There were no other compulsory powers on either side. The owner of non-building land could exchange it for land as a better possession for the tithe rent-charge on his estate, or he could redeem the rent-charge on his lands up to 20*s.* a-year, with the consent of the tithe owner in either case. No further power existed at present. The Bill before their Lordships merely extended existing Acts; it created no new machinery. Clause 1 extended the compulsory power as to building lands to other cases, which experience had shown it necessary to include. Clause 3 extended the provisions of 9th & 10th of the Queen, c. 73, s. 5, and allowed either the landowner or tithe owner to redeem without the consent of other parties. Their Lordships would see in the clause the words, "if they see fit," "they" meaning the Tithe Commissioners; so that full protection was given so far as the payment of money was concerned. By Clause 4, the tithe owner and the land owner, with the consent of the Bishop and Patron, and the approval of the Tithe Commissioners, were enabled to redeem the rent-charge, which could not now be done, however advantageous such a proceeding might be to both parties. There was no fear of any injustice occurring under the clause, guarded as it was by the necessity for the approval of the Tithe Commission, and the contents to which he had referred. As some Amendments were to be proposed to the Bill, he had thought it necessary to make this short explanation to their Lordships.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, that he would reserve the Amendments of which he had given Notice until the third reading.

House in Committee; Bill *reported* without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

## DEBTORS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

(NO. 163.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF LIMERICK, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, explained that under the Debtors' Act, 1869, and the Debtors' Act (Ireland), 1872, when an application for attachment was made against any person who had failed to comply with an order of the Court as to payment, the Judge had no option in the matter; he was bound to direct that the attachment should issue. Many cases of hardship had arisen out of this arbitrary rule; and very frequently in instances where there was a legal, though not a moral, responsibility to the law in this respect, Judges had expressed their regret that no discretion was allowed them. There were only two clauses in the Bill, the first of which recited that—

> "In any case coming within the exceptions numbered 3 and 4 in the fourth section of the Debtors Act, 1869, and in the fifth section of the Debtors Act (Ireland), 1872, respectively, or within either of those exceptions, any Court or Judge, making the order for payment, or having jurisdiction in the action or proceeding in which the order for payment is made, may inquire into the case, and (subject to the provisions of the said sections respectively) may grant or refuse, either absolutely or upon terms, any application for a writ or attachment, or other process, or order of arrest, or imprisonment, and any application to stay the operation of any such writ, process, or order, or for discharge from arrest or imprisonment thereunder."

Their Lordships would see, therefore, that the Bill simply left to the Judge or Court a matter which was now beyond his or its discretion; and to such a change in the law, he thought, there could be no opposition. If the House agreed to the second reading, he would be prepared to insert modifications for the purpose of bringing the Bill into harmony with that introduced by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack last year.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly; and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

## WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

(*The Lord Henniker.*)

(NO. 161.) COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 37, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 38 (Power of Board of Trade to verify metric weights and measures).

EARL FORTESCUE moved an Amendment, the object of which, as he explained, was to legalize the verification of weights and measures on the metric system. To him it seemed very remarkable and invidious that in this, the greatest commercial country in the world, engaging in large contracts on the metric system with other nations, the only weights and measures authorized by law to be verified should be the imperial, the equivalent of which in the metric system were given in the Act in figures running to five places of decimals. Though the metric system had rather retrograded than advanced in the favour both of Parliament and the public during the past few years, yet it had now been adopted compulsorily in countries numbering some 200,000,000 of inhabitants, and permissively in countries with some 100,000,000 more. Considering the constantly increasing extent of our commercial transactions with many nations, and especially with the French, using the metric system, it did certainly seem to him desirable that the facilities now given by the Bill for the use of that system for scientific, should be extended to trading, purposes.

Amendment *moved*, in page 10, line 15, to leave out from "trade" to end of clause.—(*The Earl Fortescue.*)

LORD COLCHESTER observed, that he did not intend to move the Amendments, of which he had given Notice, to the 50th and the 53rd clauses, the noble Lord in charge of the Bill having given Notice that he could not adopt them. He hoped, however, that the noble Lord would hold out some hope that hereafter some legislation would be attempted on the lines of his (Lord Colchester's) suggestion, if, after a reasonable trial, it was found that the "local authority" did not satisfactorily discharge the duties which devolved upon them under the Bill. He did not hope, or desire, that the imperial system should be superseded by the metric system. As he said on the second reading, all he wished was that the two systems should be put upon an equality, and that where buyer and seller agreed, the metric standard might be used.

LORD HENNIKER said, he had already stated that the Board of Trade were strongly of opinion that the Bill went far enough in its provisions as to the metric system, and that it could not go further, at present. He could not, therefore, accept the Amendment of the noble Earl opposite. He must add that this Bill was a consolidating measure, and he did not think a Bill of this kind was the proper place for the introduction of a new principle—namely, a change of such great importance as the establishment of a new system of weights and measures. He thought the noble Earl, and those who agreed with him, ought to be content with the step taken by the Bill in the direction he desired. Should this Amendment be carried, no doubt, the Bill would be lost. He did not believe that this was the wish of the noble Earl—to throw away all the labour which had been expended in preparing the measure, and to put off carrying out the many improvements in the system in force which it contained. He, therefore, appealed to the noble Earl not to press his Amendment.

On Question? Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 39 to 49, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 50 (Local authorities and local rates).

LORD COLCHESTER said, he had an Amendment which he feared would fall under the same objection as the Amendment which had just been negatived. He had, however, seen and heard a great deal which convinced him that the permissive power granted to these local bodies should only be temporary, and that it should only be continued until they saw whether those bodies were willing to gracefully abdicate the functions for which they were in no way fitted. What were the facts of the case? These strong municipalities were intrusted to the control of Inspectors in this matter, and the poorest class of householders were not likely to get much consideration at their hands. The members of small corporations were, on the other hand, very often the very class of persons whose weights and measures required inspection, and the very class liable to be called to account for negligence, or worse, in this matter; and even those of them who were not likely to be called to account themselves were animated by an *esprit de corps* which would render effective inspection exceedingly difficult.

LORD HENNIKER said, it was quite impossible for him to accept the Amendment of his noble Friend. Here, again, the question of a new principle was involved. The Amendment proposed to take away all power from the local authorities which they at present possessed, and this it was proposed to do in a consolidating measure. The Board of Trade were by no means prepared to propose so great a change, and he could not agree to the Amendment.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 51 and 52 *agreed to.*

Clause 53 (Power to local authority to make bye-laws as to local verification, &c.).

LORD COLCHESTER said, he had also an Amendment, the object of which was to transfer the machinery for carrying out the Act from the local authorities to the Board of Trade, giving the local authorities, however, the power to make bye-laws which the Board of Trade might enforce. There was no fear, he said, that the local authorities would be too vigorous in the application of the law. It was much more likely that they would neglect the matter altogether. He thought the Department of the Board of Trade would be well qualified to work the Act in all cases. It ought, at all events, to have the power to recommend bye-laws, which could be enforced if the local authorities did not voluntarily draw them up and apply them. Considering how much they favoured centralization in some other matters, he was surprised at the Government's enthusiastic worship of local self-government in this. He did not wish to press the Amendment, but he hoped it would before long be adopted in legislation. He would inquire, in future, how far the local authorities had made use of this clause, and if they had not applied it, he would again propose that the power should be taken away from them. He suggested to the Government the desirableness of enabling Inspectors of weights and measures to visit canteens to which civilians were admitted to make purchases. It was important to stop some scandalous abuses arising from clashing jurisdictions in this matter.

Lord HENNIKER said, this was a most important clause. The powers it gave to the Board of Trade were most valuable—to make bye-laws, to make regulations, and secure the proper enforcement of the law at the request of the local authority. To force them to make certain bye-laws was quite a different thing. The Board of Trade were not prepared for such a change. The powers they considered to be quite sufficient under this clause. Here, again, a new course of procedure was involved by the Amendments of his noble Friend, and this measure was not the proper place for its introduction. Both this and the former Amendment to Clause 50 pointed to centralization of the most complete kind. He could not accept the Amendment. The noble Lord had mentioned canteens. He was aware of the Hounslow case mentioned by his noble Friend. It could not be expected that the commander of a regiment would willingly consent to the interference of an Inspector. He would, however, call the attention of the proper authorities at the Board of Trade to the subject, so that the law might be clearly defined by bye-laws, when an opportunity arose.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 54 to 77, inclusive, *agreed to.*

### Application of Act to Ireland.

Clause 78 (Providing of local standards and sub-standards).

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE said, he wished to bring forward the Amendment he foreshadowed on the second reading of the Bill. It was intended to remedy the inconveniences attending the verification of local standards in Ireland. It provided that the local standards of the county of Dublin should be recognized as Board of Trade standards, and that the local standards throughout Ireland should be verified by them. They were to be verified in London every five years; and, as the matter was a constabulary matter in Ireland, it was proposed to place them in the hands of the head of the constabulary. The great expense and loss of time that now occurred would thus be removed. However, Clause 37 of the Bill appeared to empower the Board of Trade to deal with the matter, as it provided for the verification of local standards in any place; and he hoped Her Majesty's Government would give some assurance that they would deal with the matter under this clause. The urgency of the case with regard to Dublin was greater than it was with regard to any place in England and Scotland; for, besides the expense of sending the local standards long distances for verification, there were certain climatic differences between the two countries to be considered.

Amendment *moved,* in page 23, before Clause 76, to insert as a new Clause—

(Standards in custody of Inspector-General of Constabulary to be equivalent to Board of Trade standards.)

"The local standards which at the passing of this Act are in the custody of the Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, shall be verified by the Board of Trade not less than once in five years, and shall be deemed for all the purposes of this Act as regards Ireland to be equivalent to Board of Trade standards; and the said Inspector-General shall, subject as aforesaid, have the same powers and perform the same duties in relation to the said local standards as the Board of Trade have and perform in relation to Board of Trade standards."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord HENNIKER said, the Board of Trade were disposed to think that the present system in Ireland of verifying weights and measures was not satisfactory; it led to unnecessary trouble, and unnecessary and great expense. The Board of Trade were prepared to take some steps to remedy this evil; if possible, by sending Board of Trade standards over to Ireland to be kept in Dublin. Before any such step would be taken, the Irish Office and the Treasury must be consulted. This would require time. If his noble Friend the noble Earl would withdraw his Amendment, he would undertake, on the part of the Board of Trade, to communicate with these Departments on the subject, to see what could be done. No clause would be necessary to carry out what he had proposed, as the provisions of Clause 37 would be quite sufficient to meet the case.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, it could, no doubt, be done now, but only in a manner that was most expensive. What he desired was that it should be done in the cheapest manner.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received *To-morrow.*

## TRAMWAYS BILLS—(Nos. 130, 122.)

On the Order for going into Committee on the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill and the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill,

THE EARL OF REDESDALE asked that the Order should be postponed, and he intended to-morrow to bring before the House certain Resolutions regarding the use of steam power on tramways. It would be well, he thought, that the whole matter should be discussed together.

LORD HENNIKER said, on Monday week the noble Earl at the Table requested him to postpone the consideration of these Bills in Committee. He then stated that he could not postpone them for more than a week or 10 days. As then agreed, he had put these Bills off till to-day. He could not do more than that in justice to the promoters, for they had been put to very great expense and trouble by the action of Parliament during the last two years. In fairness to them, he could not put the consideration of them off longer, and the noble Earl himself said he did not wish the Bills to be lost by lapse of time. He (Lord Henniker) was quite ready to go on with them; but after what the noble Earl had said, he could do no less than to put them off; for it would, probably, be more convenient to their Lordships to consider the main question in dispute —that was to say, the use of steam on tramways—on the discussion upon the Motion of the noble Earl, when the whole question would be raised. He did so with regret, for he thought the promoters and others concerned in these Bills had good reason for asking their Lordships to come to a speedy decision on this subject.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE said, there were six other Bills of a similar character involving the use of steam power.

Committee *put off* till *To-morrow.*

## CRUELTY TO ANIMALS—VIVISECTION.

### QUESTION.

EARL DE LA WARR asked, When the Return relative to the Medical and Scientific Experiments upon Living Animals would be laid on the Table of the House? The subject excited a great deal of public interest, and the Reports of the Inspectors who visited places registered for such experiments were anxiously looked for.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said, that on the Motion of Mr. Mundella, copies of this Return had been distributed to the Members of the other House, and a copy only came into his (Earl Beauchamp's) hands that morning. He would communicate it to their Lordships' House.

Then an Address for—

Return of Licenses granted under the Act 39 and 40 Victoria chap. 77 to amend the Law relating to Cruelty to Animals.—(*The Lord Steward.*)

House adjourned at half past Six
o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Ten o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday, 25th July, 1878.*

MINUTES.] — PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*) — Traherne's Estate*; Vane Tempest Settled Estate, read 2°*.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee*—Duke of Connaught, Message from Her Majesty [23rd July].

*Second Reading*—Prison (Officers' Superannuation) * [269]; Commons Regulation (Expenses) * [273].

*Committee — Report* — Intermediate Education (Ireland) [249-275]; Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) * [268].

*Considered as amended*—Highways * [261].

*Third Reading*—Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland) * [237], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn* — Bar Education and Discipline * [88]; Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment (*re-comm.*) [205].

## *PUBLIC PETITION.*

### PUBLIC PETITION — PETITION FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD — RULES RESPECTING PETITIONS.

PETITION PRESENTED.

MR. J. COWEN: I beg to present a Petition from Manchester, Bolton, Stockport, Maidstone, Newcastle-under-Lyne, and other places, reciting the events which have taken place in the East during the last two years, and concluding with the Prayer—

> "That this honourable House will exhibit articles of impeachment against Lord Beaconsfield, and cause him to be arrested for high crimes and misdemeanours, in order that the honour of the country may be maintained."

I may be permitted to add that I do not agree with the argument contained in the Petition, nor do I concur in its Prayer, and I simply ask that I may be allowed to lay it on the Table.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS: I wish to ask you, Sir, whether a Petition asking for the impeachment of the Prime Minister, without assigning any reason, ought to be received, and whether it is in Order?

MR. SPEAKER: This Petition, in the ordinary course, will go before the Select Committee on Petitions, and if they think it out of Order, no doubt they will make a special Report to the House. As far as I know, from all that has been stated by the hon. Member for Newcastle, I see nothing out of Order in the Petition.

## *QUESTIONS.*

### BOILER EXPLOSIONS—LEGISLATION.

QUESTION.

SIR THOMAS BAZLEY asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, having regard to the constant sacrifice of human life by steam boiler explosions, 416 persons having been killed, and 700 others injured thereby, since the Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to inquire into the cause of these catastrophes, reported, in the year 1871, that—

> "Steam boilers were placed in much frequented parts of towns and cities, under the pavements of crowded thoroughfares, in the lower storeys of houses, and in the midst of crowded dwellings;"

and, having further regard to the fact that, notwithstanding that report, no legislation has taken place for the protection of the public, he will take the matter into consideration with a view to the introduction of some judicious measure for arresting this sacrifice of human life?

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, I have not been able to ascertain whether the numbers quoted by the hon. Baronet are correct; but in any case I fear it is too true that there has been a lamentable amount of loss of life and injury to person owing to boiler explosions. I have been in communication with my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary on this subject, and we have come to the conclusion that it requires further inquiry and consideration. I hope to be in a position at the beginning of next Session to state the views of Her Majesty's Government on this matter, which I can assure the hon. Gentleman shall not fail to receive our careful attention.

### PRISON ACT, 1877—PRISON DISCIPLINE.

QUESTIONS.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is true that a prisoner in Coldbath Fields Prison, who has not been sentenced to hard labour, is confined in a cell six feet long by four feet wide for twenty-three hours out of the twenty-four; whether the diet of such a prisoner includes only six ounces of meat in the week; and, whether the only occupation which the prison authorities will supply to such a person, if he desires to have anything to do, is to give him a piece of mat to pick to pieces?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had received a communication from the Governor of Coldbath Fields Prison, from which it appeared that there was no cell in the prison so small as 6 feet long by 4 feet wide. The smallest cell was 6½ feet by 5½ feet, and there were cells 11 feet by 6 feet, and 11 feet by 8½ feet wide. The dietary of a prisoner not sentenced to hard labour, included 6 ounces of meat in the week, cooked and without bone, besides which he receives meat in soup and also suet. So far as the occupation was concerned, it was not the case that it was confined to picking a piece of mat. There was considerable variety in the occupation, which, among other things, included needlework, stocking knitting, and oakum-picking.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the Question whether a prisoner who has not been sentenced to hard labour is confined for 23 hours out of 24?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: The Governor's answer is "Certainly not."

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, since the Metropolitan and County Prisons passed into the hands of the Government, the visits of the friends of prisoners have been much curtailed, and the diet of the prisoners much reduced by the cutting off of the coffee and cocoa formerly allowed; whether it is true that, under the revised regulations, a prisoner rises at half-past six and cleans out his cell, at eight has gruel and bread for breakfast, at noon dinner, at four o'clock gruel and bread again, and no further food until the next morning; whether on Sundays the diet at dinner is half a pound of cold suet pudding and no meat; whether absolute silence is required during the whole day; and, whether, when the weather is bad, a prisoner, not sentenced to hard labour, is deprived of his exercise and locked up in his cell for the whole of the twenty-four hours?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the general practice in all great prisons, before the prisons passed into the hands of the Government, was that a visit to a prisoner might take place once in three months. No change had been made in the number of visits allowed, but the length of the visits had been extended from 15 to 20 minutes. The Visiting Committee had power to enlarge the time in special cases. If the hon. Member looked at the dietary table presented to the House, he would see that the diet of the prisoners had been reduced by the cutting off of the cocoa formerly allowed. The Sunday dinner consisted, not of cold suet pudding, but of suet pudding served hot, together with bread and potatoes. No change had been made as to the rule of silence. In wet weather a prisoner not sentenced to hard labour was not deprived of his exercise. When the weather was bad, he took his exercise in the corridor. The hon. Member could learn all about the prisons in a quarter of an hours' discussion with the Home Office officials, and he would then see that there was no such grievance as his Question implied.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION—CONGRESS OF BERLIN—INSTRUCTIONS TO THE BRITISH PLENIPOTENTIARY.

### QUESTIONS.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in regard to the following passage of the instructions of Lord Salisbury to Lord Odo Russell, dated June 8,

> "There is no ground for believing that Russia will willingly give way in respect to Batoum, Kars, or Ardahan; and it is possible that arguments of England urged in Congress will receive little assistance from other Powers, and will not be able to shake her resolution in this respect. You will not, on this account, abstain from earnestly pressing upon them, and upon Russia, the justice of abstaining from annexation, and the expediency, in regard to the future tranquillity of Asia, of forbearing to shake so perilously the position of the Government of Turkey,"

whether this passage is intended to imply that Lord Odo Russell, one of the English Plenipotentiaries, was kept in ignorance of the article of the secret agreement of May 30th between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff, by which Lord Salisbury "consented not to contest" the acquisition, by Russia, of Batoum, Kars, and Ardahan?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, Lord Odo Russell, our Ambassador at Berlin, was cognizant of the confidential Correspondence which had taken place between the Government of England and Russia. I may point out to the noble Lord that the form of these instructions, which is that of an Address from the Marquess of Salisbury as Foreign Secretary to Lord Odo Russell as third Plenipotentiary, was, in fact, the most convenient form to be adopted for putting on record the instructions given by the Government at home to the Plenipotentiaries. There was no secrecy observed in the matter.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU: I have another Question to put to the right hon. Gentleman, which is, Why a Despatch of instructions, dated June 8th, from Lord Salisbury to Lord Odo Russell, and laid before Parliament, was written in contradiction to the secret Agreement between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff dated May 30th, and which was surreptitiously obtained from the Foreign Office?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Perhaps the noble Lord will give Notice of that Question. I may say that it seems to me that the matter is one very much better suited to argument than to the form of a Question.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: I will repeat the Question to-morrow evening.

Mr. C. BECKETT-DENISON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If there is any Correspondence in the archives of the Foreign Office in connection with the Tripartite Treaty between Great Britain, France, and Austria, of 15th of April 1856, guaranteeing the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire, either prior to or immediately after the date of the said Treaty? The hon. Member added that if there was any such Correspondence he intended to move for it.

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, in reply to my hon. Friend, I have to state that there is a despatch from Lord Palmerston in the Foreign Office on this subject, giving the assent of the Cabinet to the Treaty, and discussing the form of the Treaty; but there is no despatch or other document at the Foreign Office which explains the reasons that Lord Clarendon had for proposing the Treaty, or the reasons which the Cabinet had for assenting to it.

Mr. GLADSTONE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is intended to present to Parliament a Copy of the Agreement between the Marquess of Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff, dated May 30th, 1878?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the Paper surreptitiously published could not be laid on the Table of the House officially by the Government unless it was accompanied by other documents which are necessary fully to explain it. These documents, however, the Government is not at liberty to publish without the consent of other Powers.

*Lord Robert Montagu*

Mr. GLADSTONE: If Her Majesty's Government will give me an opportunity, or if I can find one to-morrow evening, on the Motion to go into Committee of Supply, I will move for the production of that Paper.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: With reference to the answer given by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, I wish to ask him—or, if he is unable to answer it, perhaps some other Member of Her Majesty's Government will be able to give an answer—Whether any steps have been taken by Her Majesty's Government to obtain the consent of the other Powers to the publication of these despatches, which, as he stated, are necessary for the full explanation of the Memorandum of Agreement between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff?

Mr. BOURKE: Yes, Sir; we have received an answer from one of those Powers, and we are not at liberty to furnish the document in question.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION — THE TREATY OF BERLIN—TRANSIT DUES IN AUSTRIA AND TURKEY.

### QUESTION.

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, it having been provided by Articles 8 and 37 of the Treaty of Berlin that goods crossing the territory of Bulgaria and Servia respectively should not be subject to transit dues, Whether care has been taken to stipulate that goods from England or other countries imported into the provinces of Bulgaria and Servia, or goods exported from these countries to England or elsewhere, shall be in like manner free from any transit dues whilst crossing Austrian or Turkish territory; and, whether imports and exports to and from Bosnia and Herzegovina are, during the Austrian occupation of these provinces, to be subject to the like dues as in other parts of Turkey, or to the higher duties of Austria?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, the Congress at Berlin, in conferring independence upon Servia, and autonomy upon Bulgaria, stipulated that no transit due should be taken either in the Principality or in the autonomous Province. The Treaty of Commerce under which British subjects traded through Austria into Turkey did not come under the cognizance of the Congress; and was, therefore, unaffected by the stipulations of the Congress. With regard to the last part of the Question, the Austrian and Turkish Governments have not yet entered into any stipulations with respect to the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## CORONERS' INQUESTS — DEATH OF MR. J. FULTON.—QUESTION.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA (for Dr. LUSH) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been drawn to the circumstances under which the coroner for East Surrey declined to hold an inquest upon the body of Mr. Joseph Fulton, of East Dulwich, notwithstanding that the circumstances surrounding the case led to an investigation at Scotland Yard, and that there was no medical certificate of the cause of death?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had no jurisdiction over a coroner, who had to exercise his own discretion, subject, of course, to punishment by other authorities if he failed to exercise it properly. This matter was brought under his own notice in the course of last month, and the coroner informed him then that the information he received on his inquiry was obtained from two doctors who had attended the deceased, and who stated that his death was what they expected; that they had thoroughly examined him, that his heart was very feeble, and that he had other complaints. From information subsequently received at the Home Office, he thought it right to cause inquiries to be made. The police did make inquiries, and reported that there was not the least suspicion of foul play.

## THE IRISH BOARD OF WORKS—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

### QUESTION.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, When the Government purpose coming to a decision as to the changes required in the constitution and administrative duties of the Board of Works, Ireland, and give effect to the recommendations made in the Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the Board of Works?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in reply, said, the Report of the Select Committee referred to contained so many suggestions and recommendations which required careful consideration, that he was afraid it would be hardly possible for the Government to come to any definite conclusion on the matter while the work of the Session was going on.

## LAW AND JUSTICE — MANCHESTER AND LIVERPOOL CIVIL ASSIZES.

### QUESTION.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Attorney General, What decision has been come to in regard to the periods of the year at which future Assizes are to be held, especially the period at which the third Civil Assize for Manchester and Liverpool will be held; and, whether Rules and Orders will be made, if necessary, allowing the service of proceedings during the later portion of the Vacation?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): Sir, the attention of my hon. and learned Friend will have been called, no doubt, to a Report, which has quite recently been laid on the Table of the House—made by a number of Judges, who have considered, among other matters, the arrangements which should be made for holding Civil Assizes in Manchester and Liverpool. The Committee recommend that in the places mentioned three Civil Assizes shall be held—one in spring, one in summer, and one in autumn, in the month of October. This recommendation will, I believe, be carried into effect. If it is, such rules and orders as may be necessary will be made.

## GENERAL PRISONS BOARD (IRELAND) —PRISON DISCIPLINE.—QUESTION.

MR. A. MOORE asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to Rule 24 of the General Rules for the government of Prisons made by the General Prisons Board for Ireland, which runs as follows:—

> "24. A convicted criminal prisoner shall, during the whole of his sentence, when it does not exceed one month, and during one month of his sentence when it exceeds one month, be required to sleep on a plank bed. The prisoner shall be allowed the opportunity of earning by industry the gradual remission of this requirement after the expiration of one month; but, after he has earned such remission, he shall be liable to forfeit the same on account of idleness, inattention to instruction, or misconduct;"

and, whether he will explain the meaning of this Rule?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Sir, the rule to which the hon. Member refers is, I find, identical in the English and Irish prison rules; but I am bound to say that I am not surprised at his asking its meaning, as I confess I was unable myself to make head or tail of it when my attention was first called to the matter, and it certainly is not by any means happily expressed. What, however, I am now led to understand the interpretation to be is, that in the case of a sentence of one month or less, every prisoner—unless excused upon medical grounds—is required to sleep upon a plank bed during the whole period of his sentence; and also that in the case of sentences exceeding one month, the prisoner may be required to sleep upon a plank bed during a period amounting in the aggregate to one month; but that such period need not necessarily be the first month of the sentence, nor, so far as I can see, need the month be a consecutive period. The latter part of the rule is accordingly framed in order to enable a remission of its provisions to be made in the case of well-conducted prisoners whose sentences extend beyond one month. As some misconception appears to have arisen upon the subject of bed-clothing, I may, perhaps, as well add that an adequate supply is invariably furnished to the plank beds, and that it is not the case that prisoners are compelled to sleep in their day clothes.

## PUBLIC HEALTH—SMALL-POX.

### QUESTION.

Dr. CAMERON asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to statements in the "Herts and Essex Observer" of July 13th and 20th, according to which a man named Carter, since dead of small pox, was allowed, while prostrated by that disease, to lie from half-past seven in the morning till five in the afternoon of the 11th July, in the public highway near Hadham Cross; whether it is a fact, as stated by Mr. Garrett, that a number of children were allowed to congregate round the patient; and, whether he will order an investigation to be instituted into the case, and, meanwhile, direct that the children, and others exposed to the infection should be placed under observation, and steps taken, as far as possible, to prevent the spread of the disease?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he had inquired into this case, and the result was that he been informed by the sanitary authority that on the morning of the 10th the man Carter, feeling unwell, applied to the medical officer of the district, who saw him, and had no reason to suppose that anything serious was the matter with him. The following morning, however, the man fell down on the roadside, and was allowed to remain there a very long time, as some time was necessarily lost in procuring an ambulance from the workhouse, which was four miles distant, and as, unfortunately, the people in the neighbourhood were unwilling to lend a vehicle for his removal. The Union officers provided suitable covering for him, and supplied him with tea and brandy, before removing him to the workhouse. It was true that while the man lay by the roadside a number of children congregated around him; but as it was not known who they were or whence they came, it was impossible to have them placed under observation to prevent, so far as they were concerned, the spread of the disease. The Guardians had, however, taken the necessary steps to have the house where the man lived, and its furniture, disinfected. Under these circumstances, he did not think that any further investigation was necessary.

## ARMY — THE AUXILIARY FORCES — RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS.

### QUESTION.

Mr. HAYTER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he proposes to put in force Paragraphs 15 and 16, Clause 9, of the General Regulations for the Retirement of Officers of the Auxiliary Forces, dated War Office, May 28th 1872, by which officers above sixty years of age are to be called upon to resign their Commissions, unless specially recommended by the General Officer Commanding the District, such recommendation, in the absence of any counter report, to continue in force for five years; and, whether any officers drawing full pay of Her Majesty's Forces, are allowed to hold any Commission, except that of Honorary Colonel, in the Auxiliary Forces?

**COLONEL STANLEY**, in reply, said, that in the Militia the regulations were strictly enforced. As far as the Yeomanry and Volunteers were concerned, the recommendations of the commanding officers were fully considered. A few officers on full pay were allowed to hold supernumerary commissions in the Yeomanry, when it was thought to be for the advantage of the Service.

### PUBLIC BUSINESS — ADMIRALTY AND WAR OFFICE (RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS) BILL.—QUESTION.

**CAPTAIN PIM** asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, considering the lateness of the Session and the importance of having a comprehensive scheme for the re-organisation of the Admiralty, he will consent to postpone the Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) Bill until next Session; and, whether there is any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the name, age, salary, and length of service of the Civil Servants under the Admiralty, specifying the branch in which they are serving, whether in a dockyard or elsewhere; and also Copies of all Petitions from Admiralty Civil Servants forwarded since 1870, with the Minutes of the Superintendents thereon and the replies thereto?

**MR. W. H. SMITH**, in reply, said, the measure referred to in the Question of his hon. and gallant Friend was very important to the Public Service, and any delay would be serious both to the War and Admiralty Departments. He, therefore, hoped the House would find time to pass the Bill into law this Session. Certainly, the Government would lose no opportunity of pushing it forward. He did not see that any advantage would be derived from laying on the Table any of the Returns asked for by his hon. and gallant Friend. Some of them were confidential, and could not be made public; others would involve considerable labour and expense, and could not possibly be issued in time to be of use in connection with the present Bill.

### COLONIAL MARRIAGE LAW — WESTERN AUSTRALIA — NATAL. QUESTION.

**MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies (with reference to an answer given by the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 18th of January last), Whether the Bill passed by the Colonial Legislature of Western Australia for legalising marriage with a deceased's wife's sister, which, having been amended according to the suggestions of the Law Officers of the Crown, was received at the Colonial Office on the 22nd of October 1877, has now received Her Majesty's Assent, and, if not, what is the reason of the delay; whether a similar Bill has been received from Natal, and whether the Royal Assent has been given to such Bill; and, whether similar Bills have been received from any other Colonies besides those whose Bills have received the Royal Assent?

**SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH**: Sir, the Bill passed by the Colonial Legislature of Western Australia for legalizing marriage with a deceased's wife's sister has received Her Majesty's Assent. No similar Bill has been received from any other Colony except Natal, and the Royal Assent has not been given to that measure. It was the first occasion on which a South African Legislature had passed such a Bill; the measure was opposed by considerable and increasing minorities on its various stages, and was finally only carried by the Speaker's casting vote. Under these circumstances, I did not consider myself justified in advising Her Majesty to sanction the establishment for the first time of a different law in Natal from the rest of South Africa on a subject like marriage, as to which it is obviously important that the law in neighbouring communities should be uniform, and which was, doubtless, on this account included by the South Africa Act of 1877 among the subjects to which the legislative authority of the Union Parliament should extend, in the event of the union of the South African Colonies under one Government. The matter is, therefore, left open for further consideration in the Colony.

### SUGAR CONVENTION — REFINING SUGAR IN BOND.—QUESTION.

**MR. J. STEWART** asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government are urging the Governments of France, Belgium, and Holland to adopt a system of refining sugar in bond in lieu of the present system, which operates as a bounty on the export of refined sugar?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, Her Majesty's Government have never omitted any occasion to urge upon the Governments mentioned by the hon. Member the expediency of adopting a system of refining in bond. Negotiations have been going on for some time; but, as is well known, the negotiations have come to an end in consequence of the Dutch Government having refused to adopt the system.

Mr. RITCHIE gave Notice that, on an early day next Session, he would call the attention of the House to the subject of the bounty on refined sugars, and move a Resolution to the effect that a countervailing duty should be levied on all sugar imported from countries in which the system of refining was such as practically to confer a bounty on the export of refined sugar, such countervailing duty to be an exact equivalent to the bounty.

## THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—THE NEGOTIATIONS.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: In the absence of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Goschen) I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, before the debate on the Resolutions of the noble Lord the Member for the Radnor Boroughs, he will place the House in possession of fuller information with regard to the negotiations between Her Majesty's Government and the Porte which resulted in the Anglo-Turkish Convention, by laying Papers upon the Table of the House showing what communications passed between the two Governments with reference to that Convention?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: As I stated the other day, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London, the despatch of the 30th May, which is on the Table of the House, was in substance telegraphed some days previously. That was the first communication which passed between the two Governments with respect to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, and the answer to that despatch is the despatch from Mr. Layard under date of June 5, which is also upon the Table of the House. There have been some telegraphic communications since upon matters of detail, and these can be presented, and will be presented immediately.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Are we to understand that there have been no despatches—nothing except telegraphic communications?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER was understood to say there were none.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN — BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.—QUESTION.

Dr. KENEALY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question, of which I have given him private Notice—Whether he will lay upon the Table before or on Monday next a Copy of the treaty or engagement between the Emperors of Austria, Germany, and Russia alluded to by Lord Derby in a speech last Thursday, in which he is reported to have said—

> "I do not believe that the cession of these two Provinces, Bosnia and Herzegovina, could have been prevented. I will only notice as a curious fact that, although, as I understood it, the annexation was proposed by the British Representatives at the Congress, yet we well knew that their transfer to Austria was part of the original engagement between the three Emperors entered into some five years ago."

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I received a few hours ago an intimation from the hon. Gentleman of this Question. I can only say, in answer to it, that Her Majesty's present Advisers have no knowledge of any such engagement as that which Lord Derby is reported to have mentioned; but if the hon. Gentleman will give Notice of his Question for another day, the Records of the Foreign Office shall be searched, to ascertain if any evidence of it is to be found.

Dr. KENEALY: I shall repeat the Question to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to point out to the hon. Member that he is not in Order in referring to a debate in the House of Lords in the present Session.

Dr. KENEALY: I beg your pardon, Sir. I said "in a speech last Thursday." I studiously avoided referring to the House of Lords in my Question.

## INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of the Government to state to-day the names of the Commissioners under the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I cannot name the Board of Commissioners to be appointed under the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill until that Bill has passed through Committee. The names shall be communicated to the House before it has parted with the Bill—at its next stage.

## LAW AND JUSTICE—THE SCOTCH JUDICIAL BENCH—LORD CRAIGHILL.

### QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Lord Advocate a Question of which he had given him private Notice, as to the judicial arrangements in Scotland—Whether his attention has been called to information which appeared in the Scotch Papers, to the effect that Lord Craighill had not only carried out his threat of shutting up his Court at half-past 2 because the Government had not thought fit to fill up a particular office, but had suspended until the winter a case which had been under consideration for three days, and in which a number of witnesses had appeared; and, whether, in view of the great inconvenience to the public caused by those proceedings, the Government intended to take any action in the matter?

THE LORD ADVOCATE: Sir, it is, of course, the intention of the Government to make arrangements for the efficient performance of the duties of clerk to the Lord Ordinary. Under the provisions of the Statute 1 & 2 *Vict.* c. 118 there are two clerks attached to each Lord Ordinary, and it is the duty of one of them to leave at about 2 o'clock for the purpose of attending in his office; but the Act provides that it shall be competent for the Lord President of either Division, on application by any Lord Ordinary, to direct that any of the clerks in any Division, or any person receiving compensation or retiring allowance under this Act, shall discharge such duties in the absence of any such clerk, or if the state of business before the Lord Ordinary shall render his service necessary. I think it is to be regretted that any inconvenience should have been occasioned to the public on this occasion, looking to the fact that the Court rose for the Long Vacation on Saturday last, and that there should have been no difficulty in furnishing the Lord Ordinary with a sufficient staff on the day this resolution was come to by him.

## PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SATURDAY SITTING.

### QUESTIONS.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD: As this is the 25th July, and there are 30 Orders, of which 22 or 23 are Government Orders, on the Paper, I think it is not unreasonable to ask for some information from the Government as to which of these measures it is intended to proceed with.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I think the Question is one which is rather abruptly put. It is necessary to see first what progress is made with the Business immediately before us before I am able to answer the Question.

MR. CLARE READ: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman, If there is any intention to ask the House to sit on Saturday?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think it is not improbable we may have to take that course; but it depends upon the progress we make with the Bills immediately before us, especially with the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill and the Cattle Bill. I hope, before the end of the evening, I shall be able to announce whether we shall require the House to sit on Saturday or not.

MR. ONSLOW: If we sit on Saturday morning, Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with any private Member's Bill?

## THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN AGREEMENT—PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

### QUESTION.

MR. GLADSTONE: Since I gave my Notice of Motion a few minutes ago an Answer has been given to a Question put by my noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) which bears upon the question; and as I wish not unnecessarily to trouble the House, I am very desirous to know whether I understood correctly what fell from him. I understood him, in answer to my noble Friend, not to intimate an objection on the part of the Government to the production of the Agreement between Count Schouvaloff and Lord Salisbury, but to say that application had been made for the consent of certain Powers, without whose consent the Paper could not, according to usage and rule, be produced, and that one of the Powers had declined to consent, and that, consequently, Her Majesty's Government were not responsible for withholding it. In that case, I should not think it right to make the Motion of which I gave Notice.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Perhaps I may say that my hon. Friend's Answer had reference not to that particular Paper, but to other Papers which, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, are necessary.

MR. GLADSTONE: Papers illustrative of it?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Yes; but the objection does not proceed from Her Majesty's Government, but from another Government.

MR. GLADSTONE: Then I shall not make the Motion of which I gave Notice.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.

Message from Her Majesty [23rd July], Order for Committee thereupon read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE rose to move, as an Amendment—

> "That the consideration of Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be deferred until there be laid before this House a Return showing in tabular form (1) the Princes; (2) the Princesses of the Blood Royal, being Members of the Royal Family of England (excluding the Sovereign for the time being and Queens Consort or Dowager), from the accession of His Most Gracious Majesty King William the Third to the present time; specifying, with regard to such of them as succeeded to the throne, the date of such accession, and, with regard to such of them as contracted marriages with the consent of the Sovereign for the time being, the date of each such marriage; and also showing separately, with regard to every Prince or Princess, the several applications (if any) made to Parliament for grants, or confirmations of grants, out of the public revenues, and the results of such applications, adding in each case a Copy of the Royal Message by which such application to Parliament was made."

The hon. Baronet said, he had expected that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have made his statement on the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair. He believed that in the case of the Royal Message with reference to the Duke of Edinburgh the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was made on the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: It is not usual.] The applications to Parliament to make provision for the younger children of our Kings were so largely motived upon precedent that, believing, as he did, that there were no precedents earlier than those of the present Reign which would apply to the present case, he had ventured to place upon the Paper a Notice which called for the production of documents which would show whether there were precedents or whether there were not. In the absence of these Papers, he would do his best to prove that the applications in the cases of the Dukes of Edinburgh and Connaught were wholly without precedent. He might briefly dispose of the cases before the accession of the Hanoverian line by saying that in those times there were no precedents to be found. Coming to the Hanoverian line, George I. had only one son. Here, then, there was no precedent. George II. had two sons—namely, Frederick Prince of Wales and the Duke of Cumberland. The Duke of Cumberland died unmarried, and hence in this reign, too, there was no precedent to be found. Frederick Prince of Wales had four sons, of whom the eldest succeeded to the Throne. One of the remaining three died unmarried, and two married without application to Parliament. One of these latter left no issue; the other, the Duke of Gloucester, left an only son, who married his first cousin, the daughter of George III., no application to Parliament for money being made. The King informed Parliament of the marriage in 1816, and in 1817 a congratulatory Address was voted, but the House was not asked to go into Committee of Supply. He came now to the sons of George III., and in their cases his contention was that it could be proved that no application was made in connection with the marriage of any younger son, except with the direct view of providing for the succession to the Crown. The first of the sons of George III. who married was Frederick, Duke of York, in 1791. No provision was made for him in the year of his marriage; but in the year after the marriage an application to Parliament was made. The Duke of York was the second son of George III. It was distinctly stated in the House of his elder brother, the Prince of Wales, by Sir Matthew White Ridley, the great grandfather of his hon. Friend now sitting on the other side of the House, that he "entertained no idea of marrying;" and, as a fact, it was well known to every Member of the House of Commons that, on account of a morganatic alliance which he had contracted, this was true. None of the other sons of George III. were married, and the provision made for the Duke of York in the year after his marriage was, therefore, a direct provision for the succession to the Crown. There was every human probability at that time that the Throne would be occupied by the issue of that marriage of the Duke of York. But, luckily, he was not left to draw inferences from the facts, but he had the direct admission of the responsible Minister of the day. Mr. Pitt, when proposing the Vote, had made use of words which entirely confirmed his view. Mr. Pitt distinctly said—

> "He did not think the present Motion would establish a principle or precedent. . . In his mind it was necessary that the House should take into consideration the degree of probability that the succession to the Crown might be involved in the transaction."

So much for the so-called precedent of the Duke of York. The view of Mr. Pitt had been confirmed by the events of 1815. On the marriage of a younger son of George III., the Duke of Cumberland, Lord Castlereagh proposed an allowance because there was only the life of the Princess Charlotte between his future children and the Throne. A very hot debate ensued. Sir Matthew White Ridley said there was no precedent. Mr. Wynn said—

> "The noble Lord had talked of precedents; what precedent was there of such a vote to a Prince of the blood on his marriage, except the single instance of the Duke of York? Were the cases in the slightest degree parallel?"—[1 *Hansard*, xxxi. 1031.]

The result of the debate upon the Resolution had been a majority of 17 for the Government and for the grant. On the Report, Mr. Gordon had asked what special reason there existed for this grant? He declared that the Duke of York's case "had been proved unanswerably to be no precedent," and said that it did not follow that any King's son should on marriage obtain an augmentation of the allowance which Parliament had granted when he became of age. He moved that the Resolution be reported on that day three months, and the Government beat him only by a reduced majority. On the second reading of the Bill on the 3rd of July, 1815, it was rejected by the House. Three years afterwards the project was revived, and on the 15th of April, 1818, that Bill was rejected by the House. He might point out that in both the cases to which he had made allusion the treaty of marriage had been laid upon the Table of the House before the money was applied for, and in both the cases the money was only asked for after the marriage had been solemnized. On the 28th of June, 1815, Lord Castlereagh distinctly said that—

> "It had never been the custom, and he hoped it never would, to submit such a question to Parliament before the marriage was solemnized, for obvious reasons of delicacy and propriety."—[*Ibid.* 1029.]

He came now to the last of the so-called precedents. He referred to the marriages of the Dukes of Clarence, Kent, and Cambridge, in 1818. The fact that the three marriages were solemnized at once was the best evidence that what was in view was the pre-eminent State necessity for establishing the succession to the Crown. George III. had not a single grandchild living, and on the sudden death of his only grandchild, his sons, who were then men past the middle age, had been requested by the Ministry to marry for the highest reasons of State. Before the grant was made, absolutely different as it was in principle from that now before them, and far less indefensible, a detailed account of the income from all sources of the Royal Dukes for whom increased allowances were asked was laid upon the Table of the House. As the 1818 case had been quoted by the right hon. Member for Greenwich as a precedent, it was at least worthy of careful investigation by the House. On the 13th of April a Royal Message had been sent to the House, which stated that—

> "After the afflicting calamity which the nation have sustained in the loss of his Royal Highness's beloved and only child, the Princess Charlotte, his Royal Highness is fully persuaded that the House of Commons will feel how essential it is to the best interests of the country that his Royal Highness should be able to make a suitable provision for such of his Royal Highness's brothers as shall have contracted marriage with the consent of the Crown."

He then asked their aid—

> "To enable him to make the necessary arrangements for this important purpose."—[1 *Hansard*, xxxvii. 1296.]

Was it necessary to go beyond the Message to show what the "precedent" was worth? On the receipt of the Royal Message by the House, a Motion was made and carried for

> "A Return of all incomes received by the Royal Dukes from military, naval, or civil appointments pensions, or other emoluments," &c.

This Return was laid upon the Table on the 20th of April, 1818. In support of the Motion, Lord Brougham had said—

> "The House was bound to consider the means which each possessed to answer that purpose, before any additional grant was acceded to."—[1 *Hansard*, xxxviii. 12.]

In the House of Lords, Lord Liverpool, the Prime Minister, had used, in order to show that the case was no precedent, words still more clear and emphatic than were even those of the Royal Message. Lord Liverpool's words were these—

> "In considering the question which would hereafter arise, their Lordships would have to look at the nature of the case to be provided for. They all recollected the great and deep calamity in November last, in the death of her Royal Highness Princess Charlotte . . . and the general question which everyone asked himself and asked his neighbour was—how will this event operate on the succession to the Crown? This was a question which naturally arose from the state of the Royal Family. His Majesty, they all knew, had been blessed with a numerous issue; but it was singular that, of the 12 living descendants of his Majesty, seven Princes and five Princesses, the youngest Prince was now 44 years of age, and there was not one of the Princesses under 40. When he stated this circumstance, and that there was at present no descendant from any of the married branches of the family, he thought their Lordships would not think it unadvisable to take measures to guard against any unfortunate contingency which might arise with regard to the succession. The situation in which the Royal Family stood with respect to issue must surely be regarded as an object to which it was the duty of the executive government to pay attention."—[*Ibid.*, 53.]

In the present case these words did not apply. They were words which Lord Liverpool distinctly used of all three cases, and, as they did not apply, the so-called precedent was worthless. In the debate which followed Lord King repeated that Mr. Pitt in 1792 had over and over again declared that it was not intended that the Duke of York's case should be considered a warrant for a similar step at any future time—"he had distinctly guarded it from being drawn into a precedent." Lord Lansdowne also contended that these succession cases formed no precedent, and added—

> "The marriage of any member of the royal family ought always to be a subject of joy and congratulation with the whole nation; but it would cease to be so, if upon all occasions such an event was to be attended with new and grievous impositions."—[*Ibid.*, 64.]

Lord Holland, Lord Althorp, and many others of great authority, denied that Parliament ought ever to be called upon to make fresh provision for the younger sons of Kings upon their marriage. Mr. Plunkett made a magnificent speech in the same sense. The contention of the Tories in 1818 was that cases where the succession was in view were no precedent. The contention of the Whigs was that in no case whatever ought additional provision to be made for younger sons upon their marriage, and the Whigs voted against the provision even for the popular Whig Duke of Kent. Both sides agreed that no additional provision should be made on marriage in such a case as the present, where the succession was not in view. Lord Castlereagh, in defending the grant, declared that the Royal Dukes stood out for the provision, and would not otherwise marry. He then went on—

> "It would be felt how desirable it was that the succession should be continued by a line of British princes. . . . Though the hopes of securing a regular succession were not closed, all the Members of the Royal Family were so advanced in life, that he was sure that neither the Legislature nor the country would wish any unneces-

sary delay to take place in the adoption of measures calculated to secure so desirable an object. . . . To excite some of the Members of the Royal Family to marriage was now an object of much importance to the country. . . . A single marriage would not satisfy the anxiety of the people on the subject of the succession—though, if those illustrious persons were less advanced in life, the case would be different. The Prince Regent had, in consequence, offered to such as should enter upon marriages with the consent of the Crown, to propose to Parliament to make such provision for them as would be consistent with public economy."—[1 *Hansard*, xxxviii. 79-80.]

Mr. Canning went so far as to assure the House that—

> "With respect to his Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence, he could assure the House that his Royal Highness would not have thought of contracting this marriage, it would never have entered into his contemplation to engage in this alliance, if it had not been pressed upon him as an act of public duty . . . for the purpose of providing for the succession to the Throne."—[*Ibid.* 107-8.]

Lord Castlereagh was beaten on the amount. He had proposed the same sum as was now proposed—namely, £10,000 per year additional to the Duke of Clarence, and £6,000 a-year each to the other Dukes. The Duke of Cumberland having been married three years before, and there being, therefore, no question of tempting him to marry in order to provide for the succession of the Crown, the provision proposed for him was rejected by the House. The £10,000 a-year for the Duke of Clarence was reduced by the House to £6,000, and the Whig Party voted against any provision at all in the cases of the Dukes of Cambridge, Clarence, and Kent. He thought he had shown that there existed no precedent for this grant earlier than that of 1873; and as to that he and his Friends were clear, for they had voted against that grant. He considered that he had already made an amply sufficient case for resisting the proposed grant. But there was another case behind. In 1873 there were debates in the House upon the Crown Private Estates Bill, which became an Act; upon that Bill two important Amendments had been moved—one providing that as the Crown, which had been formerly debarred from holding private property in land, had now by a succession of Acts, of which the last were those of 1862 and 1873, been allowed to hold it, it was desirable that the analogy of the Duchy of Lancaster case should be followed, and accounts of receipts and disbursements should be laid before Parliament. The other provided that, in view of the altered circumstances created by these Acts, the secrecy at present attaching exclusively to Royal wills and testaments should be put an end to. On that occasion Mr. Bouverie made a most important speech, and he voted with the Radicals against the Bill and for all the Amendments that were moved. Mr. Bouverie pointed out on that occasion that in future all applications to Parliament during the continuance of a Reign would be met, if not by the statement that the Crown possessed sufficient property to make it unnecessary that it should come to Parliament, at all events by the contention that it was possible that the Crown possessed such property, and by a demand for information. That demand for information he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) over and over again had made, just as Lord Brougham had made it in 1850. That demand for information had been refused in 1850 to Lord Brougham, as it had been refused to himself in 1872 and 1873. Now, this fact bore upon the present application in several different ways. In all the older Royal Messages the King used to be made to say that his application was based upon the consideration "that he was restrained by the laws now in being from making provision for his younger children." These laws were so strictly observed, that when the Hanoverian Kings made provisions for their younger children out of their own Civil List, they always came to Parliament for confirmation of the grant, which explained the words alluding to confirmations in the Return for which he moved. His second case, then, was that the form of the Royal Message was necessarily different in the present case from the form of the Royal Message in the case of the applications which had been made to Parliament in the last century. By the passing of the three Acts relating to the private estates of the Crown, without any provision for the publication of accounts, and with the retention of the secrecy of the Royal will and testament, the position of matters had been so greatly changed that it was impossible for Parliament to know whether the Crown was or was not in a position to make provision for the younger children of the King for the time being. He had, he thought, shown in the first part of his speech that there was no precedent; in the second place, he had shown that if there had been it would not apply. The hon. Baronet concluded by moving his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the consideration of Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be deferred until there be laid before this House a Return showing in tabular form (1) the Princes; (2) the Princesses of the Blood Royal, being Members of the Royal Family of England (excluding the Sovereign for the time being and Queens Consort or Dowager), from the accession of His Most Gracious Majesty King William the Third to the present time; specifying, with regard to such of them as succeeded to the throne, the date of such accession, and, with regard to such of them as contracted marriages with the consent of the Sovereign for the time being, the date of each such marriage; and also showing separately, with regard to every Prince or Princess, the several applications (if any) made to Parliament for grants, or confirmations of grants, out of the public revenues, and the results of such applications, adding in each case a Copy of the Royal Message by which such application to Parliament was made,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*,)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the hon. Baronet in the first observations which he made expressed some surprise that I did not begin by making a statement as to the proposals which it is my intention to submit to the House when it has gone into Commitee, and he intimated an opinion that it would have been more in accordance with precedent if I had done so. I wish to correct him on that point. I think it is in accordance with almost invariable precedent that these statements have been made to the House in Committee; and, so much so, that I observe, looking to some former precedents, that on one occasion, when Lord Londonderry, I think it was, made a Motion of this kind, with the Speaker in the Chair, he was interrupted, and he apologized to the House for having brought forward in the Whole House what ought to have been brought forward in Committee. It will be seen, therefore, that it was more strictly in accordance with precedent and my duty that I should move that you, Sir, do leave the Chair, and then make my proposals when the House was in Committee. I shall still so far adhere to that principle that I will not attempt now to make any distinct proposal to the House; but I will so far clear the ground as to intimate that the proposals I shall have to make will be of the same character and to the same extent as were made in the case of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. Now, with reference to these proposals the hon. Baronet has stated that when last the question was mooted by my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich, he rested his argument entirely, or almost entirely, on precedent. The hon. Baronet, in taking up that point, has endeavoured to show that precedents of preceding Reigns are against the course which was followed on that occasion, and which he presumed, and rightly presumed, would be followed on this occasion. But I would venture to demur to that description of the argument which was used at the time when the Vote for the Duke of Edinburgh was proposed. I do not think that the argument did rest entirely upon precedent; and, so far as it did rest on precedent, I think it rested on precedent of a character to which the argument of the hon. Baronet is not altogether properly applicable. The argument which was then put forward, and the argument which I should principally rely upon on the present occasion, rests not upon ancient precedent, but rather upon the reason of the case as we now in these days have it before us. It is very difficult, indeed, in the situation of the Crown and its financial relations to the people, to compare the cases of application for grants to younger sons or other children of Sovereigns in former times with the circumstances under which we find ourselves at present placed. Because, if you are to compare the position of the Crown in the Reign of George II. or George III., or even of George IV., with that of the Crown at the present time, it will be necessary to take into account the circumstances of the Crown, the amount of the hereditary revenues, the amount of the Crown property, and the amount of the Civil List itself; and it will be obvious that the change which has been gradually taking place since the Revolution, and which was really only completed at the time of the accession of her present Majesty, has completely revolutionized the conditions of these grants. It is not sufficient to say that there are differences between the circumstances under which the grants were asked for in former years and those which at present exist without taking those changes into consideration. We know, as a matter of history, that in former times the Crown might almost be said to have contracted with Parliament for carrying on the civil government of the country, and large grants were made to the Crown with that view, and large services were then charged to the Civil List which are not so charged now. Of late years, from time to time, one or other of those services has been removed from the Civil List, and the Civil List itself has been proportionately reduced. For instance, the salaries of the Judges used to be charged to the Civil List, and there were several other charges which have now been removed from it. Now, what is the net result of these changes as regards the personal income of the Sovereign? I will compare, as was done by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich on a former occasion, the personal income of the Sovereign now with that of George IV. The total Civil List of George IV. was £845,000. There were certain public charges then laid upon that List which are now removed, these amounting to £315,000. Therefore, King George IV. had, for the purposes for which Her Majesty's Civil List is now settled, an income of £530,000; whereas Her Majesty has for precisely the same purposes £385,000, or about £150,000 less than George IV. had. Therefore, we must bear in mind what the circumstances of Her Majesty are in that particular. Then there is another matter on which I may just say one or two words. The House will bear in mind that in all these matters, as has been frequently stated, there has been something in the nature of a bargain between the Crown and Parliament, by which the Crown, surrendering the various hereditary revenues and Crown Lands to the public service, has in exchange received fixed sums which have been granted; and, undoubtedly, upon a comparison of what the Sovereign might have received with the amount which the Sovereign did receive out of that transaction, it is not the Crown but the nation which has been largely the gainer. This is shown by an interesting Return which was moved for at the commencement of the present Reign. Sir Robert Inglis moved for a Return showing what was the net result of these transactions between the years 1762 and 1837, and it was there found that the amount of the hereditary revenues which the Crown might have enjoyed was £116,000,000, whereas the amount of the Civil List was £69,000,000, showing a balance of £47,000,000 to the nation as against the Crown at that time. Since that time the public revenues from the Crown Lands have largely increased. They now amount to more than a total of the Civil List, or to about £410,000 a-year, while the Civil List is under £400,000; so that the position of the Sovereign is relatively less favourable now than in the last Reign, because the Civil List has diminished, while the hereditary revenues have increased. But then the hon. Baronet speaks about these allowances or grants made to the younger children of the Sovereign, and says there is no precedent whatever for any grant being asked for on the marriage of a younger son of the Sovereign except with direct reference to the succession to the Crown. I am not prepared to discuss that point with him, and I am not prepared to deny that in most, if not all, of the cases to which he has referred some reference was made to that point; but I am prepared to deny that the arguments turned, as he says, entirely upon that question. Certainly, in one of the cases—a case in which the grant was refused—that was not the point on which the argument took place. But, Sir, I do not wish to go into matters of that kind. I wish to point this out—that, at all events, the principle of making grants to Members of the Royal Family is one that has been long in existence. The first grant was made earlier, I think, than the hon. Baronet said—I refer to the grant to the Duke of Cumberland, son of George II.——

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: But that grant was not made on his marriage.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, not on his marriage; but that I do not dwell so much upon. According to the hon. Baronet's argument, it might be possible to contend that no grants ought to be made to the sons of the Sovereign; and if we adopted that principle, of course we should stand in a very different position. But I maintain that from the days of George II. downwards there have always been grants made of a certain amount and of a considerable amount to younger branches of the Royal Family irrespective of their prospects of succession to the Throne, and these have varied very much in amount. I think, in the case to which reference has just been made, the grant at the time when the addition was asked for was considerably greater than the grant now given to the younger sons of the Sovereign before their marriage. The Duke of Cumberland was in receipt of £18,000 a-year at the time when the proposal for an additional grant was refused. Certainly there were cases in which as much as £18,000 a-year had been granted, and in which this provision had been made while the Princes remained unmarried. If you admit the principle that any grant of that kind is to be made, then on what ground is it to be made? It is with the view of enabling a Member of the Royal Family to support a proper state and dignity, and to defray the various expenses necessarily connected with his position. It seems to stand to reason if that is the case, and if it is right to make such a grant, you must in fairness and reason take into consideration whether you have to deal with one who is single or with one who is married. I could undertake to point out to the hon. Baronet in the debates to which he has referred many passages in which it is said that if it was thought that so much should be given to a Prince when single it was right that he should get so much more when married; for otherwise either the grant given to him as a single person was too large, or else he would be unable to marry, unless he was to marry for the purpose of obtaining a large addition to his income, which I do not think, with a view to the happiness and character of the Royal Family, is an argument which anyone would like to urge. Well, the position which was taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was this—that there was an understanding—an unwritten understanding, undoubtedly, but still an understanding, founded on reason, and which had been entirely justified by the course pursued throughout Her Majesty's Reign—that some provision should be made for Her Majesty's children as they attained to years when they went out into the world and became their own masters. When proposals were made for giving certain annuities to those Princes who had attained their majority, it was either distinctly or by inference proposed that these grants should be made during the time when a Prince remained single, and that a further sum should be given when he married. That was distinctly done, and said in so many words, on the occasion of the coming of age of the Duke of Edinburgh. When the grant of £15,000 a-year was asked for, it was distinctly stated that whenever His Royal Highness contracted marriage a further sum would be asked for; and the reason given was that if the sum asked for would suffice for married life it would be too much and could not reasonably be asked for. When the original grant for Prince Arthur was asked for I forget whether the same notice was so distinctly given. ["No!"] Well, it might not have been so distinctly given; but it was asked for with this distinct observation—that there was no reason whatever why Prince Arthur should not receive the same grant from Parliament as had been accorded to the Duke of Edinburgh. I remember perfectly well that these words were used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time; and, of course, when it was said that Prince Arthur should receive the same amount of grant as Prince Alfred had received, it was understood that the reservation made in the one case should apply also to the other. I think that, under all the circumstances, it would be difficult indeed to show that that was an unreasonable arrangement. The arguments put forward so well by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone), as to the relations which it was desirable to encourage between Her Majesty and her people, the reasons which rendered it desirable that some provision should be made, and that that provision should be made at the time when the sons attained their majority and when they contracted marriages, and that they should not be made prematurely independent of the Sovereign—all these reasons must be fresh in the recollection of the House, and I think all these reasons are in full force to-day, when we are asking Parliament for a grant in a case where there are no circumstances whatever to distinguish it unfavourably from those in which similar grants were given before. When those recent applications were made it was no question of successions to the Throne that was involved. It was no question of immediate succession to the Throne, happily, which induced Parliament to make the grant on the occasion of the marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh. And similarly it is in no immediate reference, happily, to the succession to the Throne that a proposal will be made to the House to-day. The grant will be asked for now on behalf of the Duke of Connaught because he stands on the same footing as his brother —because the same reasons exist in the one case as existed in the other; and I am sure this is a case in which His Royal Highness has endeared himself to all with whom he has come into communication. He has been brought into communication with the people, not only within the limits of these Islands, but also in other parts of Her Majesty's Dominions, where his presence was received with the kindliest feeling, and where it contributed not a little to improve the good relations between the Mother Country and the Colonies; because, too, His Royal Highness is about to contract a marriage which is distinctly, and above all things, a marriage of affection. It is entirely a marriage of affection, and not one dictated by political reasons such as those which the hon. Gentleman has quoted and referred to; and I think that, under these circumstances, it can hardly be expected that this House would so far depart from what has been done on former occasions, or set itself so much against what I am convinced are the feelings of the people of the whole nation, as now to set a new example in the direction to which the hon. Baronet points. This is a proposal which, having reference either to the pecuniary and national relations of the Crown to the people, or to the domestic relations of which I have spoken, will, I am sure, command the general assent of the country; and although I do not at all dispute the right of the hon. Baronet to call attention to these matters and challenge, as strongly as he pleases, the relations between the Crown and Parliament, I am convinced that we shall not now be prevented from accomplishing the act which the House is about to be invited to perform.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, that a fallacy ran through the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, from which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not wholly free. It was true that Parliament now dealt with the hereditary revenues of the Crown — namely, the Customs and Excise, the Post Office, and so on; and why? Because Her Majesty of her own free will chose to exchange those revenues for a Civil List. But Her Majesty only did so for her own life—it was the act of the Sovereign, not of the Crown—and when another Sovereign ascended the Throne, which he hoped would not be in his life-time, then the Crown Lands and the other hereditary revenues would revert to the Crown. But the sons and daughters of the Sovereign must have bread to eat; and if Parliament denied them the means, then another Sovereign on coming to the Throne might refuse to enter into such an agreement as that which subsisted between Parliament and the present Sovereign, and would provide those means out of the hereditary revenues. Now, up to 1688—["Oh, oh!"] A Conservative Member interrupted; but the interruption showed that he had neither Conservative feeling nor Tory knowledge. If he had, he would know that the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea began his precedents exactly where they told in his favour, and did not touch those which told eminently against him. He spoke of the Act of this Reign, which enabled the Queen to hold landed property of her own; and, on this ground, he said no precedents could be found in former Reigns; but he did not go back to 40 *Geo.* III. c. 88, nor did he refer to the Act of the 1st of Queen Anne. If he had, he would have reasoned on it, and found that until the Revolution of 1688 the Crown enjoyed all its Crown Lands and hereditary revenues subject to certain charges of administration. When William III. came to the Throne he cared nothing for England, and told Parliament to manage the Crown Lands and take some of the hereditary revenues into its hands, only giving him a Civil List and enough to carry on his foreign war. That was the origin of the Civil List, and William III. got £315,000 a-year. He then came to the year 1777, when the Civil List amounted to £900,000, though in those days the King paid some such items as those for the Judges and the Ambassadors, the latter costing £10,000 a-year. During that Reign, however, no matter what the precise outgoings might be, the Civil List was £900,000. In the time of William IV. the Civil List was relieved of all expenses of administration, and amounted to £510,000. Now, with reference to the Reign of Her present Majesty, there was a Return made in the year 1837, on the Motion of Sir Robert Inglis, and laid on the Table of the House, which was very curious reading. In his mention of that Return the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a mistake, and a mistake againt his own argument. The Return excluded the Crown Lands, and took in only the hereditary revenues of the Sovereign—such as Customs, Excise, the Post Office, certain Fees, &c. He found on inspection that the total amount of hereditary revenues alone between the years 1760 and 1837 was, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated, £116,784,816; while the total of the Civil List, according to the Return, was £69,385,031; so that on the hereditary revenues alone the Crown had lost, in round numbers, £47,400,000. But there was also the income from Crown Lands to be added. He had made a search, and had been unable to discover the total revenues of the Crown Lands; but he had found out the net revenue from that source during a few years, and he could state that, after all expenses had been paid, the sum actually paid into the Exchequer in 1853 was £250,000, and in 1877, £410,000. Now, if only they knew the sum for all the years from 1760 to 1837, it would have to be added to the £47,400,000 of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Her present Majesty came to the Throne in 1837; and was persuaded into resigning her hereditary revenues and Crown Lands, during her life, in exchange for a Civil List of £385,000, of which £60,000 was for her private purse, and the rest for her household. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said—"The Crown contracted with Parliament;" and he spoke of "a bargain between the Crown and Parliament." It was no such thing. It was a contract between the person of the Sovereign and the Parliament, and bound no future King. Obviously, if the Queen had not made the agreement for her lifetime, and—he must repeat it again and again—it was not for any longer period, she would not have been under the necessity of applying to Parliament for her children. She might have provided for them out of her ample revenues. It was true that she might hold private property; but that was by an Act of Parliament, passed for the very reason that the Crown Lands were alienated during the lifetime of the Crown. It was to be remembered, also, that the Crown had not descended in a direct line, so that she derived no benefit from any accumulation of private property by previous Sovereigns. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] He felt sure that the interruption did not come from the Irish Members, although it came from below the Gangway, and that they would not chose for their opposition a question so eminently Irish. [*Laughter.*] Well, the Duke of Connaught had an Irish title, and had passed much time in Ireland, and had "won golden opinions from all kinds of men." [*A laugh.*] Let the noble Lord the Member for Clare (Lord Francis Conyngham) go to his constituents and ask them whether the Duke of Connaught had not won golden opinions from the people of Ireland during his residence in that country? Did the Irish people not remember him with enthusiasm? Moreover, that Royal Duke was called Arthur, after Ireland's great hero—the Duke of Wellington. Was not the Duke of Wellington himself godfather to Prince Arthur? That Prince now bore an Irish title—an Irish Dukedom. Let Irish Members go back to their constituents and ask them whether they did not regard the Duke of Connaught as an Irish Prince? just as the Duke of Edinburgh was looked upon by the Scotch as a Scotch Prince. He could not believe, then, that any opposition would come from the hon. Members from Ireland.

Mr. ANDERSON said, that the arguments they had just heard, if they amounted to anything, amounted to this—that the Sovereign, at the beginning of the next Reign, would have the right to take from us all those properties which were called Crown estates, but which were really national estates, and he thought that hardly required answering. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had done well not to rest his case on old precedents; because, as the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had shown, there were none. He (Mr. Anderson) admitted there was one precedent for this grant created by the right hon. Member for Greenwich in 1873, and which he remembered he voted against. The right hon. Gentleman on that occasion justified the proposed Vote on the ground that when the first grant was made to the Duke of Edinburgh it was stated that, in the event of his marriage, a further sum would be asked for him; but no such statement was made when the first grant was given to Prince Arthur. The Chancellor of the Exchequer contended that all the sons of the Queen ought to be treated alike; but it seemed to him that was wrong, and proximity and possible succession to the Throne ought to make a difference: and when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich proposed the grant to the Duke of Edinburgh, no doubt he had had in his mind the subject of the succession to the Throne, as the Prince in question was the second son. Indeed, he had spoken of the propriety of the grant for the second son in his speech on that occasion, intending, evidently, to draw a distinction between the second son and his younger brothers. He had himself that day presented to the House a Petition against the proposed grant, and the wording of that Petition was somewhat remarkable. It prayed the House to refuse the grant, not entirely, but until such time as necessity for it was shown. That was the point—proof was wanted of its necessity. The common belief was that the money which was voted under the Civil List, and which was given to support the dignity of the Crown, and to extend hospitality to foreign Princes and other distinguished personages when they came to visit this country, had not been employed in the full and generous way in which it was intended to be used, and that large accumulations had been made from it. The House had been refused information as to what was done with the money. The Civil List was not given for accumulation—the House had apportioned it in classes—and it was believed that there was a surplus on several items, and that this surplus was made over to the Queen, and was not used in the way Parliament intended. He had only one complaint to make against the Royal Princes, and his complaint was, not of their personal characters, but of the circumstance that they did not do certain work. Whenever there was an occasion on which a thing might be done more gracefully by one of them than by any other of the Queen's subjects—as when some compliment had to be paid to a foreign Prince or people—they were not found ready to do that work. For example, the other day our Ally, the King of Italy, died; why was a Royal Prince not sent to represent this country at the funeral? Other nations sent their Royal Princes, and our sending only a lord in waiting had given great offence to a friendly nation. The other day the Queen of Spain died; and again a Royal Prince was not sent to attend the obsequies. The Crown of England would have been more gracefully represented in that way; friendly nations would have been propitiated instead of being slighted: but he supposed the Princes were so immersed in their own pleasures, that they could not find time—or, at all events, were not sent—to do that work which they might perform for the service of the nation.

Mr. GOLDNEY remarked that the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, while he enumerated his precedents, ought to have mentioned that the Royal Dukes of George III. were in the possession not of £15,000, but of £38,000, and yet they came to Parliament for further grants. Her present Majesty, when she gave up the whole of the hereditary revenues of the Crown at the beginning of her Reign, had relied for the support of her Throne and dignity upon the generosity of Parliament.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, if we had now been in Committee, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made his proposal to be submitted to the House, I should have left my noble Friend the Leader of the Opposition to deliver his sentiments upon that subject. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer has most properly said that the proposal ought not to be made in the House; that it ought to be made in Committee, on the principle that all grants of money should be proposed where they could be most freely and largely discussed without the limitation that attaches to debates in this House. Having heard the frequent references of the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to myself, and having been on so many former occasions engaged in submitting to the

House similar proposals, I feel it to be my duty absolutely to express my opinion upon the Amendment which my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea has now moved. If I were to consider the Amendment with respect to what it contains as a distinct and independent proposition, the principle on which it rests is one to which I can take no objection whatever. It is that full and ample information should be given to the House to enable it to discharge its duty on a question of this kind, when it arises, with the largest possible knowledge of the facts. My hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea says, for example, that if there are separate sources of income and public emoluments these ought to be made known. My hon. Friend is anxious that the income of Her Majesty, as a landed proprietor, should be made known to this House. I at once agree in the principle that if these separate emoluments were matters of serious consequence, and such as ought to weigh with the House, it would be most rational that they should be made known to us before we were called on to impose any further charge upon the people. If Her Majesty were in her personal capacity among the great proprietors of the Kingdom, I should say the House ought to be made acquainted with that before adding to the burdens of the people for the support of the Royal Family. But although we have no distinct or formal information on the subject, we know perfectly well that neither of these things is the case. Whatever ground you may take on this measure, I defy anyone to say that any adequate provision is made for Members of the Royal Family by means of any separate emolument attaching to them, professionally or otherwise, or to say that it is possible for Her Majesty to make even the meanest, the most limited, provision for them out of the means at her command. Therefore, however good this information may be, it does not bear on the question before the House. The House has to perform one of the most delicate, and in a sense one of the most difficult, of its duties. There is always something invidious in the view of a portion of the people in voting very large incomes to anybody. This is one of the subjects on which, I think, some people complain with even morbid sensitiveness when they hear of a figure involving a considerable sum of money. Therefore it is our duty, who have the responsibility in these matters—and especially of one like myself, who has been accustomed to complain, as I often do, of the small attention paid to public economy in the present day, compared to what used to be the case 30 or 40 years ago—it is our duty, it is my duty, to take full share of the responsibility of supporting Her Majesty's Government in the proposal they are about to make, in strict conformity with precedents, which I fully admit are only precedents of the present Reign. My hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea complains that there are no precedents before the present Reign; but my answer to him is this—there could be no precedents, and it was not in the nature of the case that there should be precedents. The circumstances have been radically and fundamentally altered during the present Reign. I should include the Reign of William IV., which, however, did not produce any facts having any bearing on the question. The great epoch in the history of the Civil List arrangement I take to be in 1830, on the accession of William IV. When he came to the Throne a principle, which I may call entirely new, was adopted, and, I think, with great wisdom and with great advantage to the public, for the regulation of the Royal expenditure. Before that time, though there had been large sums of money placed in the hands of the Sovereign without a too minute investigation of the purposes to which they were applied, and many public charges were included in the Civil List, yet, as it has been shown by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, after deducting those public charges, a much larger sum remained available for the Sovereign than was granted on the accession of William IV., and still greater than the sum which was granted on the accession of her present Majesty. I must point out one fact not included in the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer which ought not to be forgotten by the House when it has to deal with this class of questions. I will not enter into the argument as to the £49,000,000, or the much larger number of millions, which my noble Friend (Lord Robert Montagu) would add to the loss of the Crown by this arrangement; but this it is fair to point out—that during the time when larger amounts than the Civil List were given by Parliament, they did not dispose of the whole case, but from time to time applications were made to Parliament that greatly offended and scandalized the country, and weakened the foundation of Royalty itself, for the purpose of discharging those debts which from time to time were allowed to accumulate on the Civil List, and which the Sovereign himself was not able, without Parliamentary aid, to discharge. The great object, then, was to get rid of all applications of that kind. It was not a matter of great consequence to the people of England to know whether £20,000 or £50,000 a-year more or less were to be expended in maintaining the dignity of the Monarchy. What was important was that they should know what was to be paid, and that the Sovereign should not be put in the undignified and humiliating position of accumulating debts which he could not discharge, and then coming *in formâ pauperis*, and almost as a mendicant, to the doors of the House of Commons to ask for its aid to discharge those obligations. That great object has been completely attained. We started on the principle of administering to the wants of the Court and the Sovereign on a fair and liberal scale, adequate as it was then to the grandeur of this Monarchy, but, at the same time, with the strictest reference to the actual circumstances of the Royal Family at the time. It is quite plain that, from some source or other, we all require our wants to be supplied. From what source are the wants of the younger Members of the Royal Family to be supplied? They are not in a condition of life, however assiduously they may apply themselves to public duties, to earn a living for themselves—and I much more commonly hear acknowledgments of their performance of public duties than lamentations to the contrary effect. Surely my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) must see that even if a Member of the Royal Family had attended the obsequies of the King of Italy or of the Queen of Spain, whose death took place under circumstances so touching, that these were not cases in which pecuniary grants from this House could have been made—the Princes were not in a position in which they could be self-supporting members of the community. Neither their position, nor their traditions, nor the opinion of the country, would allow them to become what are called self-supporting members of the community. The allowances which have been granted to Her Majesty are not on such a scale as to permit Her Majesty, either with facility or with propriety, so to reduce her own expenditure as to make becoming and adequate provision for the wants of the younger Members of the Royal Family. From whence, then, is that provision to come? What I think can be clearly shown—I will not say from records or covenants, but from the common sense of the case and the facts of the case—is that the intention of Parliament was, on Constitutional grounds, which I think to be sound, to administer to the wants, not only of the occupant of the Throne, but of the Members of the Royal Family, according to the circumstances of the case, and to leave to itself the right of granting further means according to the exigencies that might arise. The Civil List of William IV. was £435,000; the Civil List of Queen Victoria was £385,000, and was subject for the first time to the payment of Income Tax at whatever rate the Income Tax might be enacted by this House. Why was the Civil List of Queen Victoria less by £50,000 a-year than that of William IV.? Not because we were more economical in 1837 than we were in 1830. On the contrary, the basis of the arrangement as regarded Court expenditure was the same; but it was less on this account—that, in the case of William IV., there was the fully-developed expenditure of a Court, because there was a Queen Consort; whereas on the occasion of the Queen's accession there was no Prince Consort, and there was only one Royal personage of supreme state to maintain. When, happily, the Queen married, an immediate application was made to Parliament to enlarge the means for the Court. Can there be a more distinct proof of the main proposition which lies at the root of all the demands made from time to time, that Parliament kept in its hands the means of judging of all those occasions, and of course bound itself morally to provide for them when they arose? Therefore, really, the question is whether the arrangements that have been made are, or are not, reasonable arrangements? My hon. Friend, I am quite sure, will not stand on so small a point in a case of this kind as a demand for information, however reasonable in principle that demand may be. There can be no doubt that from no source, except from the proceedings of Parliament, can this provision be obtained. Is it a proper, is it a reasonable provision? I may say it has had the approval of a number of successive Governments, and of a number of successive Parliaments. The first of these provisions was the one made during the Ministry of Lord Palmerston, on the occasion of the marriage of the Crown Princess. From that time onwards it has been necessary, from time to time, to make application for one or other Member of the Royal Family. On every occasion these applications have been met and answered in the most loyal and becoming spirit. I hold that the basis of the present system is essentially a popular basis, because it reserves to Parliament the power of judgment upon each case as it arises, and strengthens the control of Her Majesty over the Members of her family, and it strengthens the Constitutional control which Parliament ought in every case to exercise. Sir, taking this particular question before us, as I understand the complaint of my hon. Friend, it is a complaint, not that a provision is made, but that an additional provision is made for marriage. That is the point that he complains of. Well, that is the very thing I am most anxious to defend, and to own myself responsible for, as the original adviser of the arrangement that was made about the year 1862, and of which it was an essential part. It is infinitely better upon every ground, as I hold that a provision should be made for single—bachelor life, adapted to the condition of a young Prince living a single life, and that a new provision should be made for married life to meet the new circumstances which arise. Therefore, Sir, I give my full and entire adhesion to the proposal of Her Majesty's Government. The sum of £25,000 a-year may, to some people, appear a large income for anyone to enjoy. But let any man fairly and candidly compare that with the general scale of expenditure in this country, with the vast amount and number of private incomes, not only of great families, but of men who have made their own way in the world, with the calls of every description that are made upon Royalty, with the extreme jealousy with which the people of England look upon retrenchment, or the supposed retrenchment, of people in a high station, and then let him say candidly whether it is reasonable or unreasonable. For my part, I believe it to be thoroughly reasonable. I do not believe it is an unpopular Vote; but if it is we ought to meet that unpopularity, standing as we do upon the equity and justice of the case.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR said, he did not propose to continue the debate at present; but it might be convenient to know that on the second reading of the Bill—which would, doubtless, be introduced to meet the Government propositions—he should meet it with a direct negative.

LORD FRANCIS CONYNGHAM said, the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu) had accused him of laughing in the course of the debate, and also that he could not give a vote on the question for fear of his constituents. He wished to say that he was not present in the House when he was accused of having laughed, and fear of his constituents would in no way operate on him in giving his vote.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 320; Noes 33: Majority 287.—(Div. List, No. 235.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Her Majesty's Message *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Mr. Raikes, after the discussion which has taken place before the Speaker left the Chair, I think it will be unnecessary for me to say more than a single sentence in placing this Resolution in your hands. The Resolution which I shall propose is that the same grants be made to His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and his bride-elect as were made in the case of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. There are two Resolutions. The first is—

"That the annual sum of Ten Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the

Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, towards providing for the Establishment of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, the said annuity to be settled on His Royal Highness for his life, in such manner as Her Majesty shall think proper, and to commence from the day of the Marriage of their Royal Highnesses, such annuity to be in addition to the annuity now enjoyed by His Royal Highness under the Act of the thirty-fifth year of Her present Majesty."

The second Resolution is—

> "That Her Majesty be enabled to secure to Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes, in case she shall survive His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, an annual sum not exceeding Six Thousand Pounds during her life, to support her Royal dignity."

These are proposals precisely similar to those made and accepted in the case of the marriage of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh; and, although from the discussion and the division which has taken place, it is evident that there are a certain number of Members of this House who demur to the principle of grants of this character, I think I may assume that I am speaking on behalf not only of a majority, but of the whole Committee, when I say that if such grants are to be made in such cases, there can be but one feeling that it would be only consonant with the wishes of us all that this grant should be made to one so justly beloved and so popular as His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. The circumstances of this marriage, which, as I have before said, is purely a marriage of affection, are such as to induce us to make this grant cheerfully and with generous approval. Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret is scarcely known in this country; she has been here but a short time; but the few who have had the opportunity of meeting her Royal Highness know that she is graceful, amiable, and accomplished, and that she is one well calculated to win the affections of those among whom her home may be. We have, therefore, every hope that the marriage may be blessed with domestic happiness, and that Her Royal Highness may set a bright example and do good in the station in which she may be placed. I beg to place this Resolution in your hands.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That the annual sum of Ten Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, towards providing for the Establishment of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, the said annuity to be settled on His Royal Highness for his life, in such manner as Her Majesty shall think proper, and to commence from the day of the marriage of their Royal Highnesses, such annuity to be in addition to the annuity now enjoyed by His Royal Highness under the Act of the thirty-fifth year of Her present Majesty."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I so entirely concur in all that fell from my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich while the Speaker was in the Chair, upon the general policy of these grants, that it is quite unnecessary I should do more on this occasion than say one or two words to express, on behalf of those who sit near me, our entire concurrence in the proposal which has been made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It has been observed, on similar occasions to the present, that the time has passed when great political importance can be attached to alliances between Royal Families; but I believe it will be gratifying to a great number of Her Majesty's subjects that an alliance of this kind should be formed between the Royal Family of this country and the great House which is ruled over by the greatest Protestant Sovereign of Europe. The happy event will be regarded chiefly as affecting the happiness of Her Majesty and Her Family, and I am sure the House may refer with satisfaction to what fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the circumstances in which this marriage is to take place. In regard to His Royal Highness, although I cannot go so far as the noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu) as to his claims upon the Irish people, still, there is no doubt that His Royal Highness has succeeded in making himself popular and beloved in all those parts of Her Majesty's Dominions which he has visited, and not the least has he succeeded in that respect during his residence, on military duty, in Ireland. I am sure that in no part of Her Majesty's Dominions will this marriage be more heartily welcomed, or this grant be more cheerfully acceded to, than in that part of Her

Majesty's Dominions to which I have just referred. I have great satisfaction, Sir, in supporting the Resolution which has been placed in your hands by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. MURPHY: Perhaps I may be allowed to add a few words. It was my lot to become acquainted with His Royal Highness in that part of Ireland in which I resided, and I can fully endorse everything that the noble Marquess has said as to the well-earned popularity of His Royal Highness in that part of the country among all classes. Having been a witness of the way in which he performed his duties, I think I should be wanting in my duty if I did not express the feeling I entertain.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING: As I represent a county in which His Royal Highness has spent the best part of his time in Ireland, perhaps I may be permitted to endorse what has been said by my hon. Friend the Member for the city of Cork. I was present on an occasion on which His Royal Highness was complimented by certain public bodies in Ireland. I believe that no Member of the Royal Family ever visited Ireland who has won the feeling of affection and loyalty from the Irish people more than the Duke of Connaught. With reference to an observation which fell from my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson), I can assure him from all that I have heard or seen that there is no person who has filled the position which he has filled who has been more attentive to his duties.

Mr. ANDERSON: I beg the hon. Member's pardon; I said nothing whatever against the personal character of the Duke of Connaught.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING: I understood the hon. Member to charge the Royal Family with indolence and with not attending to their duty.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Cork is not in Order in adverting to any matters of controversy that took place before the Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING: I am glad that I have given the hon. Member for Glasgow an opportunity of setting himself right with the House. The majority in the division which has just taken place will prove, at all events, that the Irish people will receive the grant with the greatest pleasure.

Major O'BEIRNE: I can endorse everything that has been said as to the golden opinions won by his Royal Highness during his residence in the South of Ireland. I was also doing duty at Fermoy at the same time, and I know that the admirable manner in which he discharged his duties was the topic of conversation among every class of the people of Ireland; and very deservedly so, because his subscriptions were most munificent. [*Laughter.*] I can only repeat that his subscriptions have been most liberal and munificent. What has been stated by the hon. Member for Glasgow—["Order!"]——

The CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed out that it is not in Order to remind the Committee of any observations made before the Speaker left the Chair.

Major O'BEIRNE: It ought to be borne in mind that His Royal Highness will very shortly become Commander-in-Chief. The present Commander-in-Chief of the Forces will in a short time retire; because the Royal Warrant, as I understand it, limits all Staff commands to officers who are not over 60 years of age.

Mr. ANDERSON: I wish to be allowed to disclaim, in the most pointed manner, the allegation which has been made againt me by the hon. Member for Cork—that I have said anything against the personal character of the Duke of Connaught. Nothing was further from my mind. All I intended to convey was, that there were certain occasions on which certain duties might be done more gracefully by Members of the Royal Family—

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will, no doubt, indulge the hon. Member in offering any observations he may choose to make by way of personal explanation; but I would point out to him that it is not in Order to refer to any debate which has already taken place.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Allow me to ask whether my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow may not be allowed to make the same speech in Committee which he made on the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Baronet appears to have misconceived the Rules of the Committee. There is no Rule, and I am sure I have not attempted to state anything approaching a Rule, that would preclude the hon. Member for

Glasgow from making any observations he may think fit; but it is a Rule of the Committee that a reference to previous debates is not in Order.

MR. ANDERSON: I merely wish to make a personal explanation in reply to the attack made upon me by the hon. Member for Cork, and I was merely desirous of saying, in Committee, what I have said before, not only on one, but on two different occasions, in this House, that there are public occasions on which a Member of the Royal Family, such as a Royal Prince, might do good service to the country by propitiating foreign nations, and by doing graceful acts towards the Royal Families of other countries. But I said that Royal Princes are never found to do these things. If they were, there would be a much greater excuse for such demands as those which are now made.

Motion *agreed to.*

(1.) *Resolved, Nemine Contradicente,* That the annual sum of Ten Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, towards providing for the Establishment of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, the said annuity to be settled on His Royal Highness for his life, in such manner as Her Majesty shall think proper, and to commence from the day of the Marriage of their Royal Highnesses, such annuity to be in addition to the annuity now enjoyed by His Royal Highness under the Act of the thirty-fifth year of Her present Majesty.

(2.) *Resolved, Nemine Contradicente,* That Her Majesty be enabled to secure to Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes, in case she shall survive His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, an annual sum not exceeding Six Thousand Pounds during her life, to support her Royal dignity.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

## INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 249.]

(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

### COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

MR. CHARLES LEWIS, in rising to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the names of the Members of the proposed Board should be communicated to Parliament before the consideration of the Bill in Committee,"

said, he should not have interposed on the present occasion had it not been for the remarkable course taken by the Government on a previous occasion. When the second reading of the Bill was moved, there was a debate which lasted between five and six hours. Objections were taken to the Bill by himself, and also by various Members on the other side of the House; but, on the whole, the Bill received a considerable amount of support—a support which, in the main, might be said to be unanimous. On the other hand, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) made a speech containing a weighty suggestion with regard to a considerable portion of the Bill, which was described, on that occasion, as being of the first importance. Notwithstanding the fact that the debate lasted five or six hours, the Government pursued a course which was almost unprecedented. At its close, they did not condescend to take the slightest notice of any remarks which had been made in opposition to the Bill, nor did they even acknowledge the considerable amount of support given by hon. Gentlemen opposite to the main propositions of the measure. This showed the remarkable way in which Business was conducted in the House, and had it not been for the course pursued by the Government, he should not have troubled the House on going into Committee. His object in rising was to obtain the names of the Commissioners, and he submitted that it was a matter of great importance that the House should know how the Board was to be constituted. When the first Oxford University Bill was introduced, the names of the Commissioners were given before the second reading. The names of the Cambridge Commissioners were given in the Bill. In the Reform Bill of 1867, the names of the Boundary Commissioners were given, and in the case of the Irish Church, the names of the Commissioners were given before the close of the discussion. In the present case, there were abundant reasons why the names of the Commissioners should be given, and for this reason. When the Bill was once passed, the House would have no control whatever over the Board, and the Bill was so shaped, that, although certain rules were laid down in the Schedule to the Bill, the Commissioners would have the power, with the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant, to abrogate every one of the rules, and substitute an entirely new system. The National Education Board had been in existence for upwards of 40 years, and its history had been one of dissension and dissatisfaction. There was nothing to prevent the Board contemplated by the Bill from being wholly an Ecclesiastical Board, or it might be constituted of worn-out Judges, or of any other class of men. Now, he could not suppose that the Government had introduced the Bill without having fixed upon some Commissioners to constitute the Board. The Bill gave no constitutional check, either on the Board or on the action of the Board, and as his Amendment was based on obvious good sense and convenience, he trusted it would receive the sanction of the House. No doubt, there was a provision in the Bill that the rules to be made hereafter by the Board should be laid upon the Table of the House; but, unless some private Member obtained a good place on the Paper, there was nothing to prevent him from being counted out; so that, before the expiration of 40 days, the rule might become law. The Bill was objectionable in many other respects. It gave no sufficient encouragement to the erection of new schools; it provided no guarantee for the efficiency of the schools; and its inevitable tendency was to destroy all chance of a mixed secular education amongst the middle classes in Ireland, and it was a direct step towards concurrent endowment. If an opportunity had been given, the Presbyterians of Ulster, and the religious bodies throughout Ireland, would have made numerous complaints, and suggested numerous amendments. He would rather that the Bill should be abandoned, than that it should be passed in its present terms, because then they would have a better measure next Session. He warned the Government against pursuing the downward course of concurrent endowment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the names of the Members of the proposed Board should be communicated to Parliament before the consideration of this Bill in Committee,"—(*Mr. Charles Lewis,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*Mr. Charles Lewis*

Mr. RICHARD: Before offering a few observations on the Bill before the House, I wish to make one preliminary remark as a Welshman. I do not grudge any educational advantages that are accorded to our fellow-subjects in the sister Isle. But it is impossible not to feel the contrast between the profuse liberality displayed towards Ireland in the matter of education, as indicated by the endowments granted to Maynooth and the Queen's Colleges, and the £1,000,000 of money now given for intermediate education, with the niggardly, miserable spirit shown towards the Principality of Wales. A few months ago, I had the honour of accompanying a deputation to the Lord President of the Council. It was by far the most powerful and influential deputation from Wales that ever waited upon any Minister for any object. It comprised representatives from almost every part of the country, from every class of the community, and from every shade of religious and political opinion. Hon. Gentlemen opposite from Wales, headed by the hon. Baronet the Member for Denbighshire (Sir Watkin W. Wynn), were as united and earnest in their application as those on this side of the House. The object of the deputation was to ask for some aid from the Government to a most valuable and meritorious Institution, which for several years has been struggling into existence—the University College of Wales—intended to give the advantages of a higher education to the Welsh youth, especially those of the middle and working classes. The demand we made was of the most modest description. But, after waiting for several months, we have just received a reply from the Government, refusing to give us any assistance, even to the extent of a single penny. But, while I do not grudge what is done for Ireland, I do feel that it is a little hard that Irishmen, who, to say the least, make themselves very troublesome to the Government, get so much, and nothing whatever is done for the loyal and peaceable people of Wales. I begin to think that Wales is too loyal and peaceable. Perhaps, if we were to start a Fenian movement, or a Home Rule movement, and to make ourselves generally uncomfortable to the Government, they would then be disposed to listen to our voice and to pay some heed to our just claims. Now, turning to this Bill, I am sorry I was not present at the second reading. If I had been, I should certainly have united in the course taken by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis). I have since carefully read his very able and temperate speech, and I am bound to say that I concur in almost every word he uttered on that occasion. The speech of the hon. Gentleman was not, in any sense, a sectarian speech. He did not object to the manner in which this money is appropriated, because it went to this, or that, or the other religious Body; but because the Bill violates a great principle, because it involves a departure from the educational policy pursued for many years in Ireland, and because it foreshadows other and still more important and dangerous changes, which seem logically to follow from the position now taken. The Bill starts by appearing to recognize what I hold to be a sound and salutary principle—a principle for which I have always contended in this House—that when the Government deals with education, it can only deal with the secular element; that religious instruction lies beyond its province and competence; that it cannot touch that without doing violence to conscience on one side or the other, and sometimes on all sides. This does not mean that religion should form no part of education. No one would more strongly object than I do to such an exclusion. But that the State, dealing with public money, must restrict itself to aiding, and encouraging and inspecting secular instruction, leaving the religious element to be provided by the parents and guardian, and by the churches through such voluntary organization as they may think fit to adopt. But this Bill, after laying down that principle, proceeds in its details to a flagrant violation of it. That provision especially which gives payments for results to schools, will, in effect, amount to nothing less than an endowment of all kinds of denominational schools out of the revenues of the Disestablished Irish Church. Now, I, at least, can take exception to this, without incurring the suspicion of being actuated by any bigoted or intolerant feelings towards the Roman Catholics. I object to it, not because it gives money to Roman Catholic schools, but because it gives money to sectarian schools. I objected to this in English and Scotch education; and I can, therefore, with perfect consistency, object to it in Irish education. I am anxious that hon. Members from Ireland should understand the position taken by me and by those whom I represent on this occasion. No doubt, the Nonconformists are ecclesiastically as wide as the poles asunder from the Church of Rome. But we have always contended that, however widely we may differ from them in that respect, they are entitled to perfect equality of civil and religious rights with ourselves, and we have always helped them to obtain that equality. We stood side by side with them in their agitation for removing the disabilities under which they so long laboured. The best proof of this is the fact that, in 1829, immediately after Roman Catholic Emancipation had been carried, Mr. O'Connell appeared on the platform of a Nonconformist Association, well known in those days, called "The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty," to acknowledge, in frank and cordial terms, the services rendered by the Nonconformists in the struggle which had just been crowned with success. These were his words—

> "I have come here as the representative of the warm-hearted feelings of the people of Ireland. I stand here in the name of my country, to express our gratitude, in feeble but in sincere language, for the exertions made on our behalf by our Protestant Dissenting brethren. I have come here to express my thankfulness for the support which they have given to the great cause of my country."

And when that strange anti-Catholic agitation swept like a hurricane over this country in 1850 and 1851, and issued in the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, I, for one, withstood it to the best of my ability, and exposed myself to some reproach by contending that the Roman Catholics had a right to make any arrangements they thought necessary for their own spiritual order and discipline. And I repeat that I object to this Bill, not because some of the money may go to Roman Catholics — I have not the slightest idea what proportion may go to them, what to the members of the Disestablished Church, and what to the Presbyterians—but I object to it because it gives public money to promote and perpetuate sectarian education. And I shall, therefore, cordially support those Amendments of which Notice has been given by my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) and others, in the hope of making it at least less obnoxious and dangerous than it is in its present form.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR: At this stage of the Bill I must say a few words; because the Bill, in its present form, commits a real injury on the poorer classes in Ireland. Ireland and Scotland are two countries poor in the raw materials of industry, and they require—more than England—to develop the natural abilities of their populations. Scotland has done that largely, through its elementary schools. Only a small percentage—at the most 7 per cent—of children in elementary schools show aptitude for superior education. Well, it has been our principle in Scotland to plant a ladder between the lower schools and the higher schools, and to sustain the youths while climbing up the ladder by small bursaries or scholarships. Has this led to the neglect of the remaining 93 boys out of the 100 who have no aptitude for superior education? On the contrary, the infusion of higher subjects elevates the entire school, and gives a breadth and a vigour to its whole teaching. The result which this Bill fears, that if the scholarships are open to the national schools, the many will be injured for the benefit of the few, is wholly belied by our experience. The danger can be guarded against by the simple expedient of refusing scholarships to a national school unless its elementary passes are also considerably above the average. In Scotland, no grant is given for higher subjects unless there has been more than 75 per cent of passes in the examination for the ordinary standards. I know how difficult it is to argue such a cause as this in England. Here we are accustomed to look upon education to the masses very much as a pauper's dole; and, therefore, we give it with a niggard hand, and not with a generous free bounty. In Scotland, we try by scholarships to attract the intellectual few out of the mass of the population, and to convert them into producers of wealth, instead of allowing them to remain mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. Now, this is what I want to persuade the House to do, by lowering the fee for examination from its prohibitory amount of 10*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.*, and by withdrawing the words which prevent the Irish national schools receiving result-fees if they educate promising boys to compete for scholarships. Something might be said against my Amendment, if the scholarships under the Bill were attached to well-organized secondary schools. Even then, there ought to be a bridge between them and the primary schools. But the scheme of the Bill is to pay for knowledge, however and wherever acquired. It seems to me to be a double and a fatal error to cut off the national schools from the new scheme. First, because you raise an artificial barrier between the poor and the middle classes, and say to the former—"Thus far shalt thou come, and no further." Second, because you depress the intellectual fund in a poor country, when experience proves there is never too much of it for national wants. I could enlarge much upon this theme, but I do not desire to have protracted discussion on this Bill. One appeal, however, I must make to the House. The annual sum which you are about to apply for scholarships is, in my estimation, very large, and the prizes are upon an honour scale rather than on a pass scale. When the Scotch Education Bill comes on, I am going to try to persuade the House to let the ratepayers of Scotland furnish just one-tenth the sum, or £3,000 a-year, for intermediate education in Scotland. I contend, therefore, that, if properly administered, there are ample funds now provided as a stimulus for higher education, both in middle-class and in primary schools. For you do not require to pay for such a useful commodity as superior education to the middle classes; but rather, by prizes, to indicate when that commodity is good. For the poor, help ought to be more direct, and yet the Bill proposes to shut them out from all participation of a fund which comes from the surplus of a disestablished Church. That Church gave its ministrations to all classes, irrespective of sex, and making no difference between rich and poor. When we apply its funds for education, ought we not to be as broad in the distribution of the benefits? My proposal, then, is to remove the obstacles which bar the lower classes from seeking higher education, and thus to give to poor Ireland the inestimable benefits which poor Scotland has obtained, by bridging over the chasm between the elementary schools and the higher education of the country. I cannot conceive anything which would tend more to the prosperity of Ireland. If you have a country poor in the raw materials of industry, the more is it necessary to train its citizens in that knowledge which is required to enable them to take part in the intellectual competition of nations. You cannot lessen the results of the proposed Bill by enlarging the area of its action. A very forcible remark was once made—that while you lessen the power of many things by spreading them over too large a surface, the power of science increases the more widely it is diffused. That wise saying is contained in the Papal Bull which founded the University of Aberdeen, and my Roman Catholic Friends in this House might take it to heart, and endeavour to extend the operations of this Bill to all classes of the Irish people, by removing the restriction which shuts out the poorer classes from the benefits which it confers.

MR. E. JENKINS congratulated the Government on the Bill containing one or two points which, coming from the other side of the House, were rather extraordinary; for it was the first time that any Government had brought in avowedly a Bill simply for secular education, to be supported by funds taken from religious uses. It should be pointed out, for the information of the country, and that the people might understand the true meaning of the measure, that by the Bill the Government were introducing a system of concurrent endowment. To that he, for one, could never consent. There were very great and serious defects in the constitution of the proposed Board, and in the powers that were to be assigned to them. The whole thing might be placed in the hands of clerics who would not enjoy the confidence of the people; and, therefore, it would be better to lay down, as a necessary rule, that the Board should consist of lay members only. The House ought to provide that there should be some security that the education which would be encouraged under the Bill should be liberal. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman opposite would agree that the Bill should specify one of the subjects in which the students were to be examined. With regard to the Conscience Clause, if they were going to encourage education by a system of concurrent endowment, should they not insist upon the managers of schools, who would receive money directly or indirectly in respect of pupils passing examinations under this Bill, throwing open their doors to children of all denominations within the reach of such schools?

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he was sorry to hear his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) complain of a want of courtesy on his part, or on the part of his Colleagues, in not making a reply the other night to criticisms which had been made on the Bill. He did not mean in his silence to be discourteous, nor did he wish it to be understood that there was any want of appreciation on his part as to the value of the hon. Gentleman's observations. The suggestions offered in the course of the debate on the former occasion related almost exclusively to matters of detail, and it was not expected that the Government should at once pronounce a definite opinion upon the many points urged. The speech of the right hon. Member for Greenwich was a most able answer to the observations of the hon. Member for Londonderry. With regard to one of the questions touched upon in the present discussion, he could not admit that there was an absence of all check upon the proceedings of the Board to be constituted under the Bill. The Board would be incapable of departing in any way from the decision at which Parliament had arrived without Parliament having a full opportunity of considering the matter. If there should be any valid objection entertained to a new scheme promoted by any Board of this kind, the House would have an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon such scheme. The course which the Government now proposed to pursue was that which, he believed, had been uniformly adopted with regard to similar bodies, and had not, he thought, been productive of inconvenience. The hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard) spoke of the spirit of profuse liberality in which the Imperial Parliament approached the question of intermediate education in Ireland, and compared it with the miserable, grudging spirit in which a similar question with regard to the Principality with which he was connected was treated. The hon. Gentleman, however, omitted to state that this profuse liberality on the part of the Imperial Parliament was merely affording to the Irish people a share in their own money. That, he thought, disposed of most of the criticism on that head. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) had made a remark about the exclusion of national school teachers from the result payments mentioned in the Schedule of the Bill. He thought that a wise exclusion. The national school teachers had a great work to perform. Upon them devolved the task of primary education in Ireland, and he thought it would be departing from sound policy if encouragement were to be held out to them to step aside from their legitimate functions, and devote their time, in a great measure, to another branch of education. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the surplus as being part of the fund originally enjoyed by all classes, and, therefore, complained of the exclusion of those getting primary education. [Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR: The exclusion of the poor.] Certainly; but the only way in which he presumed the poor could be included was in the manner he spoke of. He must remind the right hon. Gentleman that when the claims of the national school teachers were before the House, he (Mr. J. Lowther) ventured to throw out the hint that a portion of the surplus of the Church fund might be made available with regard to some portion of their claims. That, he thought, merited the attention of the Government, and he might further point out that they were not now appropriating the entire surplus of the fund, and that there was still a considerable portion unappropriated by the Bill, and that the claim of the lower classes of the community might not impossibly be dealt with at some future time. As to the entrance fee mentioned in the Bill, its object was, as the House would clearly see, to prevent fictitious candidates from presenting themselves for examination by way of a practical joke. The amount of the fee was put down at 10*s.*, but there was no obligation to maintain it as a limit. The hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) spoke of the Bill as establishing the principle of concurrent endowment, and said he wished the House to take note of the fact that the Government and Parliament were now establishing a precedent whereby money hitherto devoted to spiritual purposes was to be devoted purely to secular purposes.

MR. E. JENKINS said, that the words "secular education" were used in the Bill.

MR. J. LOWTHER: But the hon. Gentleman wished special note to be taken of the fact that the Government and Parliament were affording a precedent for the application to particular secular interests of money heretofore devoted to spiritual purposes; and he then went on to establish, to his own satisfaction, the conclusion that the Bill would at the same time promote a scheme of concurrent endowment. Now, he thought that those two propositions fairly answered one another. [Mr. E. JENKINS: They are both in the Bill.] Secular instruction had not been put into the Bill without an object. That object was that money given by Parliament should be given exclusively in respect of secular instruction, and he denied that concurrent endowment in any shape was promoted by that measure. The hon. Member had thrown out suggestions as to the composition of the Board which were, no doubt, entitled to consideration. Now, he was not himself in a position to enter into any discussion as to the component elements of that Board. His hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) had commenced his speech by expressing the opinion that the Board should be named before the House proceeded further with the Bill. It was by no means the general practice to adopt that course. According to the precedents in such cases, it was at a later stage of the Bill than that at which they had arrived that any announcement was usually made as to the component elements of a Commission of that kind. It was, of course, necessary that the Government, before mentioning the name of any gentleman for so trustworthy a post, should communicate to him their intention to offer him a seat on the Board; and it would hardly be respectful to Parliament that Government should make offers of that description before Parliament had, in substance, sanctioned their proposal. Therefore, it was not intended to announce the names until the Bill had passed through Committee and Report. In doing that, the Government thought they would be complying with general practice, and also showing proper deference to the opinion of Parliament. In conclusion, he hoped that he should not be deemed wanting in courtesy if he did not now travel further into the points which had been raised; but urged the House to allow the Bill to proceed without any unnecessary delay.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE thought it would be advisable to exclude Italian and German from the subjects of examination.

MR. D. DAVIES, referring to what had been said by the Chief Secretary for Ireland in answer to the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard), admitted that that money belonged to the Irish people, and did not grudge them it. At the same time, the people of Wales asked for a very moderate sum—namely, £2,500—for a Welsh University, and he was sorry that the Government did not grant it. The Welsh people were exerting themselves in the matter, and he himself was happy to subscribe towards the institution; but the Government might surely give a small amount of help in aid of voluntary contributions. His constituents told him that until the Welsh Members obstructed Business in the same way as the Irish Members did, they would never get anything. He did not want to do that; but he only warned the Government not to put the Welsh Members in that position. There had been a wonderful change in the House since the Bill was introduced. The measure was thought by persons out-of-doors to be a sop thrown to the Irish Members in order to keep them quiet, that the Government might finish the work of the Session. There were in Wales about 1,500,000 of very loyal subjects, who did not give any trouble to the Government, or put the country to any expense. They and their Representatives took what they could get; but they wished to stand up for their rights. He, therefore, trusted that the Government would not refuse the small grant of £2,500 towards enabling the people of Wales to obtain in the Principality that higher education for which they could not go to Oxford or Cambridge. He was under a pledge, if the Government would only give £2,500 for a College in Wales, to contribute £4,000 himself over and above the sum he had already paid towards the same object.

MR. NEWDEGATE observed, that the Bill gave almost *carte blanche* to those who would carry out its provisions; and he was not surprised at the feeling which had been expressed by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) at the prospect of £1,000,000 sterling being voted away without the House knowing by whom the money was to be spent. Who, he asked, were to be the Plenipotentiaries whom they were to appoint to regulate the intermediate education of Ireland? There were slight indications from Wales, and also from Scotland, that the people of both did not like that manner of doing business. The Government had hitherto been trusted by the great body of the Protestants of England; but they would find that the confidence reposed in them would not be increased by the abstinence from frank and open communications they had shown on that subject. Probably, if the House was content to remain in ignorance, the Government would take advantage of this disposition and keep them in the dark.

MR. VERNER agreed with the hon. Member for Londonderry, that it would not be advisable to divide on the Motion, as it was not their wish to lend themselves to a line of mere delay or obstruction. Reluctant, as he was, to interfere with the course of Her Majesty's Government, he felt it his imperative duty to protest against this attempt to stereotype a mode of management of the education of the South of Ireland which had been proved to have a baneful effect. They had always been told that the only system of education which would suit the people of Ireland was an undenominational system; but they had found that the Board appointed to carry out that system with regard to primary education was appointed on a purely denominational ground. It was now proposed to have a Board of the same objectionable kind for intermediate education, and he could not understand it, except it was explained by the words of his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry, who feared that the Government must have some desire that concurrent endowment should be carried out, and go further. He (Mr. Verner) could not see any other reason for its being introduced into the Bill, and he thought it would be far more to the advantage of intermediate education in Ireland that there should not be this introduction of the denominational element. In his opinion, a smaller Board of paid Commissioners, who would merely administer the Act, without indulging their opinions or views one way or the other, would have been preferable; but if the present arrangement was to be carried out, he did not go so far as the hon. Member for Dundee, and he would not confine it to laymen. Possibly, the Chief Secretary might think the point he had touched upon a mere matter of detail; but, in reality, it had an intimate connection with the success or failure of the proposed system. He had not heard of the composition of the new Board; but, no doubt, the Government, to judge by their course hitherto, would please their Friends opposite.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 81; Noes 23: Majority 58.—(Div. List, No. 236.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Establishment of Board).

Mr. E. JENKINS moved, in page 1, line 7, after "established," to insert "of laymen and graduates of any university in Great Britain." The hon. Gentleman said, the object of this Amendment was professedly and designedly to exclude from the Board those who might be clerics of any denomination. It was obvious, therefore, that the proposal did not affect any particular denomination. The object was to prevent anything like an attempt to form a sort of clerical cave in the Board, which was a very small one, and which would have very important powers. He might point out that it was not in the least necessary that all the clerics on this Board should be members of any particular denomination, in order to make it unadvisable that they should be there at all; because the Board would have a very important function to perform—that of framing the rules, and creating the system under which this large sum of money was to be expended. The Committee would see that having, as this Board would have, the right to dictate a large number of subjects in addition to those named in the Bill, it was quite possible that there might be a combination of clerical elements which might be injurious to the promotion of intermediate secular education. There was no doubt that the Bill itself did appear to be very different in one part from what it appeared in another part. In one part, it promoted secular education; in another part, it practically promoted denominational education by concurrent endowment. Supposing the Government were not protected by explicit words in the Act, from influences being brought to bear upon them to place ecclesiastics upon the Board, it was clear that if the Lord Lieutenant was to elect a Presbyterian, or an Episcopalian, it would become necessary, in order to make the thing square, and have a proper balance of parties, to appoint ecclesiastics from the other denominations. It was to protect Government from anything in that direction that he brought forward this Amendment. But there was another object, and it was this—that the members of the Board should be graduates of some University. It was for the purpose of securing that there should be, at all events, some sort of *primâ facie* academical position and potentiality. It was quite clear that something must be done in order to secure that. It had been pointed out that the description he proposed in his Amendment would exclude persons who were academically competent, who were not graduates of Universities in Great Britain, but who belonged to Catholic Colleges in Ireland, and that such persons might be qualified to sit on the Board. He should be quite ready to give way with regard to that point, supposing the Government were ready to accept the principle of his Amendment. If they could suggest some way of ascertaining the academical qualifications, he should be willing to insert it in the Bill. But two main points which he suggested by his Amendment, which he urged on the consideration of the Government, and which he felt were of great importance, were that the Government should protect themselves from any influences being brought to bear in various parts of Ireland, and that it should be made a qualification that every member of the Board should be a layman, with, of course, the requisite academical qualifications.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he hoped the hon. Member would not find it necessary to press this Amendment. He would remind the hon. Member and the Committee that there was a large number of persons in Ireland who, under ordinary circumstances, would have enjoyed a University education, but did not; and by passing this Amendment, these persons would be virtually excluded to a large extent. With regard to the desirability of excluding clergymen, he would observe that such a course had not been thought necessary on any other Education Board. But apart from that, it was to be remembered that in Ireland intermediate education was, to a large extent, in the hands and under the guidance of clergymen of various denominations—clergy of the Established Church, of the various Nonconformist Bodies, and of the Roman Catholic Church. What would be the effect of excluding clergymen of those various Bodies, who took so much interest, and had so much experience, in the promotion of education? Nothing could be more fatal to the Bill. No one, he was sure, would desire to see any particular element predominant; but, on the other hand, no one who desired the success of the Bill would wish to see any particular element excluded, especially the particular element which had already taken so great a part in education. Nothing could be more ruinous than to exclude them. The result would be to exclude some men whose presence was necessary to the success of the scheme. The hon. Member spoke of the creation of a clerical Cave; but did he suppose it likely that clergymen — Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian—would join in a Cave against the laymen? It was not likely that such a thing should happen. He believed that the suggestion which the hon. Member had made was founded on a mistake which had unaccountably got into the minds of some hon. Members, to the effect that a large proportion of the people of Ireland would attempt to wrest this Bill into a scheme of sectarian education.

Mr. E. JENKINS rose to a point of Order, and said, the hon. Member had misunderstood him. It was not with reference to religious education at all; but with reference to the liberal character of that education that he made the remark.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he believed that the dread which the hon. Member, and some other hon. Members, entertained of a liberal education in Ireland, arose from the idea that the Irish Members were endeavouring to wrest this Bill to sectarian purposes. So far as he knew anything of the history of this question, they had no such intention. They desired—and desired as strongly as any Member of the House—that this measure should be a measure to be really and generously enjoyed by the people of Ireland, and that it should be equally well-fitted for all classes of the community.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that just before he came to the House, he was reading the speech delivered by the hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) in 1874, when he brought before the House the necessity for adopting some measure for the encouragement of intermediate education. He proposed that there should be an examination, but he expressly stated that he did not propose to reward the managers of schools, or the instructors in schools, because that would raise the question of denominational education.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY rose to Order. He must request the hon. Member to read his words, as he could not accept his version as a real representation of what he said.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that if the hon. Member doubted the accuracy of his memory, he could assure him that the words he had used were very much to that effect. He read the speech with great attention. It was a very able speech in many respects, and the hon. Member could not dissociate this question as to the character of the Board from the latter part of the Bill, which he expressly, in 1874, said he abstained from pressing because it would raise the denominational question. He, therefore, could not help thinking that the hon. Member's correction of what had been said by the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) was rather lame. He could not vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dundee, because he thought the total exclusion of all clergymen would be an anomaly. If he had proposed that four should be laymen, and only three ecclesiastics, he should have voted with him.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR hoped the hon. Member for Dundee would not press the Amendment to a division. In Ireland there were numerous gentlemen of the highest qualifications for a seat on the Board; but they were not graduates of any University. Besides that, he should be very sorry to see clergymen not trusted as citizens; and no man could be better qualified for a seat on the Board than that most accomplished scholar, Dr. Russell, the Rector of Maynooth.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the wish of the Government was to secure for the Board gentlemen of position, of learning, of experience in educational work; and if it were necessary to include clergymen or persons not having a University degree, he believed Parliament would not be so illiberal as to prevent their nomination; but there was no intention in the mind of the Government, as the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) seemed to think, of having a majority of clergymen on the Board, because no person in Ireland would like to see that.

Mr. BUTT said, the Amendment excluded everyone but graduates in Great Britain. Did the hon. Member for Dundee mean to exclude graduates of the University of Dublin? As the Amendment stood, it excluded any graduate of that University. He must say that this appeared to be just a specimen of the rashness with which Amendments were sometimes placed upon the Paper without due consideration. Hon. Members were not treating the House with proper respect when they did not take the trouble to ascertain that Ireland was not part of Great Britain before placing an Amendment upon the Paper. He would advise the hon. Member not to trouble himself too much in this matter, and to deal with it as little as he could, until he had made himself better acquainted with the subject.

Mr. E. JENKINS replied that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) should have listened to the observations on which he had ventured to comment before he spoke upon them. When he had brought this matter before the Committee earlier in the evening, he had distinctly stated that he felt the awkwardness of the form in which he had drawn this Amendment. He had felt that there were many members of the Catholic University who were well qualified, academically, for these posts; and, therefore, he knew how difficult it would be to draw up the Amendment in such a way as would carry out his intention. In these circumstances, he had expressed himself as being perfectly willing to accept such alterations in it as the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. J. Lowther) might suggest. The hon. and learned Member for Limerick, however, had thought right to read him a lecture because he had interfered with this Bill. It was true that he was a younger Member of the House than the hon. and learned Member for Limerick; perhaps he was not half his age as a Member; nevertheless, the hon. and learned Gentleman had no right to lecture him upon the responsibility he owed to the House before he put an Amendment upon the Paper. He certainly was not going to take his orders in such a manner from any Irish, English, or Scotch Member in that Committee, and he would inform the hon. and learned Member for Limerick that he was not in the habit of bringing forward questions with which he had not taken pains to make himself fully acquainted. He hoped, after the explanation he had given, that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick would see the propriety of qualifying the observations he had made in reference to his action in this matter.

Mr. BUTT said, that he had no qualification of his observations to make, because the hon. Member for Dundee had given no explanation whatever. The Catholic University was a totally different institution from the Dublin University, and had no power to grant degrees; but the Dublin University was on a level with Oxford or Cambridge, and the Amendment as framed—and he dealt with it as framed—prevented the most distinguished member of Dublin University from being appointed to this Irish Board of Education. He did not mean to doubt the hon. Gentleman; but, before he gave Notice of such an Amendment as this, he ought to have considered that Ireland was not a part of Great Britain.

Mr. NEWDEGATE was sorry to have misquoted the remarks of the hon.

Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy). The language actually used by the hon. Member on the 9th of June, 1874, was as follows :—

> "He would not ask for a Capitation Grant, payable to the trustees in proportion to the success of their students, because though that might be very desirable, he could not conceal from himself the fact that it would involve an expenditure to which the House might be unwilling to consent, and it would be argued that it would be for denominational education."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxix. 1273.]

The hon. Member's words, therefore, were not quite so strong as he had put them, but they distinctly admitted that it was open to argument; and he presumed the hon. Member thought that it was to be argued in opposition to his proposal that it was for a grant in aid of denominational education.

MR. FAWCETT said, that considering that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick was exceedingly anxious that this Bill should pass, it was scarcely wise of him to extend his observations to Amendments which had not yet been proposed. He had looked carefully through these Amendments, and they certainly did not appear to be open to the strictures which the hon. and learned Member had made upon them. At all events, it would not save time to make strictures upon them by anticipation. His object in rising was to save time. He had no reason to suppose that the hon. Member for Dundee would take a suggestion from him; but they were agreed, he knew, upon many points on educational matters, and he would advise him not to press his Amendment. He could not help seeing that there were great difficulties to be encountered in dealing with this subject. He entirely sympathized with the hon. Member in one part of his Amendment—namely, that which proposed that the Members of this Board should also be members of a University who had taken degrees; because that would be a guarantee that they were persons who had received a liberal education. On the other hand, it could not be denied that it would be unfair to exclude from the Board members of the Irish University. There were many Catholic gentlemen who were members of that University, who were distinguished for their learning and ability, who would be most proper persons to place upon the Board. For instance, the hon. Member's Amendment, if carried as it stood, would exclude Dr. Russell. In these circumstances, he must say that he did not see how it was possible to lay down any satisfactory rule on the point. Then, as regarded the latter part of the Amendment, although no one would regret more than himself to see too much of the ecclesiastical element on the Board, yet it would be a most illiberal thing to say that no ecclesiastic should be a member of it. There was nothing he disliked more than to impose disabilities upon any class. There could not be a more devoted friend to education than Dr. Lloyd, the present Provost of Trinity College, Dublin; and yet this Amendment would exclude him from the Board, and the same thing might be said with regard to many other clergymen in both Ireland and England. On the whole, therefore, he did not think that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dundee, although it was doubtless proposed with a liberal intention, excluding, as it did, such men as Dr. Lloyd, would meet with the approval of the Committee. He therefore hoped that the hon. Member for Dundee would be content with the discussion which had taken place, and would withdraw his Amendment.

MAJOR NOLAN said, that he would remind the hon. Member for Dundee, who possessed a great literary reputation in that House, that the object of this Bill was to meet the want of liberal education which, unfortunately, existed in Ireland. It was almost a matter of wonder that that want was not even greater than it was at present, considering under what great disadvantages, with regard to liberal education, the Irish people laboured. In these circumstances, he hoped that the hon. Member for Dundee would not throw any unnecessary obstacle in the way of passing this measure. Although the Bill might not come up to the ideal of the hon. Member, still he must admit that its effect would do much to raise the standard of education in Ireland. He therefore begged to exgress a sincere hope that the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. E. JENKINS said, he hoped that the Committee would allow him to explain that the cause of the misunderstanding which had arisen between himself and the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) was a misprint in the Amendment he had proposed, the words of it appearing to be "Great Britain" only, instead of "Great Britain and Ireland," as he had intended they should be. He had not had his attention directed to the fact before, and he ought to be grateful to the hon. and learned Member for having pointed out the mistake to him. After the opinion which had been expressed by the Committee on his Amendment, he should not feel justified in detaining them longer in reference to it. He would merely say, in reply to the observation of the hon. junior Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy), to the effect that there was no precedent for the proposal he had made to exclude the ecclesiastical element from this Board, that there was no precedent for allowing ecclesiastics to administer intermediate secular education. He begged to be allowed to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. E. JENKINS said, he should not move the next Amendment on this clause that stood upon the Paper in his name. He would, however, move the next Amendment to the clause of which he had given Notice. He proposed, in page 1, line 17, after "year," to insert—

> "Subject to the power of displacement above vested in the Lord Lieutenant. On removal of either by the Lord Lieutenant, the Board shall elect for the remainder of the term a substitute or substitutes."

He thought that it would be seen that, unless these words were adopted, some little difficulty would arise with regard to the re-election or the substitution of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Board when their offices became vacant.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that he did not think that these words were really required; because the contingency contemplated by the hon. Member for Dundee would not be likely to arise very often in practice.

MR. E. JENKINS said, he wished to point out to the right hon. Gentleman how the matter stood. First of all, the clause stated that—

> "If any vacancy occurs in the office of any member of the Board by death, resignation, or otherwise, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland may appoint some other person to fill the vacancy."

But then, in the earlier part of the clause, it was said that these offices were to be held during the pleasure of the Lord Lieutenant. Supposing that these officers were to be displaced by the Lord Lieutenant, the Board could only appoint to these offices at their first meeting; and the question would be, whether the Lord Lieutenant could legally displace the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Board when once they had been appointed?

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he would be glad to give the subject his consideration before the bringing up of the Report.

MR. E. JENKINS said, that, under those circumstances, he should ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Assistant Commissioners and other officers) *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Salaries and expenses) *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Functions of Board).

MR. COURTNEY said, he rose for the purpose of moving the omission of the 3rd sub-section of the clause which provided—

> "For the payment to managers of schools, complying with the prescribed conditions, of fees dependent on the results of public examinations of students."

The object of the Bill was to provide for intermediate education in Ireland, and it was solely in furtherance of that object that he now moved the omission of this 3rd sub-section of the clause. If he believed that the retention of this sub-section would tend to the improvement of intermediate education in Ireland, he should have been the last to have opposed it; but it appeared to him that instead of its doing good in that direction, its operation would be positively mischievous in relation to the future progress of education in Ireland. The main scheme of the Bill was to stimulate education in that country by means of prizes to be given to those who distinguished themselves. This sub-section proceeded upon the principle, not of giving the prizes to the students who distinguished themselves, but to the managers of the schools who produced them. He asked, whether such a course was either necessary, or desirable? This sub-section was so essentially different from the provision for awarding prizes to successful students as to involve the principle of concurrent endowment, and the payment that was made for producing certain results might be devoted to something else. It was not necessary, for the cause of education, that payment should be made in this way, and the desired result — that of applying a stimulus to students—would be more certainly secured by awarding prizes to them individually. After all, a master might fail to present his boys, and the result would be that he would lose the reward of his labour. Just at the last moment some difficulty might arise between the master and the parents, and the latter might refuse to permit their children to go up for examination, and the master would lose his legitimate reward. He was not striking so much at the proposal to pay money for this purpose as at the mode in which it was to be paid. He was aware that it had been objected that if all the money were expended in Scholarships and prizes, the attention of the masters would be concentrated upon the most intelligent boys, and the others would be neglected. If prizes of £3 or £5 each were given to all boys who passed in three classes of subjects in the average standard, the danger that individual boys would receive too much attention would be obviated. The character of this mode of payment would be better realized, if it were considered in its application to University education. If so much were given to the managers of Colleges for each student who matriculated or took a degree, it would be seen that regular contributions, amounting to considerable sums, would, practically, result in the endowment of strictly denominational Colleges. This mode of payment was not necessary from an educational point of view, and from a religious point of view it was objectionable; and, therefore, he begged to move the omission of Sub-section 3 from the clause.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 16, to leave out after the word "students," to the word "students," in line 19, inclusive.—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MAJOR NOLAN said, the hon. Member for Liskeard did not appear to bear in mind that there were two analogous cases in which the Government paid by results. The first was exactly in point, it arising out of the payment for primary education. A large proportion of the grant for elementary education was paid for results in precisely the same manner that the hon. Member for Liskeard deprecated—namely, not to the pupil or to the parents, but to the manager of the school. In the second case, the analogy was, perhaps, not quite so obvious, although it really applied to the present case with equal force. The £500,000 that was voted annually for the Volunteers was paid to the captains or colonels, who got the men together, and not to the men themselves, the grant being paid for results. That plan had been found to work very successfully. These two cases completely answered the objections of the hon. Member for Liskeard, and showed that the system of payment to the managers of the schools, as proposed by the 3rd sub-section of the clause, would work well. The hon. Member for Liskeard said, that it was a mere accident whether the students would come up for examination; and that, therefore, the managers would be obtaining payment for a mere accident. That argument might be good enough of any single student coming up for examination; but it would not hold good where a large number were to be brought up. Nothing was more uncertain than the life of one man; but nothing was more certain than the average duration of the lives of a large number of men. It would be found that the average number of students coming up for examination would be always about the same. The average number so coming up would be equally constant, at all events, with the average number of persons annually run over in the Strand; and of the total number who were examined, a certain number would pass, proportionate to the educational advantages of the schools, from whence they came. But then the hon. Member for Liskeard went on to say—"Why not give the prizes to the boys themselves?" What was the common sense view of the matter? If the money were given to the boys themselves, they would, in all probability, merely squander it in giving themselves and their friends a holiday treat, or, at the best, they might buy a box of mathematical instruments with it, and go to the wrong shop for it. Or, said the hon. Member, it might be given to the parents themselves. But then the parents might give it to the schoolmasters—perhaps half would do so. The boys, however, would not get so much stimulus, in an educational point of view, from that course being adopted, instead of giving money directly to the teacher. If the money were given to the teacher, he would constantly be urging upon the boys the necessity of their earning a prize. He had no doubt that the whole band of teachers would be able and willing to coach boys to pass for the larger prizes. It would be pleasanter, and, perhaps, more profitable, work to instruct such boys who would make a figure in society than to produce average men, who made the wealth of the nation not because they were the cleverest, but because they were the most numerous.

Mr. GORST said, he wished for information as to who were to be the managers of these intermediate schools? In the case of elementary schools the word "managers" was most carefully defined; but no such definition was contained in the present Bill, which had reference solely to intermediate education. It was important to have information on this point, in order that the money might be paid to the right persons. In illustration of what he meant, he would ask his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who was the manager, or who were the managers, of the Royal School at Armagh—was the manager the headmaster, who only contributed to the success of the school; or was the management vested in the Board of Commissioners in Dublin, whose duties were restricted to the appointment of the head-master, and who had just as much to do with the actual management of the school as the House of Commons had? In the event of a number of boys from this school passing, to whom would the capitation grant be paid, and how would it be applied? He thought the Committee ought to have information on this point before being asked to discuss the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman opposite.

The O'CONOR DON said, he did not rise to answer the question asked by the hon. Member who had last spoken, for he entertained no doubt that it would be very easy to ascertain the names of the managers of these institutions; but he wished to say a few words on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liskeard. His hon. Friend said the object of the Bill was to promote intermediate education in Ireland, and he should like to know how that education was to be promoted, and what was the want at present existing? Taking the last question first, he would say that, as far as the Roman Catholics were concerned, what they wanted was really good schools with efficient teachers. Well, was that more likely to be supplied by paying the successful teachers or by giving the money to the pupils, who, by themselves or their parents, might do what they liked with the premiums awarded? If the money was to be disposed of in the way he had suggested last, it would fail in accomplishing what he took to be the main object of the Bill; and therefore he thought the Amendment would defeat the object which he felt sure its Mover had at heart, and which he had stated to be the object of the Bill.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, the further the discussion proceeded, the more clear it became that the Government had laid before the House a very admirable scheme in a very loose manner. It was very important to know, as the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) had suggested, whether any definition was to be included in the Bill as to who were to be the managers of the schools? and it was no answer to a suggestion to say that the fact could be very easily ascertained. The hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Major Nolan), referring to the question of payment by results, said the same system prevailed in England. So it did, but the conditions were different. In England the payment depended upon inspection; under the present Bill there was no such provision. Again, the Bill provided for certain pass examinations; but it gave no definition as to what the students should be examined in, in order to obtain a pass, and so entitle the managers of the schools—whoever they might be—to take the results fees.

Mr. MURPHY thought the Bill sufficiently explained the nature and constitution of the managing Bodies of the schools; and enabled the Lord Lieutenant and the Commissioners to ascertain for themselves what the duties of the managers were, and how they were to be performed.

MR. GORST said, if that was the explanation it made matters even worse, because it would enable the Commissioners to give the public money to whomsoever they thought fit. Parliament certainly ought to take such steps as would secure the money finding its way into the right hands.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA pointed out that one of the chief duties of the Commissioners would be to determine who were the managers of schools, and they would do that according to the varying circumstances of the cases. If a hard-and-fast line was to be drawn by the Statute, there would, practically, remain nothing for the Commissioners to do.

MR. ERRINGTON objected to the Amendment, on the ground that it would make the Bill not only worthless, but injurious. He took it that the intention of Parliament was to raise the general standard of intermediate education in Ireland; to induce able men to take part in the educational work—instead of mere adventurers, who look up "cramming" as a profession—and also to raise up permanent institutions for intermediate education. Not one of these points would be gained by giving certain prizes for what he might call hot-bed students. He objected to any system which would have the effect of transforming the intermediate schools into a class of "cramming" institutions.

MR. FAWCETT said, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liskeard raised two questions of extreme importance in connection with education. Looking at the question solely from an educational point of view, he wished to consider it with regard to the novel principle which it introduced—a principle which, if it was drawn into a precedent, would not only do great harm to Irish education, but would re-act prejudicially upon English education. Hitherto, two distinct principles had been resolutely acted upon with regard to the distribution of public money in aid of education—firstly, that the schools receiving grants should submit themselves to inspection by properly appointed public authority; and, secondly, that the teachers in such schools should have certificates of efficiency. Further, it had always been insisted upon that Parliament should know explicitly into whose hands grants of public money went for distribution. As far as he could see, this Bill set at nought each of these, which he had always regarded as cardinal principles, in reference to the granting of public money for educational purposes. His own view was that the main object of many of his hon. Friends who sat near him was to promote not so much intermediate, as denominational education in Ireland. He could not, in any circumstances, consent to depart from the principle of inspection—a principle which, he thought, was one of the utmost importance, in that it enabled the Education Department to know something of the schools beyond the point of mere educational and examinational efficiency. He hoped some assurance would be given on this point before the Committee disposed of the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard. The question raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), as to the hands into which the money grants were to go, was one of the utmost importance; and he hoped the Government would give their serious attention to it. Unless it was most clearly defined who were the managers, there was no security that any portion of the results fees would go to reward the teachers who had brought about the results in question. What security would Parliament have that the teachers were not under the thumb and control of some ecclesiastical authority, who would deny them any right to the smallest part of the results fees which they had, practically, earned? Looking at the question from an economical, as apart from an educational, point of view, he thought the duty of the House of Commons was clear. They had to dispense public money, and they ought to take every care and security possible to have defined, with the utmost distinctness, the purposes to which the money was to be devoted, and the hands into which it would pass. The hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Errington) had said, in answer to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liskeard, that if money was given in prizes instead of in the shape of payment for results, it would prove a great encouragement to "cramming." He could not understand this argument; because the interest of the teacher in such a case would not be to select special pupils for "cramming" purposes, inasmuch as the pupil, and not the "crammer," would be rewarded. In the case of payment for results, on the other hand, it would not be the "crammed" but the "crammer" who would reap the reward. He could not help thinking that the argument about "cramming," which he should not have used—for he objected to it—if it had not been introduced into the debate, was often in the mouths of persons who objected to all systems of examination in any shape. His own experience, both as one who had been examined and had conducted examinations on many occasions, led him to the conclusion that, properly conducted, examinations threw extraordinary light upon the individual capacity of the persons examined. He thought it was possible to escape from the dilemma by adopting the English system in reference to payment for results by submitting the schools to public inspection. If the proposal for such inspection was refused, they could only conclude that it was refused for some very good and strong reason. Believing that the grounds for the refusal, and the refusal itself, would not promote the cause of education in Ireland, he should have no alternative but to support the Amendment.

Mr. BUTT thought the point which had been raised by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) was a mere bugbear, which could be removed by a slight change in the draft of the Bill. As far as the question of the managers of the schools was concerned, he should think they would be the persons who managed the schools, and he saw no valid objection to such a body on the ground that it was or might be ecclesiastical in its character. If any attempt was made to alter the Bill in this particular respect, the result would simply be to mar the measure, as many other measures had been marred, by intolerance, though ostensibly framed for the purpose of serving Ireland. The person who managed schools and received the payments for scholars was, to his mind, the person who ought to receive the result fees. If the word "managers" required to be explained, let the explanation be given; but do not let the Committee forget the more important question—one of the most essential parts of this very imperfect attempt to stimulate and aid Irish intermediate education—namely, that all the attempts of the Government would be vain unless they could carry the convictions and affections of the Irish people with them. He would press upon the Government the fact that the Bill had been received with all but universal satisfaction by the people of Ireland; and that if the principle of payment for results was struck out of it, that feeling of satisfaction would disappear. The Irish people would not submit for a moment to the giving of Exhibitions and nothing more, because there were many schools—principally Protestant—which were richly endowed, and would train students specially for those Exhibitions; while the other schools, which had no endowments, would not be able to secure any of the prizes nor, in fact, any of the money which was set apart by the State for educational purposes in Ireland. To take the course which was involved in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liskeard would be to put a weapon into the hands of those persons who wished to keep alive in Ireland the spirit of disaffection; and to reject the principle of payment by results would be to create a feeling of opposition to the Bill which could not but extend to an enormous extent. In Ireland they wanted something more than Exhibitions which would stimulate the activity of pupils and afford to them the means to prosecute their studies. They wanted, not an increase in the number of schools generally, but good intermediate schools; and these could not be secured unless encouragement was given to the teachers by the payment of results fees. How were good schools and schoolmasters to be got? There was certainly one way, and that was by undertaking the entire educational system; planting a school and a schoolmaster wherever they were wanted, and providing all the necessary funds. If that was done, the Government would have a perfect right to insist on public inspection of every school before making a grant; but nothing of the kind was proposed by the present Bill, and no Government in its senses would undertake so great a responsibility without greater deliberation than had been bestowed upon the present measure. The Government had undertaken a far more modest and limited operation—namely, that of encouraging schools which had hitherto carried on their work without any endowment from the State. The State said, practically—"We are neutral on the question of denominational education; we willingly ignore that question, because we leave religion to yourselves, but we will aid you on the one condition, that you give us a good manufactured article; give us educated men, and doing your own work, you may do it in your own way." The Government and the country owed much to the cause of intermediate education in Ireland, by reason of the fact that the lavish grants made in aid of primary education had checked some of the means by which education was in former time afforded. When he was very young, and before he was sent to one of the Royal schools, he received his education from a Methodist minister in his father's parish—an old gentleman who had the reputation of being the best classical scholar in the county—and who gathered round him pupils drawn from the middle class in society, some of whom were now clergymen holding high positions in the Roman Catholic Church, and others of whom were then, and still remained, members of the Protestant Communion. This was a case of mixed education, being given in what was practically a denominational school—a system which might, with advantage, be pursued in the future; but which would be materially impaired if the payment of result fees were not allowed to obtain. It was a mistake to suppose that the Government was establishing denominational education by paying results fees. The Irish people wished to see the principle adopted; the Government professed a wish to carry the Irish people with them; but they, at any rate, entertained, if they did not adopt it, a proposal which would run counter to the wishes of the people. Education did not consist in a pupil being able to pass a particular examination; therefore, he was strongly in favour of payment for results, in preference to the giving of prizes or Exhibitions for extraordinary proficiency in particular subjects; in fact, all he wanted, and all the Irish people wanted, was that the Government should give assistance to the existing schools, and establish others where they might be needed. The system of Exhibitions and prizes would tend to the encouragement of "grinders"—he disliked the appellation "crammers" as much as the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) did—instead of encouraging the real masters of the schools. The giving of Exhibitions and prizes would certainly create a demand for teachers; but they would not be teachers of the class likely to be most useful in the general work of education. He could not support those who wished to institute a system of inspection in intermediate schools, because it would involve a needless expenditure of time and money, and would lead to a great deal of bickering and quarrelling. Let the schools manufacture educated men in their own way, and they would be sure of their reward, without reference to the process of manufacture which they might choose to adopt. He was quite sure it would be better to let the Bill pass in its present form, than to run the risk, by attempting to improve it in essential points, of losing the confidence of the Irish people.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, they were told it was not enough to reward the scholars; they must reward the school teachers. Who were those teachers? Most of the schools were in the hands of the religious Orders or other Roman Catholic priests. The regular or Monastic Orders of the Church of Rome would not submit their establishments to inspection. Why, then, should they endow schools which would not submit to their inspection? He perceived a secondary object in this Bill. If they made these payments to these schools, they would contravene the law by which these Monastic establishments were held to be illegal. The promoters of this scheme were aiming at the repeal of the law which declared these institutions to be illegal. There were legal as well as constitutional objections to making payments to these schools. This was an objection recognized by most of the countries of Europe; and while he would vote for the payment of the educated man, he objected to pay for schools which were so constituted that they rejected inspection. Were they driven to this—that they must contravene the law? If they endowed Monastic schools, they would raise additional obstacles to the erection of independent schools such as that in which the hon. and learned Member for Limerick was educated; they would raise a barrier against enterprize in that form. Let them adopt the Amendment now before the Committee, and go straight to their object, which he admitted to be legitimate—the encouragement of intermediate education. He would do much to meet the wishes of the Irish people, for he was convinced it was the want of education which made them so dissatisfied; but when they asked him to encourage Bodies known to disseminate principles which produced alienation, he replied that if they could attain their object by other means, they ought to adopt those means, and not go out of their way to endow establishments and an anti-national system under which a large portion of the Irish people was now enthralled.

Mr. SULLIVAN, in listening to the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down, thought the Committee must have been very much reminded of a character in one of the stories of Charles Dickens, who was continually referring to the head of Charles I. He was waiting during that speech in order to see when the Jesuits and Cardinal Cullen would make their appearance. If the hon. Member would go over to Ireland, he would find that he was making a wail on the floor of the House all too late; for if it were illegal to recognize the existence of religious Orders of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland by giving them what he (Mr. Newdegate) called State endowments, he must learn that they enjoyed those State endowments already, and that, in the opinion of the Lord Lieutenant, they well earned the money which they received. At Glencree, in County Wicklow, he would find one of those religious Bodies conducting a school partly with the money given by the State; and there was no Government or Administration in Ireland the officers of which had not testified to the success of that experiment made in the direction of "concurrent endowment"—a phrase in many ears more mysterious and awful even than the word "Mesopotamia." Let the hon. Member go over to Ireland, and he would learn that the illegality of which he complained had been sanctioned by the Legislature of which he was a Member.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN was aware that the hon. Member for North Warwickshire had a craze upon the subject of Catholic institutions, and would, therefore, only address himself to one of his observations. The hon. Member had referred to the deleterious character of the education likely to be afforded by those establishments. The answer to this was that if managers in Ireland were to spend time in imparting to their pupils education of that kind, they would not be likely to receive a very large amount in result fees. In matters of education he was with Bishop Butler, who drew the distinction between the terms "emulation" and "envy," that the one regarded a person in the hope of being raised to a higher level, while the latter described the feelings that would drag another man down. He (Sir Patrick O'Brien) was in favour of levelling up. With reference to the kind of education received at intermediate schools, he remembered that when he was at Trinity College, Dublin, they were generally over-weighted by the students who came up from those schools; but who, after their first year, did not retain their superiority, and this Bill would, in some degree, remedy that inequality. Every hon. Member of his persuasion should assist in passing the Bill, in order to give encouragement to the schools, and enable themselves to meet their fellow-countrymen on an equal footing. He put it to the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), whether he intended to put his philosophical views against the unanimous opinion of the people of Ireland? With all deference to the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis), he would remind him that he was possessed of English prejudices, and had not for any great number of years been associated with his countrymen, the Irish. He expressed his thanks to the Government for the introduction of the Bill, which he trusted would soon pass into law; for it was, in his opinion, the best measure that had been introduced for many years with the object of benefiting the Irish people.

Mr. EWART was not insensible to the weight of the objections urged by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), and he frankly confessed that it would be disagreeable to him, and against his feelings, to see result fees given to the religious Orders in the way indicated by the hon. Member, and as he had no doubt they would go if the Bill passed. Yet, looking at things as they existed in Ireland, he could not vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liskeard, even though the Roman Catholics of Ireland got a share of these funds to aid in the better education of their youths. He very much doubted that if all the advantages were given in Exhibitions, as the hon. Member for North Warwickshire proposed, it would serve the end he had in view; for what would be easier than to have an arrangement with the pupils that the Exhibitions should, in the main, go to the teacher. They wanted in Ireland two things—first, some aid to the teacher; second, some aid to the pupils. The latter the Bill proposed to give in the way of result fees, some of which would undoubtedly pass from the manager to the teacher. He had some experience in Ireland as a manager of a high-class intermediate school, and the great difficulty experienced was the want of means to pay first-class teachers. He hoped the Bill would pass, and he believed it would enable them to provide good teachers for the intermediate schools. He looked forward to a great improvement in the education of his countrymen; and, in his opinion, the Bill would give satisfaction, and tend to the happiness of the people of Ireland.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Gorst) had remarked upon the absence from the Bill of any definition of the term "manager." There should be no difficulty on this point; but, in his opinion, it would be very difficult to frame a wording that would assist anyone of ordinary intelligence in his endeavour to understand the meaning of the word "manager." He had just said that he was not in a position to afford the Committee information as to the component elements of the Board about to be appointed; but he could assure them that it was not intended to select gentlemen incapable of satisfying themselves as to the ordinary meaning of plain terms. He believed it would occur to every hon. Member that a definition of the word "manager" was unnecessary. Now, with regard to the payment of results fees. Something had been said about a guarantee that the money would go to the persons entitled to receive it; but was it to be supposed that it would be handed over to anyone who applied for it? Was it not more probable that the Board would apply the 7th subsection of the 6th clause, which afforded a guarantee that the money would only be paid to persons entitled to make application for it? The fees would go to the manager, who, in his view, was the person who "kept the bag," so to speak, and paid the teachers; and no one of average intelligence could go far wrong in determining who were entitled to receive the money. It was said in the course of the debate by the hon. Member for Liskeard, that "the Lord Chancellor had alluded to result fees as affording a good precedent." When the question of University education came to be dealt with, he (Mr. J. Lowther) had perused authentic records of what had taken place, and failed to find any such expression of opinion; and he, therefore, made bold to say that his noble and learned Friend had never said anything of the kind. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had stated that Parliament had always prescribed that public money should not be given in aid of education unless the schools were subject to inspection. He thought, if hon. Members would look, they would see that these conditions were strictly complied with in the Bill. They would see that by the 3rd clause of the Bill, the Assistant Commissioners should act, when required, as Inspectors as well as Secretaries. That, of course, contemplated the exercise, by the Board, of the power of inspection whenever it was thought fit. He was, therefore, justified in saying that not one sixpence would be given to an institution that was not liable to inspection. He thought the fees in question were needed to carry out the object of the Bill, which was the development and improvement of intermediate schools, and, when it was required, the calling into existence of new ones. With regard to Exhibitions, he thought if these, whether great or small, were given to any child, the parent might come in for a share; but that the last person likely to get any of the money would be the teacher. With reference to the supposed enforcement by managers of a condition that a proportion of the Exhibitions should go to them, he would say that that would be obtaining, in a covert way, the object the Government desired to keep above board. He hoped the Committee would retain the words proposed to be omitted.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), in his opinion, had not been very successful in reminding the Committee of the results of the Catholic suppression in Germany. He did not think that Germany could be congratulated on the production of that distinguished non-Catholic, Dr. Nobiling. Again, he could not but think that all those expressions of terror, horror, and fear came with singular inappropriateness from an Englishman; because it was a fact that not the worst part, but the best and highest part, of popular education in England was almost exclusively in clerical hands. He did not know that the pupils of Harrow, Eton, and Rugby were distinguished by anything deleterious as regarded the education they received. Some fear had been expressed on that side of the House at the Papal character of the education which the fees were to reward and encourage. He would venture to give the Committee an illustration of the character of the education likely to be so rewarded and encouraged. It was but the other day that a deplorable accident happened at Oxford. A brilliant young student of Pembroke College, holding a Scholarship was, unfortunately, drowned in the river. That student, who was already regarded as certain to attain the highest distinctions at Oxford, had been a pupil and student of Queen's College, Galway; but had previously been through a lengthened course in a Catholic school, conducted not only by Catholic teachers, but by Catholic ecclesiastics. On the news of his sad death reaching Galway, one of the Professors of the College, with grief and feeling, which astonished no one, read a notice of the young pupil, and in the course of that notice he remarked that on the entrance of young O'Connor into Queen's College, he was already possessed of a sound classical knowledge, and the ordinary subjects of intermediate education, and was not to be surpassed in Greek by the captains of Eton, Rugby, Cambridge, or Oxford. This was the testimony of the Professor of Greek, with regard to the education given in a Catholic intermediate school; and he (Mr. O'Donnell) was quite certain that the fact of their being Catholic would not, in the mind of any Member of the House who loved education, be an obstacle or objection to the payment of result fees to such managers and teachers who were capable of turning out men equal to his old friend George O'Connor.

Mr. HIBBERT inquired of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Lowther), whether he would consent to insert in Clause 6, Sub-section 7, after the word "describing," the words "by inspection or otherwise." He had gathered from the speech which he had just made that he considered inspection to be provided for in the Bill; and there could, for that reason, be no objection to the insertion of those words. It seemed to him that the addition proposed would carry out the views of the right hon. Gentleman, and be of great use to many hon. Members who had spoken in favour of the Amendment. He could not support the Amendment, and thought that the proposal contained in the sub-section then under discussion was very much in accordance with the system carried out in this country. He could conceive no reason why the Government proposal should not be adopted.

Mr. J. LOWTHER could not agree to the insertion of the words proposed by the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert), as he did not think any alteration necessary.

Mr. COURTNEY explained, that in his reference to the speech of the Lord Chancellor, he did not say that the noble and learned Lord spoke of result fees as creating a precedent. The Lord Chancellor had declared that the present Bill was a preparation for legislation in respect of Universities; and it therefore followed that anything done in the present Bill must necessarily be of great weight at any future time, in defence or extenuation of any new proposals of the same character. With respect to inspection, the Bill provided none, in the sense in which his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had used the word. Payment by results hitherto had had a totally different meaning from payment by results in the Bill. In payment by results under the board school system, and under the voluntary system they were dealing with organizations, and they inspected organizations. They inspected the organization for primary schools, the results of which they were going to pay for, and they did precisely the same in respect of voluntary schools. In this case, there was no inspection whatever of the organization of intermediate schools. The only thing they were going to ask for was that a manufactured article of a certain quality should be turned out. If that were so, why incur the inconvenience of dealing with managers? Why not deal at once with the manufactured article? Here he would refer to the most interesting experience of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt). He referred to the time when he was a boy, and to the schools which then existed in Ireland. But these schools were supported because they turned out good scholars. Owing to the reputation thus secured, scholars came to them; and, in the same way, if the lads themselves, or their parents, were paid, instead of the manager, voluntary schools would spring up and prosper, because the turning out of successful boys would be resorted to, and boys would come to them. Thus, in order to obtain prizes, parents would patronize the schools where the education might be relied upon to produce that success. In that way only could they secure the improved education which was the main object of the Bill. They must remember that in this Bill they were only dealing with a prize boy, and unless they went and examined the school itself, and saw its working, they could not tell whether a thoroughly good education was being generally given. But, dealing, as they necessarily must, with the manufactured article, he asked whether they did not secure it much more conveniently, and without the disadvantage attending this scheme, by paying directly to the parent instead of to the manager? Who was the manager? The Government might say that the recipient of fees was the manager. Well, suppose the master got a certain portion of the tuition fees, was he the manager, or the person who appointed him? They could not get out of that. But there was another difficulty. The hon. and learned Member for Limerick said he did not care whether it was a denominational school or not. But if they were dealing with the managers of a school, they must take care to secure this elementary condition —that all boys should have equal power to resort to that school. They were bound, if it was a denominational school, to see that it was so guarded and checked by a Conscience Clause that all boys might go to it, otherwise they were not dealing fairly with all classes, and they were devoting money to a public school to which a certain section of their boys might be unable to go. So that directly they dealt with the managers, they had this difficulty of a Conscience Clause, without any corresponding advantage. All the educational advantages hoped for would be secured by increasing the Exhibitions and prizes to the boys. On these grounds, he must press his Amendment.

MR. E. JENKINS said, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Lowther) appeared to have had his orders to stick to every letter of the Bill; but he must warn the Government that if they were going to continue as inflexible with regard to Amendments which had yet to be proposed in this Bill as they had hitherto done, it would be fatal to its progress. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members around him, who had been accustomed to obstruction, said "Oh, oh!" but they must remember that the points which had been raised that night were of the deepest importance, and they must not be angry with him and other hon. Members if they felt rather inclined to insist upon them. But he desired to disclaim any sympathy with the observations which had fallen from the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate); and if the Committee would give him their attention for a moment or two, he should show the real distinction there was between the argument which had been used on the opposite side of the House, and that which had been advanced on his side. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire occupied a position which was very different from that which he, for instance, occupied. The hon. Member, having supported denominational education in England, and believing that English children who were not taught religion would be damned, was perfectly willing that Irish children should be damned. He did not sympathize with that sort of argument, nor did he go with the hon. Member at all in the attack which he had made upon Roman Catholics. That was not the point before the Committee. The point which had been raised by his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Courtney) and others was, whether or not, as this was a Bill which professed to be in aid of intermediate secular education—a principle which he had always and still supported—it was right that the matter should be so arranged as that there should be incidentally a concurrent religious endowment. That was a very different question from that raised by the hon. Gentleman opposite. They simply adhered to the principle of secular education, and objected to any endowment of any religion whatever. He hoped it would not be thought that the time of the Committee had been wasted in pointing out that distinction. But the question now was—what were the Government going to do? The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in answer to the appeal of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), had not given the Committee any satisfaction. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that there was vested in the Board a certain power of inspection; but then it was a power which they were not bound to exercise, and the point which they put was this—was it, or was it not, right that payment for results should be allowed in cases in which the Board might, if it chose, decline to inspect the efficiency of the teachers, and the character of the education given in the schools? He thought it would be most dangerous if, with reference to Ireland, they introduced this entirely new principle; and he felt that, unless the Government were prepared to consider the matter, any opposition which should be offered to that principle as it stood in the Bill would be perfectly justifiable.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 165; Noes 47: Majority 118.—(Div. List, No. 237.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Rules to be made by Board).

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that a point which had already been the subject of some discussion might, he thought, be conveniently referred to at this stage of the Bill. It was as to how far the Bill did, or did not, include the education of girls. He was free to confess that when he moved the second reading of the Bill——

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: I rise to Order. I wish to ask what is the Question before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman is explaining an Amendment, which I understand he intends to move to the clause.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that when he moved the second reading of the Bill, he was under the impression that as drawn it did not extend to the education of girls. Since the second reading, this subject had been very carefully gone into; and he was now informed that it was a matter certainly open to a good deal of legal doubt as to what the exact application of the present wording of the Bill might be. He believed that those hon. and learned Gentlemen who were acquainted with what was known as Lord Brougham's Act would understand the nature of the doubts that had arisen; and certainly, so far as the Government were concerned, they had no objection whatever to the benefits of this scheme being, in a reasonable way, thrown open to girls as well as to boys. He certainly should have objected to raising any question which might give rise to lengthened debates upon women's rights, or any topics of that kind; and if doubts had not arisen as to the construction of the Bill as drawn, he should have been disposed to deprecate the opening-up of a controversy which was not necessary to the fulfilment of the ostensible object with which the Bill was introduced. But as matters now stood, he would suggest that either now, or if the Committee did not like to adopt the words without Notice, on the Report, the following words should be introduced after Subsection 3:—"For applying, as far as conveniently may be, the benefits of this Act to the education of girls." He might mention that these words were taken, as nearly as might be, from the Endowed Schools Act of 1869, and he thought they would meet every reasonable requirement. He begged to move the insertion of these words.

Mr. COURTNEY thought the Committee were in a somewhat unfortunate position in having this Amendment suddenly sprung upon them. As the words had not been put on the Notice Paper, the Committee could not easily judge of their effect. The right hon. Gentleman had said that they were taken from the Endowed Schools Act of 1869; but their experience of the working of that Act was not at all satisfactory. It was quite true that, under that Act, the Commissioners were instructed to do what they conveniently could in the way of promoting the education of girls; but, in point of fact, they had done next to nothing—he might almost say, nothing at all; and, as he believed that the benefits of the Bill, as it was at present drawn, were equally open to girls as to boys on precisely the same conditions, it was a limitation of the Bill, and not an enlargement of it, to insert a Proviso giving the Commissioners power to deal, "as far as conveniently may be," in their discretion, with the education of girls. In fact, the Bill, as it stood, did admit girls equally with boys to its full advantages. On that ground, he thought it would be inconvenient that a decision should be taken upon the point at the present moment. The right hon. Gentleman had suggested that the matter might be deferred to the Report. Speaking for himself, he would rather have it deferred to the Report than that it should now be decided, for this reason—that the Amendment did certainly limit the Bill as it stood. The matter was now brought before them in a manner in which they could not possibly decide at once as to what was the proper plan to be adopted. This special Proviso clearly pointed to a different style of examination for girls from that for boys. Speaking for himself, he should most strongly deprecate any such distinction. The University of Cambridge had examined boys and girls under the plan of this Bill for many years. The boys and girls were admitted to precisely the same examination; the same papers were sent to them; and they were examined by the same Examiners. These local examinations had been conducted with so much success in the last year that, whilst there were 2,800 junior boys, there were 1,216 junior girls; and whilst there were 935 senior boys, there were 856 senior girls. The experiment had been tried for many years in this country with success, and the precedent might, he thought be followed with advantage in Ireland.

LORD FRANCIS HERVEY said, the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down must entertain some doubt as to whether the Bill, as it stood, would apply to the education of girls; otherwise, he would scarcely have given Notice of an Amendment which had been placed in his name on the Paper. Yet, when the Government generously and opportunely came forward with an Amendment of their own, in order to remove all doubt in the matter—an Amendment which would, he believed, be quite as effectual as that of the hon. Gentleman, and quite as easy of comprehension—the hon. Gentleman, for reasons which he could not understand, declined to accept their proposal, and desired to withdraw his own, thus leaving the whole question at issue in a state of uncertainty. As to the Endowed Schools Act, the reason why so little had been done under its operation for the education of girls was that the funds had to be administered under the restrictions of trusts, which did not exist in the present case.

MR. STANSFELD said, as he took a very great interest in the question under discussion, he was not disposed to run any risk with regard to it; and he could not, therefore, concur in the course which the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) wished the Committee to adopt. The proposal of the Government was, he thought, well entitled to their favourable consideration, and he hoped it would be accepted. He, at all events, was prepared at once to close with the offer which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. J. Lowther), and to agree that this Amendment should be at once inserted in the clause. If any further question should arise with respect to it, it might be dealt with on the Report. He did not, however, think that any difficulty would arise, because the words of the Amendment were taken from the Endowed Schools Act of 1869; and, in his opinion, the amount of discretion which the Amendment would give to the Commissioners might very fairly be vested in them.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA, while he should not object to the Amendment of the Government — the concession made in which he hoped would not be carried further—said, he certainly should offer his most strenuous opposition to the Amendment which stood on the

Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney). It should be borne in mind that the fund to be disposed of under the Bill was not very large, and, indeed, was not sufficient to provide for the requirements of the male youth of Ireland; and, therefore, it would not be expedient that it should be divided equally between girls and boys.

Mr. HERSCHELL believed, that as the Bill stood it would apply to boys and girls alike; but expressed a hope that, in order to clear up any ambiguity which might exist, the Amendment of the Government—which, in his opinion, would be perfectly sufficient to carry out the object in view—would be accepted by the Committee.

Mr. MELDON said, it was supposed by some hon. Members that girls would be treated more favourably under the Bill, in its present shape, than if the Amendment of the Government were adopted. But, be that as it might, the course which the Government had taken in dealing with the question appeared to him to be most extraordinary. Both in that House and in the other House of Parliament, it had been distinctly stated that the Bill had been drafted with the view that it should not apply to girls; and that, upon that point, the Government would not give way. Why, he should like to know, did they now propose to deviate from that policy? Was it because they were convinced that they were originally wrong? Nothing of the kind. It was simply because a mistake had been made of their draftsman, and that it had been found that girls might obtain some advantages under the Bill as it was drawn. For his own part, he was not one of those who objected to a reasonable provision being made for the education of girls; but he certainly objected strongly to the victory which the proposed Amendment would give to the advocates of women's rights, whose object was not that there should be a limited measure dealing specially with the education of women, but that the same education should be given to girls as was given to men. How did matters really stand with regard to the question? For years and years the subject of intermediate education had been discussed and pressed on the attention of the House. When the present Bill was at length introduced, not a word was said about affording any aid as to the intermediate education of women; and he would point out that in Ireland the same necessity did not exist for any such aid as existed in the case of boys. Ireland was studded over with exceedingly good schools for the education of girls; but for boys no such provision was made. The result was that while girls could be satisfactorily educated in that country, it was found necessary, in many instances, to send boys belonging to the same class for the purpose of education to England. There was only a sum of £1,000,000 available for educating boys under the Bill; and the result of extending its provisions to the education of girls, as was proposed, would be to render it entirely useless and inoperative, as it was, to a great extent, already, seeing that the amount to be disposed of was so small. It was not, he contended, a right course to adopt to change the vital principle of the Bill, simply because the Government draftsman had made a mistake. He hoped, therefore, that the question would not be pressed further that evening, and that it would be fully considered before the Report. If it was really advisable that some provision should be made for the intermediate education of girls in Ireland, then let that be done after due deliberation, and not in the hurried manner in which the Committee was now asked to proceed.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY could assure his hon. and learned Friend who had just sat down that the question at issue was not one of women's rights, but simply of their education, and that the object of the Amendment was nothing more nor less than to educate the women of Ireland, that they might be better able to discharge their duties as daughters, wives, and mothers. There were in Ireland, it was quite true, already excellent institutions for the purposes of female education; but it could not be justly said that that education stood in need of no stimulus. The hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) would place boys and girls on a perfect level in matters of education. He would have them submitted to the same examination, and, for all he knew, would establish competitions between them. Now, identity of education might do very well in theory in England, though he doubted whether it was found to answer in practice; and the hon. Gentleman, he imagined, hardly supposed that those girls who passed the Oxford and Cambridge examination, were fairly representative of the girls of this country. But, however the case might be in England or Scotland, Ireland did not want the same thing; and any attempt to establish identity of education as between Irish boys and girls would, he felt satisfied, end in failure.

MR. J. P. CORRY was very much obliged to the Government for having proposed the Amendment, and thought the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) would do well to accept it; for it was calculated, in his opinion, to confer very great advantages in connection with the cause of female education in Ireland. He was, he must confess, astonished to hear the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) object so strongly to the proposal; but, for his own part, he entirely approved of it, and hoped the Government would adhere to it.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he did not think the question before the Committee was one which exactly concerned women's rights, although it might very easily become a question of women's wrongs. For his own part, he could see nothing more reasonable than that money, which was about to be appropriated to the advancement of intermediate education in Ireland, should, "as far as conveniently might be," be employed in promoting the education of girls. The hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) had told the Committee that a vital principle of the Bill was that no attention should be paid to their education; but the hon. and learned Gentleman could, he thought, scarcely have been serious in making that statement. After all, it should not be forgotten that the very monies from which the endowment under the Bill was to come, had been used, whether rightly or wrongly, for the advantage of both men and women; and although it might be true that there were already good schools for girls in Ireland, the Committee would, he could not help thinking, make a very great mistake if they allowed the Bill to pass without making, as far as it could be reasonably done, some provision for the education of the female population of that country. The way in which the Government proposed to carry out that object was, it seemed to him, on the whole, better than the mode suggested by the hon. Member for Liskeard. It was rather a strong thing to say that no discrimination should be made between the sexes in the matter, and he felt thankful to the Government for the very reasonable course which they had adopted.

MAJOR NOLAN hoped the hon. Member for Liskeard would be satisfied with the manner in which it was proposed by the Government to extend the benefits of the Bill to the education of girls. After all, the real object which the Committee ought to keep in view was the best mode of assisting those of the middle classes in Ireland, whose incomes were limited, in educating their children, and it did not so much matter whether the money was spent upon girls or upon boys. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) appeared to be of opinion that the money would go but a very little way in promoting education if it were divided between the two sexes. That, he thought, was a view of the matter which was entitled to attention; and it would be well to consider whether the fund to be disposed of under the Bill could not be increased, so as to meet the requirements of both.

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING was not an advocate of what were called women's rights; but he knew that there existed a considerable deficiency in the means of providing female education in Ireland; and he, therefore, cordially supported the Amendment, which would, he felt sure, be received with great favour by all classes in that country.

MR. COURTNEY would offer no further opposition to the Amendment proposed by the Government, although he certainly preferred his own, which he should reserve to himself the right of bringing forward at some future stage of the Bill.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. E. JENKINS wished to propose an Amendment which, he said, was, in his opinion, necessary for the purpose of securing that literature and languages should, in some shape or another, form part of a boy's studies under the operation of the Bill. The Lord Chancellor, in "another place," had made a very startling statement, which he drew from the Report of the Commissioners in 1871.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the hon. Gentleman was not in Order in referring to a debate which had taken place in the other House during the present Session.

MR. E. JENKINS said, he had not referred to any debate, but simply to a statement which had been made in "another place," drawn from the Census Commissioners' Report of 1871, to the effect that only 13,814 were engaged in learning in the schools in Ireland Latin, or Greek, or other languages, or mathematics, and that in one county there was in a particular school only one boy learning any one of these subjects. The Committee would at once see the importance of that statement, because it would serve to show what might be the character of the education which would be given under the operation of the Bill, when a very great improvement was made in the teachers in those intermediate schools. Now, what he proposed, in order to meet that difficulty, was nothing very dangerous. If hon. Members would turn to the Schedule of the Bill, they would find that the subjects of examination set down there were six in number—namely, Latin and Greek languages and history, English language and history, foreign languages and history, mathematics and the natural sciences; and then came, lastly, the very vague definition—"Such other subjects of secular education as the Board may from time to time prescribe." The Committee would at once perceive how the number of "such other subjects," relating to commerce, or something of that sort, might be enlarged; and, if any hon. Member would look at the Schedule, he would also find that a student would be obliged to answer satisfactorily in only two subjects in order to pass, and three in order to take [illegible] Now, that being so, there was not the slightest provision, he contended, made in the Bill to secure that under its operation even an elementary knowledge of literature or languages should be obtained. It was to remedy that defect that he proposed to add to Sub-section 4 of the clause the words "subject to the conditions of this Act." It was not an unreasonable proposal, because it would secure that the elements of four subjects, at least, should be taught to the students. He ventured to submit to the Committee that some such provision as this was essential, when they found that the Government were unwilling to have inspection, and unwilling to give the House satisfaction as to the character of the education which was to be given. Hence he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would see his way clear either to adopt his proposal, or one similar to it.

MR. J. LOWTHER agreed with a good deal of that which had fallen from the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins); but he hoped he would not press his Amendment, as he would consider some of the points on Report.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR said, there was a word used in the Schedule to which he desired to direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland. That was, as to the various modes in which the word "subject" was used. It was quite necessary to have an interpretation of that word. In one place it was used as representing a whole class of subjects; whereas, in another case, it obviously applied to one thing only. Therefore, the interpretation he asked for was necessary.

MAJOR NOLAN entered his protest as to the degradation which he thought the Bill would cast upon mathematics and the natural sciences if the Amendment was accepted. Such a course he strongly objected to.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he should not like to agree to the Amendment if he thought it degraded mathematics and the natural sciences. The Amendment provided, as he approved, for the study of literature; but that would not prevent the study of mathematics. Anyone who was familiar with Universities or intermediate studies must have seen that certain subjects of natural and physical science were constantly taken refuge in by boys who tried to earn a reputation. But under the present Bill that could not be done. He thought nothing could be more suitable than the study of literature; and he considered the suggestion of the hon. Member for Dundee very valuable, so as to insure the proper teaching of classics. At present, classics were taught in Ireland; but the teaching did no intellectual good to nine boys out of ten. If it was made a point that mathematics be studied properly, and not in a slip-shod way, the Bill would do a good deal to raise those studies from the discredit into which they were falling.

MR. BUTT did not say that the Amendment would degrade mathematics; but he strongly opposed taking such questions as it involved out of the discretion of the Board.

MR. E. JENKINS withdrew his Amendment, but again wished to point out how very important the subject was. They were giving money, as the Bill stood, without any security as to the inspection of the schools. That being so, he hoped, on Report, the Government would take the means of securing that which his Amendment aimed at.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. GORST moved an Amendment to Sub-section 7, with the view of seeing fees paid were properly applied. He did not for a moment say the managers of schools were not efficient bodies; but Parliament ought to see that the fees received were applied for the purposes of the Act, which were to improve intermediate education in Ireland. He might remind the Committee that in the case of the Elementary Education Act for England, there were the most ample securities that the fees which were received by the managers should be applied to improving the education given. Without wishing to discuss the regulations laid down by the Board, he thought there should be ample provision for the due application of the money which might be received.

MR. J. LOWTHER did not think the Amendment was necessary, because the object of his hon. and learned Friend was attained by Clause 5 of the Bill.

Amendment *negatived*.

MR. FAWCETT said, he had an Amendment to move which he was sorry was not on the Paper; but he had desired to see the results of previous Amendments before he put it. His proposal was to the effect that in cases where money was paid, the schools should be inspected. His right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland had said more than once that inspection was provided for in the Bill. He (Mr. Fawcett) was perfectly aware that it was; but it did not, in the slightest degree, follow that the inspection contemplated would be secured. He thought it a very unfortunate thing that the House should depart from a very important principle and a very important precedent, which had been uniformly observed in Acts relating to education—and that was, whenever money was given as payments for results in those cases, public money being so given, public inspection should follow. The Committee having decided, by a large majority, that payments by results should be maintained, of course, those who objected to such a course were bound to accept their decision. Therefore, he did not, in the slightest degree, wish to revive a controversy which had been settled, or in any way alter the intentions of the Committee by anything like a side-wind. He accepted it as absolutely decided, that there should be, as regarded intermediate education, payments for results, just in the same way as it was provided under the Elementary Education Act in England. But such payments ought necessarily to be followed by inspection; and, although the Bill provided for inspection, his Amendment had for its object making the intentions of the Bill more precise as to attaining the real principle of inspection. He therefore moved his Amendment, which simply asserted that in every case where managers received money as payment for results, in those cases, the schools superintended by such managers should be inspected under the authority of Parliament.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 10, after the word "Schedule," to insert the words "for the inspection of the schools the managers of which received any payments under this Act."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. J. LOWTHER said, it was quite impossible to accept the Amendment. His hon. Friend the Member for Hackney would see that the first thing which would arise if his proposal were adopted would be to add very largely to the working expenses of the Act. Incidentally, no doubt, they did comtemplate inspection under certain conditions; but inspection was to be the exception, as the Government did not contemplate that the Board would find it necessary to adopt constant inspection. But whenever there was reason to believe that inspection was necessary, it would be adopted.

Mr. E. JENKINS hoped the hon. Member for Hackney would press his Amendment. The Committee had no guarantee of efficiency; there was no certainty that proper subjects would be taught, and there was not to be any inspection. He ventured to ask the Committee, whatever the other House might do, whether it was right to pass the Bill in its present form? It was a matter for consideration—after the discussion which had taken place that night, after the manner in which it had been shown that the Bill failed in almost every particular to secure anything like efficient education or an efficient result for the money to be paid—whether the House should allow it to pass?

Mr. BUTT said, the Amendment, if carried, would mean the total re-casting of the Bill, and a departure from every principle laid down in it. There was inspection in the Bill, but it was very wisely limited. He asked the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), and the other Members who supported him, whether they thought they had a better knowledge of the wants of the Irish in respect to intermediate education than the Irish Members, and whether they thought they were better judges of the way to manage such education than the Irish Members? What was the object of the inspection proposed? The real fact was that if they inspected they controlled; and he considered the real meaning of the proposal was to put the whole of the schools under the control of the Government, and to allow them to interfere with their internal arrangements. He assured the Committee that the proposal of the hon. Member for Hackney must end in total failure. The parties who were proposing and supporting the Amendment knew nothing about the wants of Ireland. He was glad to see that the Scotch Members, generally, who took part in the discussion, had spoken temperately and with a knowledge of affairs; but, at the same time, he must say he considered it a very suspicious thing that the Paper should be black with Amendments by English and Scotch Members, while not a single Irish Member had one proposal to alter the Bill. He repeated, this was a very suspicious thing; and, seeing that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hackney was a complete departure from the whole principle of the Bill, he hoped the Government would act upon their own judgment of what was right and reject the Amendment, not heeding the temporary obstruction which had been offered to the passing of the measure.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, it was quite impossible to carry out inspection under the Bill as it stood. It was quite certain that the schools would be conducted by religious Orders, and it was well known that they would not be subject to inspection.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS could not help thinking that the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick was singularly inconsistent. He said there was inspection in the Bill; but that, if it was to be made a reality, as proposed by the hon. Member for Hackney, the Bill would require re-casting.

Mr. BUTT desired to correct the statement of the hon. Member for Londonderry. What he did say was that there was limited inspection provided for in the Bill; but that if extended, as proposed by the hon. Member for Hackney, the Bill would require re-casting.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, it really amounted to this. If the Conscience Clause, to which they would presently come, was to be anything else than a sham, inspection would be absolutely necessary. That was the only way by which they could be sure that the Conscience Clause would be a reality. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had told the Committee plainly enough that inspection was to be the exception and not the rule. Why was that to be the case in reference to an Education Bill for Ireland? The House would not allow any public money to be given for educational purposes in Scotland or England without adequate provision being made for inspection. This was done for two reasons. The first purpose was to insure respect for religious opinions, and prevent religious liberty being infringed upon. The second purpose of inspection was to see that the schools were efficient. To provide inspection for schools in Ireland, they were told, would destroy the Bill. He was quite aware of the reason why inspection was not provided in the Bill, and why it was objected to. The real reason for such a course of procedure was that it was a denominational Bill. It was a Bill for the purpose of endowing denominational education in Ireland. It was meant to be so, its operation must be so, and it was accepted as such by those who were greedy to accept it, and who knew that if it was altered as proposed by the hon. Member for Hackney, it would be destroyed as a purely denominational measure, and, therefore, would not be accepted by them. The hon. and learned Member for Limerick had plainly said that the alteration proposed, if conceded one jot or one tittle, would have the effect of qualifying the Bill, and, in point of fact, making it worthless in the eyes of the Irish Members who supported it. In reality, this Bill, which was introduced at so late a period of the Session, after having been in the Government bureau for months, was to be thrust down the throats of hon. Members, and to be passed without any concessions being made to those who opposed it. Considering that not to provide inspection was contrary to the principle on which money was voted for education in England and Scotland, he should vote with his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney if he divided the Committee, and as he hoped he would.

MR. EVANS was desirous to see the Bill passed; but he could not conceal from himself the importance of the discussion which had taken place. What was the use of providing a Conscience Clause unless some kind of inspection was decided on? He certainly thought it necessary to provide for inspection, as suggested by the hon. Member for Hackney.

MR. BUTT said, the Bill had, in its present form, been accepted by Protestants and Roman Catholics alike, without objection, and the animosity of the hon. Member (Mr. Charles Lewis) who had averred himself a strong Protestant, and who had said he represented a strong Protestant constituency, was not justified on the part of Protestants generally. He (Mr. Butt) must say this—that dealing with an intricate question the Government seemed to be satisfied that it would be better not to touch the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hackney. The Bill made certain things necessary for payment by results, and one of these was the provision of a Conscience Clause. No school whatever, conducted as an intermediate school, would consent to Government interference at every turn for the sake of payment by results. It was not a question of religious, but of gentlemanly, feeling, and both Protestants and Roman Catholics—and he must say it was only from Protestants that he had heard complaints—would indignantly object to it. If inspection was to be obtained, it must be purchased at a greater price than was offered for it in the Bill. They had within the limits of the Bill all the inspection that could be properly carried out. Any attempt to subject the intermediate schools of Ireland to a general inspection would, he believed, prove futile.

MR. MACARTNEY was very much astonished to hear the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) say that all school managers in Ireland would object to inspection. For his part, he did not believe Protestant school managers would object to it in the least. Rather they would invite it. He thought it most extraordinary that the Assistant Commissioner should also act as Secretary and as Inspector. The hon. and learned Member for Limerick stated that when the Board thought it necessary they could send down an Inspector. That was to say, those gentlemen would send down one of themselves. If, however, they had onerous duties to perform, how could they afford time to inspect schools? He was also very much surprised to hear the Chief Secretary for Ireland say it would be impossible to provide funds for the inspection of schools. Surely, the number of intermediate schools could not be large. They were not by any means so numerous as the national schools, which, of course, required a great number of Inspectors. A couple of Inspectors would, perhaps, be all that was necessary, and he thought the money devoted to paying them would be very well spent.

MR. FAWCETT interposed between the Committee and the division he was about to take, only for the purpose of entering his protest against the language used by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick in reference to the English and Scotch Members who happened to take part in that debate. He had distinctly referred to them as if they were guilty of an act of intrusion, and said—"What did they know about Irish education?" Now, he could assure the hon. and learned Member for Limerick that he (Mr. Fawcett) was just as sincere in this matter as he was. The hon. and learned Member warmly welcomed English assistance in carrying out his views on the Land Question, which was much more difficult for English Liberals to understand than this question of Irish Education. He was then as lavish in his praises of English Liberals as if they were the most enlightened of men; but when they happened to disagree with him the hon. and learned Gentleman changed his tone. Now, he (Mr. Fawcett) altogether objected to this attempt to separate English, Irish, and Scotch Members. To say that English Members should not concern themselves with Irish questions was introducing into that House Home Rule in its worst form. He put it to the hon. and learned Member for Limerick whether, if English Members were entitled to vote on such a complicated Irish question as Land Tenure, they ought not to express their opinions on the question of the inspection of schools? If inspection was good for education in England, it was good for it in Ireland. If it was necessary to have inspection in order to secure a proper expenditure of the public money devoted to education in England, it could not be less necessary to have the same sort of security for the proper expenditure of the public money devoted to education in Ireland. They did not wish to force inspection upon those schools which objected to it; but they did not do so in England. All they said was, if the managers of those schools wished to obtain certain payments, they must earn them in a certain way. There was no difference in this matter between England and Ireland. None, at any rate, had been pointed out, nor had any reason been shown why the same rule which applied to elementary schools should not apply to intermediate schools also. Some day or other the Bill would be drawn into a precedent for intermediate education in England. If it passed, it seemed to him absolutely impossible that the Conservatives and Liberals who supported it could refuse to extend to England the principle of payment without inspection. Feeling that an important principle was involved in this question, he thought it his duty to divide the Committee.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 42; Noes 126: Majority 84.—(Div. List, No. 238.)

Mr. E. JENKINS said, he did not know that he quite understood what the right hon. Gentleman proposed to do in reference to the next Amendment on the Paper, which stood in his (Mr. Jenkins's) name. The Amendment was as follows:—In Clause 6, page 3, to add the following sub-section:—

"(10.) The rules shall provide, in the discretion of the Board, either that one of the subjects in the Schedule (1), (2), or (3), shall be necessary in pass and honour examinations, or that it shall be necessary for the student in either of such examinations to obtain one-third of the possible marks in any four subjects."

He begged to move the Amendment.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, this was the Amendment to which he referred at a previous stage of the discussion. If the hon. Member would withdraw it, he (Mr. J. Lowther) would consider it before the Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*.

Clause 7 (No payment unless conditions as to religious instruction be observed).

Mr. FAWCETT observed that they had now reached an hour at which they might fairly report Progress. It could not be said that the Movers of the Amendments had wasted a single moment of time. He had himself advised the withdrawal of an Amendment which might have occupied hours, and the discussion upon it did not last more than 20 minutes. They now came to the most important clause of the Bill, after he and other hon. Members had been in the House continuously since 7 o'clock—he meant the Conscience Clause. The Government surely did not expect to get the Bill through Committee at a single Sitting, considering that the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill had occupied nine nights. If this education measure was being considered for the first time in Committee on the 25th of July, he was not in the least degree responsible for it. He thought the wisest course they could now pursue, considering the importance of the subject and the lateness of the hour, was to report Progress, and, accordingly, he begged to move that they should do so.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER hoped the hon. Member would not persist in his Motion. He had mentioned the 25th of July; they were now actually at the 26th, and it was customary at that advanced period of the Session to prolong their discussions beyond the usual time. He hoped the Committee would make a little sacrifice of its convenience in order that the Bill might proceed. They had already got through the substantial part of the measure. No doubt, there would be some discussion upon the clause before them; but after it had been disposed of very little would remain, as it was his intention to accept some of the Amendments on the Paper. Under these circumstances, he trusted the Committee would proceed.

MAJOR NOLAN begged the hon. Member for Hackney to leave the Irish Members this one night. They had not had one for a long time. All of them, with the exception of three or four, were anxious to go on with the Bill.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS supported the Motion, though he had no doubt that if the Government and the Irish Members wished it, they could force the Committee to sit longer, and treat all suggestions for an alteration of the Bill as they had treated them hitherto. He would remind the Committee that this was really a most important clause, and that, moreover, it was not the only subject on which discussion would arise. There was a very important Amendment in regard to national schools still to come—one which he was sure deserved careful consideration and discussion. Unless they were told they were bound to pass the Bill through Committee that night, he thought it hard that the discussion should be continued. He should certainly vote in favour of the Motion, out of regard for the interests of the people of Ireland — ["Oh!"] — at all events, of certain people in Ireland. With reference to a remark which had fallen in the early part of the evening from the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), he (Mr. Lewis) begged to say that he never spoke of himself as a representative of the Protestants of Ireland on this question. All he claimed for himself was that he represented a considerable number of persons in Ireland who thought deeply on this question, and who desired that their views should be laid before and considered by that House, though, like himself, they were perfectly prepared to be beaten. He thought it right to make these remarks, because the hon. and learned Member was entirely in error in supposing that he (Mr. Lewis) put himself forward as representing any body. That was to say, he did not represent any particular constituency, but only those persons who disagreed with the Bill.

MR. BUTT said, he was glad to hear the hon. Member admit that he did not represent any constituency on this question.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 18; Noes 134: Majority 116.—(Div. List, No. 238.)

MR. FAWCETT said, that, although he still thought it extremely inconvenient to proceed with the Bill at that hour, there was nothing which he disliked more than for any hon. Member not to accept the decision of the House or of the Committee. He was perfectly satisfied, therefore, with the protest which had been made; and, after the division which had just taken place, he should offer no further opposition to the measure being proceeded with.

MR. J. P. CORRY moved, in page 3, line 24, after "Board," to insert—"that such school is open during certain specified hours for secular instruction alone." His object was to secure that no children should be excluded from any school because of their religious convictions; but that they should have a full opportunity of receiving that instruction to which he conceived they were entitled under the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 24, after the word "Board," to insert the words "that such school is open during certain specified hours for secular instruction alone."—(*Mr. James Corry.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, the Government and the Committee would be acting contrary to the whole spirit of the Bill if they accepted the Motion of the hon. Member.

Mr. J. LOWTHER did not conceive that there was any occasion for the Motion.

Mr. NEWDEGATE believed that no Amendment could make the clause anything but a pretence. A Conscience Clause without inspection was nothing but a trap for unwary parents, particularly in the case of Monastic schools.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, he believed Parliament had been informed that this clause was framed upon the precedent of the Endowed Schools Act of 1869; but the fact was that it differed from the provisions of that Act as much as possible. The English Education Act provided that religious instruction must be at the beginning or end of school hours, so as not to interfere with a certain specified time for secular teaching which all the scholars might receive alike; but, under the clause which was now before the Committee, there was nothing to prevent the managers of schools from rendering it inoperative by refusing to receive scholars of particular classes and denominations. In England and Scotland schools were kept open to all comers, and the protecting influence of the Conscience Clause came in to prevent proselytism.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 32; Noes 111: Majority 79.—(Div. List, No. 239.)

Mr. COURTNEY moved, in page 3, line 25, after "pupil," to insert—

> "Is refused admission to such school on the ground of religious belief, and that no pupil."

The Proviso was one which could not, he thought, be well refused. He regarded it as an important elementary principle that, if public money were to be paid to a public school, that school should be freely open to the children of the people who were ready with the necessary fees, and that the Board should not make any grant to the managers of a school unless it could be shown that no child had been refused admission on the ground of religious belief.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 3, line 25, after the word "pupil," to insert the words "is refused admission to such school on the ground of religious belief, and that no pupil."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA pointed out that all the schools in Ireland were at the present time practically denominational.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the result fees to be given under the Bill would make it the direct personal interest of managers of schools to take as many pupils as they could.

Mr. EVANS said, that not very long ago a scheme was received from the Commissioners which had been adopted in the management of schools in the neighbourhood with which he was best acquainted—that of Derbyshire. One of the provisions of the scheme was that no pupil should be excluded in consequence of religious belief; and he did not see why that which was suitable for boarding schools in Derbyshire should not also be suitable in Ireland.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, it was impossible for him to look at the provisions of the Bill, from beginning to end, without being brought back to the conclusion that this was a measure for the endowment of denominational schools. He might be in a minority at the present time in that opinion; but in the course of the past week he had received communications from intelligent persons in Ireland, showing that they were beginning to understand the subject; and he was convinced that when the measure was actually in operation, some hon. Members would regret that they did not take up a different position from that which they had occupied in the course of the present discussion.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, reference had been made to the Endowed Schools Act of 1869; but he did not think that the interpretation which had been put upon that Statute was altogether correct. The sections of the Act which had been spoken of were not of general, but of special application; they did not say that every child, whatever his religion, should have a right to attend any school; but that if a child was entitled to admission on other grounds, he should not be excluded from attending a day school merely because of any difference in religion.

MR. COURTNEY thought that compliance with the principle for which he contended could be secured by making it a condition of result fees that the managers of schools should receive such scholars as were brought to them.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS remarked, that if, in the case of the English Endowed Schools, when Parliament was not dealing with public money, but with private endowments, it was thought necessary to have a Conscience Clause, how much more necessary was it when dealing with public money, to have an effective clause of that description.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, it appeared to him that the proposal of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) was altogether impracticable. If the hon. Member was not prepared to go further, it was simply childish and absurd to suppose that any adequate protection could be derived from his Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 28; Noes 107: Majority 79.—(Div. List, No. 240.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Finance).

MR. CHILDERS said, he desired to call the attention of the Committee to a point of considerable importance. Under the Bill a permanent Commission was about to be formed which would have the administration of large sums of public money devoted to secular education. This Commission would perform the functions of an ordinary Civil Department of the State. It was, therefore, desirable that the proceedings of that Commission should be brought under the review of the Legislature, and this could only be done by providing that the salaries of the Commissioners should be annually voted by Parliament, as was the case with every analogous Commission, whether the funds they administered were or were not voted by Parliament; such as the Endowed Schools Commission, the Charity Commission, the Copyhold Commission, the Education Boards, the Woods and Forests, and others. In the case of the Greenwich Hospital Commission, which formerly was not voted by Parliament, the abuses were so great, mainly owing to the absence of annual review, that it was found necessary to charge them on the Votes of Parliament, repaying the amount from Greenwich funds into the Exchequer. There was no instance of a permanent Commission dealing with funds devoted to secular purposes, and acting as a Civil Department, not appearing in the annual Votes.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he saw no reason why Parliament should be asked to vote a sum of money which it did not provide, but which was to be provided from sources altogether independent of Parliament. If the right hon. Gentleman, however, would place upon the Paper the exact words of any Motion which he might contemplate on the subject, it would be duly considered by the Government.

MR. BUTT said, that in the case of the Irish Church Temporalities Commission, whose members administered £300,000 a-year, all their expenses were paid out of the funds which they so administered, without being subject to the review of Parliament.

MR. CHILDERS pointed out that the funds referred to by the hon. and learned Member were not applied to State purposes.

MR. E. JENKINS thought that the provisions for auditing the accounts of the Commission to be appointed under the Bill were somewhat imperfect. This was an important matter, and he hoped care would be taken that the accounts were submitted to the Controller and Auditor General, and laid before Parliament.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, care would be taken that Government supervision was exercised in the auditing of the accounts.

MR. CHILDERS said, that what was wanted was that the audit should not be by Government. The audit should be independent, and not under the control of the Government, and the proper authority was the Controller and Auditor General.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he did not state that the audit would be made by the Government, but that it would be conducted under Government superintendence. However, he was quite willing to consider the point which had been raised before the stage of Report.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

SCHEDULE.

THE O'CONOR DON moved, in page 5, after line 13, to insert the following sub-section :—"(1.) The Irish language, literature, and archæology." The object of the proposal was to provide for instruction being given in the schools on those subjects. In a Bill of this description it was eminently desirable to recognize the fact that there was an Irish language, and that a knowledge of it would be useful. There were, no doubt, a great many persons in Ireland who spoke that language; but there were not many who knew it grammatically, who were able to write and read it, and to decipher it in manuscript. His proposal was not a mere matter of sentiment, but one which would, if adopted, prove practically useful.

MR. J. LOWTHER hoped that the hon. Member for Roscommon would not feel himself under a necessity to press his Motion to a division. Irish literature covered a wide ground; and, as regarded the Irish language, he thought it was substantially a dead language. It could hardly be seriously contended that a knowledge of that language was necessary in Ireland towards a good liberal education. As matters stood at present, he had not sufficient information to justify him in accepting the proposal of the hon. Member.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER hoped that the hon. Member for Roscommon would not be contented with the statement of the Chief Secretary; but would, if necessary, go to a division on the subject. He might remind the Committee that a Memorial, signed by 40 or 50 Members of Parliament, had been presented in favour of the proposal now under consideration; and when a Bill of this kind was being passed—a Bill which was intended to meet the wishes of the Irish people—could the Committee disregard the opinions of the Representatives of that people, as expressed in that document? He sincerely trusted the Chief Secretary for Ireland would reconsider the matter.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, there were in Ireland a literature and a language of great value, which threw much light upon the character, the ancient history, and the tendencies of the people of that country. He believed that 50 years hence it would be part of the programme of every Irish educationalist to insist upon a knowledge of those subjects which the hon. Member desired to see included in the present Bill. He joined with his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power), in hoping that the Chief Secretary for Ireland would re-consider the matter.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR desired to point out that if the proposal of the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) were accepted, it would alter the whole structure of the Schedules, which at present included only six subjects.

MAJOR NOLAN said, that if Greek and Latin were to be separated into two, there would also be an increase in the number of subjects.

MR. SULLIVAN strongly appealed to the Government to re-consider the subject. He could assure them that this was a matter which deeply touched the feeling of Ireland—one which touched that feeling more, perhaps, than anything else. Was this a moment, when a patriotic citizen of Edinburgh had collected from his countrymen no less a sum than £10,000—he referred to Professor Blackie—for the endowment of a Celtic Chair in the University of that city, for the Government to say "Nay" to a request like the present, made to them by the Irish Representatives? He might remind the Committee that in a previous Session he had appealed, and not in vain, to the Prime Minister to recognize Irish language and literature by giving a grant of money in connection with the ancient manuscripts of that country; and he stated then, what he stated now, that, owing to the neglect of education in Ireland, if the ancient language of the country was not more extensively known, they would soon be incapable of translating those manuscripts, which were of priceless value, not only to Ireland itself, but to the whole of Europe.

MR. BUTT said, he heartily joined with hon. Members who had spoken, in appealing to the Chief Secretary for Ireland to agree to the request which, he believed, was unanimously pressed upon him on the part of the Irish Representatives. There was at present—

and had been for many years—a Professor of the Irish language at Trinity College; and it was proposed that that Chair should be endowed in memory of an accomplished man who had taken a deep interest in the subject. Another well-known Irish citizen had left £5,000 a-year towards the cultivation of the Irish language. With these examples before them, he hoped the Government would see the importance of the proposal of the hon. Member for Roscommon, and would recognize the undoubted fact that great interest was taken in Ireland in this matter. He believed that nothing would give more general satisfaction throughout that country than a recognition, under this Bill, of the Irish language.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that as one who had occupied the post which his right hon. Friend (Mr. J. Lowther) now filled, he could assure the Committee, and especially the Irish Members, that the Government had not the slightest wish to place a ban upon the Irish language, or to depreciate the wishes of the Representatives of Ireland on the subject. Obviously, however, the matter was surrounded with a good many practical difficulties. While there was a considerable number of persons in Ireland at the present day who spoke the Celtic language, there were but few who were qualified scholars in it; and if the proposal of the hon. Member for Roscommon were adopted, he ventured to say that in but few schools would it be possible for those who attended them to secure efficient instruction in Irish language, literature, and archæology. It might be possible in time, and it might also be desirable, that a knowledge of those three subjects should be extended; but the extension could only come with time. Other branches of learning of great importance were not named in the Schedule of the present Bill; but it rested with the Board to introduce them, when they saw fit, among the list of subjects. He hoped that at that hour of the morning—2.30—the hon. Member for Roscommon would see the propriety of not pressing his proposition to a division.

MR. BUTT was acquainted with at least one seminary in Ireland—a Roman Catholic institution—in which no difficulty was experienced in receiving instruction in the Irish language. Formerly there were many men of eminence as scholars in the ancient tongue of his country; but the number of such men was declining every day, because no encouragement was held out to them. For that reason, if for no other, he thought the proposal of the hon. Member for Roscommon was one which ought to command the attention and approval of the Government.

THE O'CONOR DON said, that if the Chief Secretary for Ireland would undertake that on the Report he would, in some shape, embody in the Bill the recognition of the Irish language, Irish literature, and Irish history, he would not press the subject further on the Committee; but unless the right hon. Gentleman would give them an assurance that a provision for the purpose should, in some shape, be inserted in the Bill upon the Report, it would be necessary to divide the Committee on the question.

MR. E. JENKINS desired to point out to the Committee that this was a matter of University Education, apart from Intermediate Education. And what would be the effect of adopting the proposal? A man might pass in Irish language and literature, and then in some subject of secular education to be settled by the Board, and there would be nothing to insure that a proper and sufficient education was given to such competitors, which it was the great aim of the Bill to provide. There was nothing, in fact, to make it compulsory.

THE O'CONOR DON expressed himself willing to insert qualifying words in his Amendment, before "the Irish language," so that the number of six divisions of the subjects should not be increased.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he had no wish to stand out upon the point if it was the desire of the Committee, especially as he attached very little importance to it; and he would, therefore, at once say he would consider the matter on the Report.

Amendment *negatived.*

THE O'CONOR DON moved, in page 5, line 14, after "language," insert "and." He intended next to move to insert, after "history," "of England and Ireland." The hon. Member observed, that from the manner in which that portion of the sub-section was worded, it seemed to imply that any history written in the English language would comply with the conditions of the section. He did not know whether that was meant, or that the history was to be the history of England alone.

Mr. J. LOWTHER assumed that what was meant was the history of Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. O'DONNELL remarked, that Irishmen in general regarded "English history" as meaning the history of England. A great many Irishmen would arrive at the same conclusion upon that. A great deal of the difference of opinion which prevailed among different classes of Irish people arose from the fact that a great many Irishmen did not study the history of their own country. If Englishmen could be brought to study the history of Ireland, he thought the result would be satisfactory to both countries. He thought it should be of Great Britain and Ireland.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH suggested that the sub-section should be—"The language, literature, and history of Great Britain and Ireland;" otherwise, they would be leaving out a great deal of Irish literature.

The O'CONOR DON thought that Amendment a better one, and would withdraw his own.

Mr. E. JENKINS observed, that he took it that the Irish language would be included by that wording.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Yes, and the Gælic.

Mr. PULESTON: And the Manx.

Mr. BUTT reminded the Committee that the legal language of Great Britain and Ireland was the English.

Amendment (*The O'Conor Don*) *negatived.*

Amendment (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) proposed.

Mr. E. JENKINS again reminded the Committee that the Amendment now proposed would include the Irish language.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH replied, that the Board would put a natural interpretation on the words of the sub-section.

Amendment *agreed to.*

The O'CONOR DON moved, in page 5, line 16, after "history," to insert "or any one of them." He had intended to propose "or any two of them;" but he thought the present Amendment was preferable, in order that the knowledge of both should not disqualify.

Mr. E. JENKINS objected, that this would be reducing the requirements to a minimum, after Latin and Greek had been separated. It would then not be necessary for a boy to pass in any first-class subject; but two very small subjects indeed would enable him to obtain the advantages which the Bill held out.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, that what most struck him was the extraordinary magnitude of those prizes. They were, in fact, honour-prizes, and not pass-prizes. No such prizes were known in the corresponding institutions of Scotland. If this principle were finally adopted, they would have to cut their scholarships in two. If they so cut the subjects into parts, they must cut the scholarships also, and not give such prizes for such trifling subjects.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA hoped the hon. Gentleman would leave the provision as it originally stood.

The O'CONOR DON feared that many boys would not be found able to pass in two modern languages at present, and to make it obligatory would be equivalent to abolishing both; while there were some boys who would devote themselves to learning either French, or German, or Italian. They would not, however, find in the schools with which the Bill dealt, either the boys to learn, or the teachers to teach, all three languages. He thought, therefore, if they desired to encourage the study of modern languages, the requirement should be confined to only one.

Mr. J. LOWTHER, referring to the remark of the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) as to there being honour-prizes, and as to the ease with which they were obtained, observed that, to obtain them, the student must pass in three subjects. Still, he had no vanity of authorship of the Amendment, and he thought what was suggested was an improvement on the original draft of the Bill, for the idea of the boys being expected to know those three languages was never contemplated. It ought to have been put in a category by itself; but he never contemplated all three.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he concurred in what the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) had said with regard to those languages. He wished, however, to express his regret that Latin and Greek had been separated by an earlier Amendment. He now had to suggest that an Amendment should be inserted in the Bill, on the Report, to the effect that if a boy passed in three subjects, it should be compulsory, for the purpose of his obtaining those rewards and distinctions, that one of the subjects should be Greek, or Latin, or mathematics. If they did that, they would then have an examination worthy of the competition for higher honours and rewards, and thus answer the intentions of the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh.

MR. SULLIVAN wished to remind the Committee that in some of the Universities it was strongly recommended that an option should be allowed, not to take up Greek, but two modern languages instead.

MR. E. JENKINS said, he thought that, looking at what they had been doing, it would be well if the Government would fix on certain subjects as essential.

MR. J. LOWTHER explained, that he had stated he considered the suggestion an improvement, and would consider it on the Report.

MAJOR NOLAN thought that, if there was such a thing as "cramming," which he did not believe, they had taken the best means of discouraging it.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. COURTNEY moved, in page 6, line 1, to leave out "subjects," and insert "divisions."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. COURTNEY moved, in page 6, line 2, after "himself," to insert—

"Unless the Board shall, for special reasons to be stated by them in each case, dispense with this condition of eligibility."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. COURTNEY moved, in page 6, line 11, to leave out "October," and insert "April."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR said, that if the fees were kept at 10*s.* for the notices given by the students, it would be an intimation to poor Irish people that they need not apply for admission to any of the benefits which the Bill was intended to confer. He should move to leave out 10*s.* at page 6, line 14, and insert 2*s.* 6*d.*

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. COURTNEY moved to insert "divisions" instead of "subjects," consequent upon the same alteration previously made.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. COURTNEY moved, in page 7, line 3, to leave out "in the proportion of one for every ten students who shall pass in three subjects at the least."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. J. LOWTHER moved to insert after "course," in page 7, line 6—

"No student to whom such a prize is awarded shall continue to hold any exhibition under this Act previously held by him."

MR. COURTNEY thought such a provision was scarcely necessary.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. MELDON said, he had given Notice of an Amendment to leave out, in page 7, line 33, "not being a national school," and he observed that the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) had a similar Notice on the Paper. The subject would, he thought, require some amount of consideration and discussion, which could not be devoted to it now, as it was nearly 3 o'clock, and he therefore proposed to move his Amendment on the Report.

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 275.]

## VALUATION OF LANDS (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Sir Windham Anstruther, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Ramsay.*)

[BILL 124.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY moved that the Order for Committee be discharged. In doing so, he appealed to the Secretary of State for the Home Department to deal with the subject-matter of the Bill himself next Session. It was high time that the questions in dispute between the Parochial Boards and the Railway Companies in Scotland, as to valuation procedure, should be settled, and he should be very glad to see the Government undertake the duty of bringing that about.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged;* Bill *withdrawn.*

### HABITUAL DRUNKARDS [STAMP DUTY].

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That it is expedient to impose a Stamp Duty on Licences to keep Retreats for the reception of Habitual Drunkards, and also on every Patient admitted into such Retreat, and for the renewal of such Licences, which may become payable under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to facilitate the control and cure of Habitual Drunkards.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

### ELDERS WIDOWS' FUND [DEFICIENCIES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of the Revenues of India, of such sums as may be required to make good the deficiency in the Elders Widows' Fund, and to enable the Trustees from time to time to meet the current liabilities of the said Fund, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to enable the Trustees of the Elders Widows' Fund to apply the Capital of the said Fund in aid of Income, and for other purposes relating thereto (Queen's *Recommendation* signified), *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Friday, 26th July,* 1878.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Intemperance.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland) * (174); Naval Discipline Amendment * (175).

*Second Reading* — Idiots, &c. (Ireland) (148); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (169).

*Report*—Corrib (Galway) River * (166); Freshwater Fish Protection * (173); Weights and Measures * (161).

*Third Reading*—Epping Forest * (164); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance * (165), and *passed.*

### THE TREATY OF BERLIN—THE PORT OF BATOUM.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

EARL GRANVILLE: I rise, with permission of your Lordships, to make a personal explanation. The accuracy of a Ministerial statement is of national importance. The accuracy of a statement by an individual Peer is only of importance to himself, but to himself it is of great importance. On Thursday, the 18th, and on Tuesday, the 23rd, irreconcilable statements were made by the Prime Minister and myself respecting the port of Batoum. There is no question, I hope, of either of us wishing to deceive the House. The question is, which was best informed. The noble Earl, in referring on Thursday week to the cession of Batoum, said, among things—

> "It will hold three considerable ships, and if it were packed like the London Docks, it might hold six; but in that case the danger if the wind blew from the west would be immense."

On the Tuesday following, I quoted what the Prime Minister had said, and I said that I did not know how many ships Batoum could hold, but that I knew that recently it had held not three, not six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, or 12 but 13 men-of-war and a transport. Yesterday the noble Earl read, as a Memorandum from the Royal Hydrographer, as follows:—

> "Batoum can only be described as a bay and not as a harbour. The area within which ships can anchor is limited to a circle of about 850 yards in diameter, but this area is further reduced by the very deep water—upwards of 45 fathoms—of the central part. The anchorage ground with any reasonable depth is thus confined to the shore segments of the circle, and certainly not more than three iron-clad ships could take up anchorage here, and swing clear, even with a limited amount of cable and in fine weather. With reference to the statement made that the port has contained thirteen men-of-war and a transport, this could only have been effected by the ships being placed parallel to each other at short distances, and their sterns secured to the shore near the town on the western side of the bay. These are not the conditions attached to free anchoring ground, and it could be only under very exceptional circumstances that such a squadron would be so packed, and even then with insecurity."

I have seen in *The Morning Post* a letter from Hobart Pasha, which I shall read—

"SIR,—As considerable doubt seems to exist in the public mind as to what sort of place Batoum is as a seaport, I would like to give some information on the subject. The Prime Minister was perfectly right when he stated that only three ships could lay at anchor in the port, if he meant to convey, as I presume he did, vessels laying at anchor in the ordinary way with room to swing; but if ships are hauled into the shore with their sterns made fast with the beach (that is called laying in tiers) 12 or 13 vessels could moor in Batoum harbour. If any mistake was made by the Prime Minister in his statement regarding the capabilities of the harbour of Batoum for holding ships, it evidently arose from a technical error on the part of his informant, who had not calculated on the great advantage of the existence of deep water close into the shore, merely, I presume, having measured the size of the harbour and allowed so much space for each ship to anchor in, so that she might swing with safety."

On seeing this letter, I took the liberty to write to Hobart Pasha—

"July 26, 1873.

"DEAR HOBART PASHA,—I have just read in *The Morning Post* a letter in which you give an explanation of Lord Beaconsfield's mistake respecting the capacity of the harbour of Batoum. You were not the person who gave me the information on which I spoke on Tuesday, but I should be much obliged if you would tell me whether Batoum is a bay or a harbour; whether it is or is not a fact that 13 men-of-war and a transport have recently been held in that harbour; whether of these men-of-war seven were not iron-clads and one or two other ships taking up an equal space; and whether they were not perfectly safe in all weathers?"

I received the following reply:—

"DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—Batoum is more than a bay; it is a harbour though small, and a very safe one, as no sea or wind ever endangers the safety of ships moored to the shore. It is well-known to sailors that all vessels immediately on entering the harbour have to secure their sterns to the shore, where they are quite safe. Thirteen men-of-war of different sizes, of which six were iron-clads, and two large wooden frigates, were lying moored to the shore on more than one occasion."

I trust your Lordships will think I was justified in giving the contradiction which I did on Tuesday to the previous statement of the Prime Minister, that Batoum could only hold three considerable ships, or six closely packed, which would then be in immense danger if the wind blew from a certain quarter. On authority even better than the Hydrographer, it appears that 13 men-of-war have lain there more than once in perfect safety from any weather.

**THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD**: All I can say is that the statement of the noble Earl fully bears out that of the Royal Hydrographer.

**EARL GRANVILLE**: Yes, but not that of the noble Earl.

## TRAMWAYS (USE OF MECHANICAL POWERS) BILLS.—RESOLUTION.

**THE EARL OF REDESDALE** rose to move a Resolution in reference to the existing system of legislation in respect of the use of steam power on Tramways, and declaring the necessity of further inquiry. The noble Earl said, that looking at the extreme importance of the question to all persons concerned, he was desirous that the House should consider whether it was not expedient to pass some such Resolution as that he had just proposed. The first Report on the subject of the use of steam on Tramways was presented last year to the House of Commons, and the Committee of the present year had simply adopted that Report. The Committee recommended that certain bye-laws governing the use of steam or other mechanical power on Tramways should be framed by the Board of Trade, and he presumed that they were the bye-laws which appeared in the Bills now before Parliament. The recommendations referred to several matters more or less concerning the use of steam—the employment of bells, stopping the cars or slackening speed in case of approaching danger, posting the bye-laws, protection of passengers from machinery, consumption of smoke and steam, &c. But several of these precautions were not included in the Bills before their Lordships. One of the regulations—a very important one to his mind—was that the engines should not travel at a greater speed than eight miles an hour in town, and 10 miles an hour out of town; and that, where there were facing points, the rate should not be more than four miles an hour. The speed was to be determined by an indicator attached to each engine. Now, the indicator was admittedly not a perfect instrument, and therefore it was considered desirable that a recorder should also be used. But no provision was made in the regulations for recorders. On this point it was important to note the evidence given by Major General Hutchinson, of the Board of Trade. Before the Committee that gentleman was asked whether it was his opinion that the use of steam indicators and steam recorders should be laid down in any general regulations? The answer was, that was the opinion of the inspecting officers of the Board of Trade. But even if all the regulations recommended in reference to the use of steam were observed, it could not be said that they had arrived at any fixed or conclusive decision; and the question which he desired to raise, therefore, was whether some "further and well-considered legislation" as to the use of steam on tramways was not desirable. It should be remembered that when tramways were introduced, it was intended they should supply the place of omnibuses; and their application was first made in the direction of towns, the provision being that the lines should be carried along the middle of the streets. Now that it was proposed to lay down tramways in the public highways in the country, it was right to draw attention to the remarkable fact that in all these Provisional Orders the word "street," not "road," was used. This omission of the word "road" seemed to him to be very important, since, in some of the Bills before their Lordships' House, there was an evident desire to substitute to a considerable extent tramways for railways in certain cases. If that was the right thing to be done, it behoved Parliament to take care that further provision was made for the safety and convenience of the public, and that undue competition with railways did not arise. These tramway schemes came to Parliament at a great advantage; for, instead of having like a railway to buy land, they took the public highway. That was said to be for the public advantage; but for all that it was a matter requiring careful consideration, both on the ground of competition and of public convenience. There was one case illustrative of his argument that he desired specially to mention. Down in Lincolnshire they had started a tramway which was to run 10 miles into the country, and the lines were to be laid along one side of the turnpike road. This could only be done to the inconvenience, more or less, of the cattle, and carts, and other vehicles which by right were now driven over it; and it was perfectly clear that if tramways were thus to be laid down in all directions throughout the country, that some further Parliamentary regulation and control—not at first contemplated—would be required to prevent them becoming a danger and a nuisance. He thought it desirable, therefore, that their Lordships, before giving their consent to the Bills that had been presented to Parliament, should consider how far was expedient to permit the use of steam on tramways.

*Moved* to resolve, That this House is not prepared to sanction the use of steam power on tramways generally under the conditions proposed in the Bills now waiting to be committed without further inquiry:

That further and well considered legislation appears desirable in regard to tramways to be worked by steam along public highways throughout the country in conjunction or in competition with railways, such tramways being free from many of the obligations to which railways are subject, and frequently proposed to be laid on one side instead of the centre of the road thereby affecting the property of frontagers injuriously and unequally.—(*The Earl of Redesdale.*)

LORD CARLINGFORD was not surprised at the alarm exhibited by his noble Friend, in common with many others, at the somewhat novel idea of introducing steam power upon the highways and country roads. His noble Friend shied at the idea, just as horses shied at steam tramways themselves; but they were told by witnesses who appeared before the Committee of the House of Commons, that it was possible to educate horses to the engine and cars; and he must confess that, since their evidence, he had gone through some education himself, and thought that a great deal of the ground for alarm had passed away. The Committee which this year inquired into the subject was a most competent one, and was presided over by a Gentleman of great ability and industry—his hon. Friend, Mr. Arthur Peel. Their Report was not by any means a repetition of that presented by the former Committee. A great deal of fresh evidence of a most important kind was taken, amongst the witnesses being Major General Hutchinson and other railway inspecting officers of the Board of Trade. Major General Hutchinson had been engaged during the year in examining all accessible tramway lines, not only in this but in foreign countries, where the use of steam power had already been tried. The result of those inquiries was well calculated to allay the alarm that had been created. Notwithstanding what his noble Friend had stated, there did not appear to him to be any lack of restrictions or regulations in the Bills and Provisional Orders before Parliament. On the contrary, the promoters of the tramways were subjected—and most properly so—to an amount of control such as was never imposed upon any other class of traffic. If steam was to be used on tramways at all, the most careful regulations would have to be adopted for the safety of the public, especially in regard to the danger of frightening horses, and thus causing risk to human life. For his own part, he wished that those obnoxious machines, the traction engines, which they were in the habit of seeing on their roads every day, were subjected to anything like the same regulations as were to be found in these Tramway Bills. He believed the annoyance that would be experienced from steam tramways would be less than that which resulted from the traction engines. No doubt, there were weighty arguments in favour of these Bills. The promoters had managed to satisfy two careful inquiries of the other House; they had satisfied the Board of Trade; and last, though not least, they had satisfied all the local authorities of the towns and places concerned. But it was true that this House had not itself inquired into the question of the use of steam on tramways on their public roads. He thought it would be only proper that the House should inquire for itself into that point; but he did not see why, on that ground, these Bills and Orders should be absolutely rejected. He thought the promoters, who must have incurred considerable expense, were entitled to have their Bills without the clauses authorizing the use of steam, on the understanding that an official inquiry should be instituted into the whole question by this House next Session. He trusted this suggestion might be accepted.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD said, that if the suggestion of the noble Lord met the wishes of the House, he, for his part, would be quite prepared to accept it.

LORD COLVILLE OF CULROSS was struck by the somewhat favourable legislation accorded to Tramway Companies as against Railway Companies. Over the Metropolitan Railway, which was constructed at the enormous cost of about £1,000,000 a-mile, there was actually running a tramway whose proprietors purchased no land at all, but simply laid their rails on the high road. The Metropolitan Railway Company had to pay 5 per cent on their receipts for passenger duty, whilst the Tramway Companies—those privileged interlopers on the Queen's highway—did not pay a farthing. He thought the time had come when some fairness should be shown in the matter; and he considered that the passenger duty should be imposed on the Tramway as well as the Railway Companies.

VISCOUNT POWERSCOURT hoped their Lordships would not pass the Resolution which had been proposed, as they would have the effect of preventing the use of steam on tramways altogether. He thought to do so would be a mistake, because it was quite possible the best kind of steam engine had not yet been invented, and it was not improbable that some noiseless machine might hereafter be made which would be altogether unobjectionable.

LORD TALBOT DE MALAHIDE did not advocate the use of steam on tramways, which were a sufficient nuisance without it; but he travelled in a steam carriage to Ascot and back before the introduction of railways with the late Earl of Egmont and other persons, and although the journey was a tedious one, there was no accident owing to the frightening of horses.

THE EARL OF STAIR thanked the noble Earl for having brought this question before the House, as it was one of very great importance. The noble Lord (Lord Carlingford) appeared to have no fear of tramway engines; but directly he met a traction engine, he was aghast. In regard to the testimony borne by the noble Lord who spoke last, he must state that he had witnessed the working of a steam tramway in Princes Street, Edinburgh, and his experience was that every horse which passed shied at it.

LORD HENNIKER said, it seemed to be agreed that it was desirable to appoint a Select Committee next year, and, as another debate of some importance was about to come on, it was hardly worth while to prolong the discussion or to divide the House. One point was gained, at all events—that the parties who were immediately interested in these Bills would now know what they were to expect. He understood that it was now arranged that a Select Committee should be appointed early next Session. He hoped this would be appointed as early as possible; and, meanwhile, the Board of Trade would insert powers to use steam in all Provisional Orders relating to Tramways, subject to the decision of the Committee, which would have to be considered by the Board of Trade before they could come to any decision. There were two Bills. No. 3 Bill related to tramways which were already existing, which were asking for steam powers. No. 2 Bill contained new Tramways Provisional Orders, with steam powers in them. He did not suppose that even the noble Earl (the Earl of Redesdale) wished to disallow powers which had been sanctioned over and over again by Parliament, and he supposed that under the arrangement made, No. 3 Bill would not be proceeded with, and No. 2 Bill would be passed without the clauses relating to mechanical power.

The Earl of REDESDALE understood the noble Lord's (Lord Carlingford's) suggestion to be that the clauses empowering the use of steam should be omitted from the Bills passed this year, and that next Session there should be a Committee of the House to consider what should be done. As that suggestion had been accepted, he would not press his Resolution on the House; but next year he should ask attention to the question whether better legislation could not be had as to tramways running over the public roads of the country.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

## IDIOTS, &c. (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 148.)

(*The Lord Carlingford.*)

### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Lord CARLINGFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that the object of the measure, which had passed the other House, was to give to Boards of Guardians in Ireland substantially the same powers as were possessed by similar bodies in England in regard to the disposal of blind, deaf, and dumb, or imbecile paupers, who might, under proper regulations, be domiciled where they would be better cared for than in the workhouse. There were certain words in the Bill which apparently extended it beyond the English law; but those words he would, at the next stage, agree to omit.

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Carlingford.*)

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON would offer no objection to the second reading of the Bill, although Clauses 3 and 4 appeared to go further than the English law in respect to imbecile paupers. He believed the late Lord Chancellor of Ireland introduced a somewhat similar Bill last year, which was not proceeded with in consequence of a Commission being issued in Ireland to inquire into the whole question. He was informed that the labours of the Commission had now terminated, and that the Commissioners had drawn up their Report. In assenting to the second reading, therefore, he must give Notice that in Committee, in the 4th clause, he should propose to insert words empowering the Local Government Board, if they thought proper, to impose such regulations as might be deemed necessary to give effect to the Report of the Commissioners to which he had alluded.

After a few words from Earl Nelson and Lord O'Hagan,

Lord CARLINGFORD observed, that this Bill was far more restricted in its operations than that introduced last year by his noble and learned Friend. He had no doubt that in Committee he would be able to agree to such an Amendment as that which the Lord President of the Council had sketched out.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION—
## THE TREATY OF BERLIN—ALLEGED AGREEMENT BETWEEN ENGLAND AND RUSSIA.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of ROSEBERY rose, in accordance with Notice, to call attention to a Memorandum purporting to have been signed by the Marquess of Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff on May 30, 1878, and to ask, If it was the intention of the Government to lay it on the Table of the House? He regretted that the question was not in worthier hands than his. It was of importance, as bearing on a part of the policy of Her Majesty's Government, which, from the nature and scope of it, must be of paramount importance at this moment. It might be objected from the Government Bench that he had not framed his Notice in the form of a Motion. He had always observed that when noble Lords on the Opposition side ventured to call attention to important points in the policy of the Government, they were met with the statement that the Government would be quite prepared to defend their policy when it was properly challenged. Well, in the first place, with respect to the reflection which, he thought, would be found after a little to become rather monotonous, he had to say that he thought they on the Opposition side of the House must recognize the fact that they were not a majority. They were in a minority, though, he believed, a right-thinking minority. In the second place, he thought he might state that they—that he, at any rate—did not for one moment wish to call in question the policy of the Government in this matter. The policy of the Government must be most momentous in its consequences. It was, he believed, a policy such as had not at any time been submitted to Parliament during this century. But it was a policy as gloomy as it was gigantic. They knew absolutely less about it now then they did at the beginning of the Session. He humbly ventured to say that their proper course, as an Opposition, was not so much to arraign the policy of the Government, as it was to ask the Ministers to instruct them in it, in short and easy lessons. As he said before, the policy of the Government was a great one, and, being so great, there was all the greater necessity for explanation. Upon this head the Government did not appear to agree with the view he had endeavoured to express. The course they had pursued with respect to their policy, he would venture to say, was one of obscurity enlivened with sarcasm. The other day, the noble Earl (Earl Granville) the Leader of the Opposition in their Lordships' House, ventured, in a manner so conciliatory as to be almost humble, to ask for some information with regard to the last jewel which had been placed in the English Crown, and he was referred to *The Encyclopædia Britannica.* Well, they did get a little information, but it did not come from the noble Marquess at the head of the Foreign Office (the Marquess of Salisbury). The Predecessor in Office of the noble Marquess did give them some information, and did throw light on some of the transactions of the Government, for doing which he was sharply called to account by the noble Marquess, who likened him to Titus Oates. They who came to the Government asking for bread might complain that they were treated to stones, and stones thrown with no inconsiderable force. In the whole history of the negotiations there were five cardinal points—points which became salient to everybody who had studied the history of these transactions. First, there was the San Stefano Treaty; the second was the Circular of the 1st of April; the third, the alleged secret Agreement of May 30; the fourth, the secret Convention of June 4th, with Turkey; and the fifth was the Treaty signed at Berlin on the 30th of July. As to the secret Agreement between Russia and England, the only light thrown upon it was that which came from certain proceedings in a police court. Now, as regarded this Agreement, which was supposed to have been signed by the noble Marquess the Foreign Secretary and the Russian Ambassador in England, Count Shouvaloff, on the 30th of May, it would be well to recall how they came to have any cognizance of it at all. The substance of it appeared in *The Globe* within, he thought, three or four days after it was signed, and it was on the 14th of June, he thought, that the entire text was given in the columns of the same journal. As regarded the substance of the Agreement, a Question was put to the noble Marquess on the 3rd of June, and he replied, that—

> "The statement in *The Globe*, and other statements he had seen, were wholly unauthentic, and not deserving the confidence of their Lordships' House."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxl. 1061.]

On the 17th of June, the noble Duke the Lord President of the Council, who had been interpellated on the same point, said that at the earliest possible moment Her Majesty's Government would be prepared to give the fullest information to Parliament, and that the alleged Agreement which had appeared in *The*

*Globe*—and he used words identical with those used in "another place" by a Member of the Government in answer to a Question, in similar terms, so that they must have been the result of some study—was "incomplete, and, therefore, incorrect." Upon the statement of the noble Duke, there was certainly a very strong case for the production of an authentic copy of the Agreement. Having got as much knowledge as they could of this Agreement, and there being no authentic denial, as he understood, of the principle of the Agreement, he must say he thought it a little hard of the Government to leave the nation in entire ignorance of the exact text of this particular document, which was a compact of so much importance that it would be difficult to over-estimate its significance. Not merely that; but if this was a "counterfeit presentment" of the real Agreement, it was even worse upon the part of the Government to leave it with them, and deny them the means of testing its accuracy. Another thing was apparent. It might be irregular for him to refer to what had transpired in "another place," but they had all heard that the Agreement was not to be laid upon the Table, because there were documents in connection with it which it would be necessary to present at the same time; but other Powers would not allow us to produce them. What he gathered from all this was, that if it had not been for the ill-advised conduct of a very subordinate clerk in the Foreign Office, who was intrusted with the copying of the Agreement, at the rate of 10*d.* per hour, the English public at this moment would not have the faintest conception of such an Agreement, and the key-stone of the whole purpose of the Government would be wrapped in obscurity. This was alarming in itself, as regarded the general direction and course of the policy of the Government; because, if these subterranean methods were employed as a rule, they would give the public some little dismay in regard to the progress of further negotiations. There was this further consideration, which was also alarming—namely, what were the documents that foreign Powers would not allow the Foreign Secretary to produce, and without which this important document was incomplete and incorrect? What was the nature of these documents? Did they pledge this country to anything in the future? They would have known absolutely nothing, and would have been told absolutely nothing, about the document in question, if it had not been for a pure accident. Was the British Parliament to be left in total, entire, and contemptuous ignorance upon a point like this; because, if it was, it had better abdicate its office at once. Having signed this Agreement, and having signed another secret Agreement within two or three days with Turkey, Her Majesty's Plenipotentiaries proceeded, fortified with them, to the Congress. Now came the most extraordinary point in all the history of these negotiations, so far as they knew it. Eight days after the signature, or alleged signature, of this Agreement, in which, if the House would remember, we consented to the abandonment of Batoum and the other Russian conquests in Armenia, the Foreign Secretary addressed a despatch to our Resident Plenipotentiary at Berlin, in which he urged him to use his exertions to the utmost on behalf of Batoum. The words were so remarkable that he might be pardoned for quoting them to their Lordships. On the 8th of June, the noble Marquess wrote to Lord Odo Russell—

> "There is no ground for believing that Russia will willingly give way in respect to Batoum, Kars, or Ardahan; and it is possible that the arguments of England urged in Congress will receive little assistance from other Powers, and will not be able to shake her resolution in this respect."

Well, that was not likely under the circumstances. The noble Marquess continued in this letter of June 8th—

> "You will not on that account abstain from earnestly pressing upon them and upon Russia the justice of abstaining from annexations which are unconnected with the professed object of the war, and profoundly distasteful to the populations concerned, and the expediency, in regard to the future tranquillity of Asia, of forbearing to shake so perilously the position of the Government of Turkey. In the event of the failure, in this respect, of the English Plenipotentiaries, you will be made acquainted with the course which Her Majesty's Government have decided to pursue."

This meant, if it meant anything, that the noble Lord, our Ambassador at Berlin, if his arguments on behalf of Batoum and against Russian conquests in Armenia failed, he would be made acquainted with the Convention signed four days previously at Constantinople, and which, it seemed to him, ought at once to have been brought to the notice of our Representative in the German capital. Now, the great point with regard to this was, was Lord Odo Russell, when he received that communication, cognizant of the Agreement which had been signed on the 30th of May? Because what they wanted to know was this—Was Lord Odo Russell one of a company, or was he a simple actor put up to recite the arguments of Batoum, with a prompter by to keep him to his part? Either he did know of the Agreement, or he did not. If he did know of it, then it was impossible to understand the despatch of the 8th of June. If he did not know of it, the despatch was calculated to mislead him as to the course the Government had decided upon. The contest, however, was carried on, and they all knew what it led to. The result, and, indeed, the whole thing, reminded him of a passage in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, which their Lordships would pardon him for recalling to their attention. Starveling, one of the actors in the drama, says—"I believe you must leave the killing out when all is done." To which Bottom the weaver, replies—

> "Not a whit; I have a desire to make all well. Write me a prologue, and let the prologue seem to say we will do no harm with our swords; and that Pyramus is not killed indeed; and for the more better assurance that I, Pyramus, am not Pyramus, but Bottom the weaver."

He did not believe this to be a laughing matter, but the quotation happened to come in with such pertinency that he could not help repeating it. As regarded the general character of the proceeding, he would say it was mysterious and mystifying. It was a proceeding, moreover, which he would take the liberty of saying was not characterized by the qualities which generally marked the course of British diplomacy. Then, on the same day, Mr. Secretary Cross addressed a despatch to the Plenipotentiaries of Her Majesty, urging them to make great exertions on behalf of Greece. He should say that the position of a Plenipotentiary who entered the Congress to struggle on behalf of Batoum, Kars, Ardahan, and Greece, must be a somewhat melancholy one in the retrospect; because, when the questions came up, the Turkish positions were abandoned and Greece was ignored. Many persons in England heard with sorrow and dismay that the task of upholding Greece was left to the Plenipotentiaries of France and Italy in the Congress, for they remembered that England had lavished much blood and treasure for Greece. But, in this instance, we bade her wait, and she waited. What had been the result? No doubt the noble Marquess did speak of the affairs of Greece; but this was one of the subjects which was relegated to the influence of personal interviews, whence it had not emerged. How was all this to be explained? Why had England abandoned her ancient prerogative of supporting Greece and oppressed Nationalities on the Continent, especially those whom Turkey had trodden down? Was the explanation of this course to be found in the documents which were of a nature to complete the Agreement, of which they had had at least some foreshadowing? Would any explanation be found in those documents of this very strange proceeding? He should like to know what more was to follow. As to secret Treaties, he believed they were not unknown to this country. There was a secret Treaty in 1815, by which England, Austria, and France agreed to support the decisions of the Congress of Vienna with 500,000 men. Then there was the Treaty of the 21st of November, 1855, by which we guaranteed the position of Sweden. He did not pretend that secret understandings were unknown to us; but he believed this was the first time we had called a European Congress, with the view of discussing great Treaties, and standing forth on behalf of public law, we ourselves having, at the same time, bound ourselves in private to consent to those stipulations which we had denounced, and which we continued to denounce. He believed this to be a course which was altogether unique in the history of English diplomacy; but, of course, if he were wrong on that point, he should receive correction. He might say that it did not make him happier to feel that now that they had got the drift of the document, the Government refused to produce its precise words. There was another Convention, which was the correlative of this one, about which he wished to make one remark—the Convention of the 4th of June, 1878, by which we had made important stipulations with the Ottoman Porte. It would be in the recollection of their Lordships that the ground on which they insisted upon the Treaty of San Stefano being submitted to a European Congress was that it seriously modified the Treaties of 1856; and that, accordingly, it could not be held valid without the sanction and criticism of the Powers who were parties to those Treaties. But at the very moment we were urging that, we were making a Convention with the Ottoman Empire, which, most certainly, invaded the Treaties of 1856; and he had not heard that this new Treaty was to be submitted to a Congress, or that it was ever considered to require the sanction of a Congress. He laid these matters before their Lordships, as matters not necessarily requiring censure; but he did think they required elucidation. This country had always had one or two attributes which distinguished her from many other nations. One of these was unto her a sacred prerogative—that of standing out upon behalf of weak nations; another was that in dealing with the affairs of other countries, we were fair and straightforward; another circumstance marking our history was the openness—the almost faulty openness—of our diplomacy; another, of which we had always been proud heretofore, was the completeness of our Parliamentary control. He confessed to the fear that great doubt would now be thrown upon our possession of these attributes; and, indeed, he regretted that some of them seemed entirely to have disappeared. But he regretted more than any of these circumstances, that the Government had not seen fit to trust the Parliament, and the country; and he ventured to ssk the noble Marquess whether the time had not arrived—in the words of the noble Duke, whether we had not reached the earliest possible moment — when, with regard to these transactions, he might take into his confidence the great English nation which had shown confidence in his Government, which had brought the Government an unexampled majority, and which had some claim to know the nature of those secret Conventions which must so seriously modify our career as a nation?

*The Earl of Rosebery*

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl is perfectly correct in saying that this particular movement—for it is not a Motion—which he has taken this evening, is analogous to the general policy which his side of the House have thought fit to pursue during the discussion of this question. They raise objections, they introduce general debates upon particular questions or small points; but they decline to challenge the judgment of the House upon any one point upon which they arraign the conduct of the Government or of a Minister. Their excuse for doing this is that they know they are in a minority. But the complaint of the Government is, that the result of this policy is that the country does not know in how small a minority they are. The country sees debates constantly going on—the same speakers constantly re-iterating the same charges; but they do not know—what I am credibly informed—that the Opposition, which, ordinarily, is a very strong one in this House, is in this matter confined to the Front Bench, and a few devoted followers behind. I do not think, at all events, this policy is likely to have the effect of diminishing the minority of which they complain. The questions which the noble Earl has submitted to the House have a very important public bearing; but it has also one bearing that is personal to myself. The noble Earl complains of my language, when I was asked of the truth of a certain statement which had appeared in the newspapers. I had stated that the document which had appeared was unauthentic and unworthy of the confidence of this House, and the noble Earl proceeded to characterize this document which I had so described as being the substance of a document whose general authenticity was not denied. It is merely a question of fact, whether this summary was or was not an authentic summary of the document which appeared later, and of which it purported to be the substance. I described it as unauthentic simply because it was so, and because no other adjective would accurately describe its character. I shall say in a few words why I so described it, and what my justification for this description was. At that time, the main contest and controversy between ourselves and Russia in those negotiations was the extent of the military power to be given to the Sultan in the Province South of the Balkans. Russia was willing enough to acknowledge the nominal authority of the Sultan; we were willing enough to provide institutions which would secure the people from misgovernment; but the point on which we found it impossible to agree was our contention that the Sultan should have the full power of militarily defending this Province we had assigned to him. Therefore, in the understanding which we came to with the Russian Government, this point was carefully and deliberately reserved for future consideration at the Congress, the Russian Government well knowing that we were resolved to insist upon it, and that it was a point which we could not yield. As a matter of fact—I am speaking of what is concealed from no one—when we came to the Congress this matter was earnestly contested, and the negotiations at one time seemed in danger of breaking off; but at last we obtained our point, and secured the military supremacy of the Sultan in the Province South of the Balkans. It was the key-stone and essence of our policy. This summary, of which the noble Earl speaks, and which was supposed to contain the essential part of the Agreement between England and Russia, misrepresents us in regard to this important point. It represents us as giving up that point absolutely and altogether; it said we had assented that the Turkish troops should be withdrawn from the Province and should not return to it. It was in a most essential point an absolutely untrue description of the document it professed to represent. If *Hamlet* were represented, with the part of Hamlet left out, I should describe it as at least an unauthentic representation. For the same reason, I so described the summary of the Agreement, which left out the most essential point, aye, and the point on which the eyes of the other Powers were most intensely riveted, or which gave of that point an entirely untrue description. These are the reasons why I described it as an unauthentic document, and if I were asked the same question again, I would give the same answer. The noble Earl reproaches us very bitterly because we will not lay this document and other documents illustrating it upon the Table of the House. This is not an isolated document; on the contrary, it is part of a considerable interchange of ideas. I may relieve the noble Earl's mind as to this country being under any engagements in consequence of these documents which we will not produce. This country is under no engagements for the future except those on the Table of the House. But when the noble Earl asks us to produce these documents, he must know very well that the production of confidential documents depends not merely upon your own consent, but upon the consent of those persons whose confidence you have been enjoying, and by whose confidence you have negotiated at all. We have asked for consent to produce Papers which we think essential to illustrate the document, but that consent has been refused. The complaint which the noble Earl makes that it is at variance with the traditions of English diplomacy to have confidential communications with foreign Powers, only shows that entire unacquaintance with the inside of a Government Office which I have no doubt, in the noble Earl's case, will not last long. It is not only an essential part of the diplomacy of this country, but it must be an essential part of the diplomacy of every country to conduct negotiations which those persons with whom you communicate do not wish should be published at Charing Cross. I have only been in Office a few months; but already, many and many a time, not from one Power but from many Powers have I received communications prefaced with this condition—"You are to receive it only on condition that it does not go into a Blue Book." Our Blue Books are a perfect terror to Continental Chanceries. As far as we are concerned, we have no objection to publicity; we live in an atmosphere of publicity; and we are glad to have the criticism of those to whose authority we owe obedience; but were we to enter into negotiations with the announcement that we intended to publish everything we received and heard, the simple result would be that we should receive nothing and hear nothing. Of course, the necessity of observing reticence, which is not observed by us for our own pleasure, but is imposed on us by others, somewhat hampers me in dealing with many portions of the noble Earl's contention that this document surreptitiously obtained, throws a new light on our policy. But

I think he is making a rather considerable mountain out of the very small molehill of the official Correspondence which is placed at the beginning of the Blue Book that contains the Protocols. It is the ordinary practice when Plenipotentiaries are sent out to give them instructions. For that reason Mr. Cross gave instructions to my noble Friend and myself; but I assume he is aware that was a mere formal proceeding. He does not really suppose that Mr. Cross was the sole depositary of the policy which he explained. And so with Lord Odo Russell. He knew all we had been doing; he knew all the documents that passed through the Office, and the line we intended to pursue. In the same way formal instructions were addressed to me by the Secretary of State when I went to Constantinople; but no one would suppose that those formal instructions were dictated by him. The fact is it was as a convenient way of recording what we set out to do that these formal instructions were addressed to us. The policy was determined upon first, and then it was put down in the instructions. I think, also, that the noble Earl entirely misapprehended the bearing of the Memorandum on which he lays so much stress, which he read to the House. When we found how deep the divergence of views between this country and Russia was, at the time when the first refusal to go into the Congress was made, we came to the conclusion that an immediate entrance into Congress was not desirable. A Congress is a very good thing to bring those together who already have a tolerable similarity of views, and whose personal communications are therefore likely to increase their peaceful disposition; but a Congress is only an instrument of war when it brings together those whose opinions are hopelessly divergent. We felt at first that there was this great danger before us—that if we assembled in Congress and separated in anger, the peace of Europe would be in far greater danger than if the Congress had never met. We, therefore, came to the conclusion that it would be useless to meet until we were satisfied there was that amount of agreement between Russia and ourselves as would make a peaceful solution possible. With this view, we considered it an essential preliminary that a rough outline of agreement should be arrived at; but that agreement was not what we were to discuss, what we were to settle, or what line we were to take in Congress. The agreement was in regard to what we were to do if Congress failed to settle the differences on certain particular points. Our agreement was, for instance, with reference to Bessarabia on the one hand, and the Balkan frontier on the other, that if we could not come to an agreement with regard to them after due discussion in Congress, we should not go to war on account of them. There were other questions which were still left open, and which might have been the cause of war; but a certain number were taken and put aside. We felt it perfectly certain that Russia would not abstain from entering Bessarabia; we, on the other hand, were determined that Bulgaria should not stretch to the Ægean; and, balancing one against the other, concessions were obtained on both sides; and the points I have mentioned we said should not be the cause of war. But while we said we would not go to war for them, we did not despair of modifying the opinion of Russia in regard to some of them. On the contrary; in the first place, we knew there would be other Powers at the Congress, and that their views would have great weight; and, in the second place, we knew that, apart from the threat of war, yet, by discussion in Congress, it was possible to appeal to other motives short of war as an instrument for obtaining modifications of opinion. The error of the noble Earl is not, perhaps, so great as the opposite error—that of the Peace Party in this country, who imagine that you can get everything by arguments, and have no need to employ armaments; that you have nothing to do but put reasons before your adversary, and your adversary will yield. I am glad to see the noble Earl renounces them; but it is possible to carry the opposite view too far. The threat of going to war is not the only instrument which one nation has to use in controversy with another. I will not seek to prove this *à priori*, but by an instance. We said we would not go to war on certain points; but France declared she would not go to war on any point—*à fortiori*, if we lost all influence by this preliminary understanding, France must have been absolutely without influence in the Congress. But was that the case? Anyone who sat in the Congress, and saw the impatience with which the views of the French Plenipotentiaries were waited for, and the weight which was attached to them when delivered, would not for a moment fall into that error. Take another instance. Germany said that nothing would induce her to bleach the bones of a single Pomeranian soldier in Turkey; but if any one in this House should tell me that, on that account, Germany was without influence in the Congress, I can only say his political information differs considerably from mine. I can prove the same fact from the simple instance of Batoum. The noble Earl thinks it was a mere comedy, our urging any modification of the terms regarding Batoum after the adoption of the Memorandum. Notwithstanding that, it was our firm intention to endeavour to obtain a modification of the terms, and to a great extent we succeeded. We did urge in the strongest way upon Russia the importance of not inserting into the Treaty provisions which would allow her to make Batoum an armed naval station menacing the Bosphorus. I shall not venture to say what were the arguments we used to convince her, but, at all events, those arguments were used with effect; and though on the point of Batoum, Russia well knew that we would not go to war, she consented to make it a free and essentially commercial port, and, moreover, yielded a considerable portion of territory occupied by Mahomedan populations. It is ridiculous, then, to tell us that we were playing a comedy. We were doing something which was really and conclusively serious. We sought to persuade Russia to give up certain advantages; and that we were not trusting to futile arguments is proved by the fact that she yielded to this extent. Therefore, when the noble Earl tells us that this letter to Lord Odo Russell was inconsistent with the traditions of British diplomacy, I can only say it was a plain and open declaration of what we intended to do, and what we did; and, considering that the noble Earl opposite has not ventured to challenge our decision, it seems that we did it with considerable success. I will now say a few words with respect to Greece. I can only account for the noble Earl's speech by supposing that he has not read the Protocols. He said, in the first place, that we had given some promise to Greece of an increase of territory if she abstained from going to war. No such promise has ever, as far as I know, passed from the hands or lips of any British Minister. I, myself, when these rumours were put about, challenged the Greek Foreign Minister to produce any such promise, and he entirely acknowledged the freedom of the British Government in the matter. The noble Earl tells us that Mr. Cross sent us to the Congress with instructions to defend the cause of Greece, and that the cause of Greece was utterly abandoned. I am afraid the noble Earl has not even read the letter of Mr. Cross. What Mr. Cross told us was that we were to procure a hearing for Greece at the Congress, and we did so. We did it on these grounds—not for the sake of any increase of territory—a question on which we had absolutely refused to bind ourselves—but because Greece was the natural protector and representative of the Greek populations under Ottoman rule. We thought it fair that if a Slav was to sit at the Table to defend Slav interests, a Greek should be there to defend Greek interests. We were unable to obtain that representation for Greece to the fullest extent of what we wished; but we did obtain it in a considerable degree. The noble Earl tells us that we surrendered the cause of Greece entirely into the hands of Italy and France. Why, I heard my noble Friend behind me deliver at the Congress, in defence of this very cause of Greece, one of the most eloquent speeches I ever heard from him. The noble Earl might just as well tell me that the noble Earl opposite has surrendered the Leadership of the Liberal Party in this House to the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery), because, on this occasion, he supports his Motion, as to say that because we allowed France to make a motion, and then supported it, that therefore we surrendered the cause of Greece into the hands of France. Now, in respect to the cause of Greece, I do not wish to speak many words, because words on this matter are dangerous. Any encouragement given to reckless enterprize at this moment may renew the shedding of blood, and may, possibly, condemn to hopeless ruin a Kingdom in which we all take the deepest interest. I will only say this—that in the interests of peace between Turkey and Greece, and not with a view to any of those wild and speculative ideas which may fittingly be recorded by the philosophical historian, but which have no place in the calculation of statesmen—but with a view to peace and good relations between the two countries, we always thought it wiser that Turkey should consent to rectify a frontier which had been inconsiderately drawn, and we have always plainly spoken to Turkey on that point. The very line proposed by the French Plenipotentiary had a month before been recommended by us to the Porte; and it is, therefore, absurd to charge us with any indifference to the position of Greece or her good relations with her stronger neighbour. But we did earnestly feel that it was not our duty to urge the weak to attack the strong, unless we intended ourselves to support her. That consideration weighed deeply on the Congress. No Member of the Congress was prepared to say—"We will force the Porte to make this or that concession to Greece;" and, therefore, they felt that it was wise to use the most moderate language, and to promise only the most pacific means, lest they should be the cause of inciting the object of their solicitude to attempts which would only end in her ruin. I believe that the true friends of Greece are those that bid her trust to the development of her own resources, and to the gradual increase of her own strength, and do not encourage her to undertake adventures beyond her power.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: There appear to me to be two main considerations involved in the question which the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) has raised. The one is the secret nature of the engagement to which his remarks have been principally directed, and the other is the character and substance of the engagement itself. Now, whilst I hope to say nothing which shall depart from the temperate tone in which the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) has just spoken, I must take the liberty of demurring at once to one of the arguments he has used. My noble Friend puts it as though this transaction were a link in that ordinary chain of confidential communications which constantly pass between different Governments, and which form a recognized and an essential part of the system of our own, or any other, Foreign Office. My Lords, if it were simply one of the class of confidential communications, all that my noble Friend says would be perfectly true; but the objection is that this is not a communication to enable two Governments to arrive at an understanding, but an engagement entered into, by which Her Majesty's Government and the country are bound to a particular course of action, which was subsequently defined and embodied in the Anglo-Turkish Congress. That is a broad and an essential difference. Now, as to the secrecy of the engagement, I cannot consent to pass that by in silence. There are, no doubt, precedents for secret Treaties and engagements; but they are rare. Secret engagements are not congenial to English diplomacy; they are not resorted to except in case of extreme emergency; and I do not think the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Rosebery) was far wrong when he described them as at variance with the traditional policy and feeling of this country. In the year 1853, just before the Crimean War broke out, the Emperor Nicholas made an offer—under circumstances not altogether dissimilar to the present—to the English Government of that day. He offered Crete and Egypt under a secret engagement. Now, it happened that in turning over my papers the other day, I came upon Lord Clarendon's answer on that subject. Lord Clarendon said—

> "England desires no territorial aggrandisement, and would be no party to approving an engagement from which she derived any such benefit. England would be no party to any understanding that was kept secret from the other Powers."

I apprehend that answer was conformable to all the traditions of English policy, and in accordance with the general feeling and temper of the country. It is, therefore, perfectly clear—and it will be admitted by Her Majesty's Government themselves—that in this matter they have taken an unusual course; and taking the broadest view of the question—because I prefer to take a broad rather than a technical view—the justification, if any justification there be, is to be found in the results. That is unquestionably the way in which the matter is to be viewed in this country. But if you look to these results, you must clearly consider them under two aspects—first, whether the provisions of this engagement, subsequently carried out and embodied, as they are, in the Treaty, are likely to lead to a permanent settlement of this question; and, secondly, whether the obligations we have accepted under that engagement are such as this country can safely or even prudently accept. Now, as to how far this engagement has in it the elements of stability, I would invite your Lordships, first of all, to look at the position in which Turkey is left at this moment. My Lords, Turkey is not partitioned, but Turkey is re-distributed; because we are told on high authority that there is a difference between a partition and a re-distribution—re-distributed amongst a variety of European Powers. It is re-distributed amongst a variety of European Powers — Russia, Austria, Montenegro, Servia, and, finally, this country. In other words, the area of Turkey is greatly contracted by this arrangement, and she is left helpless, so far as self-defence is concerned, yet very dangerous as a Power, should she fall into the hands of a powerful and unscrupulous enemy. But what are the feelings with which the different Governments of Europe which sat around the Congress Table have risen from it; for upon those feelings it depends, in a great measure, whether this arrangement is permanent or not? The answer, I think, is very easy. On the one hand, Russia has got pretty nearly all she desired; on the other, whilst you have acquiesced in those concessions, the seeds of ill-will have been deeply sown between this country and Russia, and an irreconcilable barrier to the friendship of two nations, to endure, perhaps, for a generation or more, has been erected. And what of Greece? My noble Friend says that nothing more could have been done for Greece than was done, and he repudiates any idea of abandonment, on our part, at the Congress. I do not care now to urge that; but it is an incontestable fact that Greece declares, with almost one voice, that she had been encouraged, and that she has now been betrayed; and it is a curious and not very edifying fact, that whilst Greece, on the one hand, desired Crete, we, on the other hand, have taken Cyprus. Then comes a case which my noble Friend very wisely avoided—the view which France and Italy take of recent transactions. Can anyone doubt what the irritation in France was when the first news of the engagement became public? Does anyone doubt what the feelings of Italy are at this moment—the strong feelings which have been conjured up by the knowledge of the secret course of action we have taken? And yet these two countries, France and Italy, are obviously interested in any future complications that may arise, as the two maritime Powers, of all others, must have a voice in the disposition of affairs, whatever they may be. In connection with this, may it not be worth while to remember what happened in 1830? In that year, after the famous march of Diebitch to Adrianople, the collapse of the Turkish resistance—events not very unlike those which we have witnessed ourselves during the last few months—the Treaty of Adrianople was concluded; but, in the following year, France acquired, or it may be said seized, Algiers. Immediately after followed that tremendous war which shook the whole of the Turkish Empire to its foundations, and which brought Russia to the banks of the Bosphorus, not as an enemy, but, as my noble Friend would probably say, in the much more dangerous guise of a friend and supporter. Therefore, it comes to this—that every one of the Great Powers, with the exception of Austria, who has obtained all she has desired, and Germany, who declared that not the bones of a single Pomeranian should be allowed to bleach in Turkey—every single Power that sat around the Congress Table has risen from it with feelings of discontent and dissatisfaction. Therefore it is not too much to presume that there are small hopes of the permanence and stability of an arrangement concluded under auspices such as those. But now, my Lords, I turn to what is, after all, far more important to us than any other part of this question—namely, the obligations to Turkey which we have accepted by this engagement. My Lords, when I first read that agreement in the daily papers, I was greatly alarmed at the clause—the 11th, I think it is—in which England charges herself, in a special degree and manner, with the supervision of the Asiatic dominions of the Porte; but although, when the Congress was decided on, I, like many others, knew it was inconvenient for the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary to be absent, I acquiesced in that inconvenience, and waited for the explanation which had been promised. Since then information has oozed out drop by drop, not, I may say, from Her Majesty's Government, but in the public newspapers, on which we have depended. When the noble Earl at the head of the Government made his speech the other night, I thought then there would be some endeavour to enlighten us; but, as I listened with the utmost attention, the darkness grew only darker, for there was a total absence of any real explanation. Something, it is true, was said on both sides of the House in regard to India and Indian procedure in dealing with Native Courts and Governments; but I would beg the House to remember there is no real analogy whatever between the state of things in India and the state of things to be introduced into Asia Minor, and for this reason. In India the whole power of England is backed by an enormous and visible Army; but in this case you have nothing of the kind; and the point on which I and every Member of this House desires explanation is, what if these obligations are really undertaken, what are the powers you have taken from the Sultan of Turkey to enable you to see that those reforms on which everything depends are carried out? By this Treaty you guarantee the Eastern frontier of Turkey on condition that she makes certain reforms. Those reforms are absolutely essential. There can be no sound administration unless there be a sound system of finance, and there can be no sound system of finance unless there are great reforms. Therefore, I would again ask, what powers have you taken from the Sultan? There is an error current at this moment, that if the Sultan's Government does not fulfil its part of the agreement in regard to these reforms, then we may retire from the protectorate; but I apprehend that that is a misinterpretation of the bargain—it certainly is not a construction which is consistent with the wording of the despatch of my noble Friend the noble Marquess, when he speaks of our having the right to "insist" on the reforms—and that we are really bound, whether Turkey makes these reforms or not, by the obligations we have undertaken. Therefore it is necessary more than ever that we should understand what those powers are which we have taken from the Sultan. But is there a reasonable chance that Turkey will ever reform her institutions herself? The whole history of Turkey is against it. In 1839, and again in 1856, at the close of the Crimean War, when there was every reason and inducement for the Turkish Government to exert themselves, and redeem their promises, they failed. Therefore, so far as the Turkish Government is concerned, it appears to me that you have bound yourselves to a covenant of unlimited liability with an insolvent partner, to whom you pledge, under all circumstances, favourable or unfavourable, your money, credit, blood, and the whole force of the country. Failing, then, these reforms, what is the nature of the task which you have undertaken? I doubt whether many of us have endeavoured even to express or depict that responsibility to ourselves. You have a country where the Exchequer is empty, where the towns are in a state of ruin, where whole districts are devastated by chronic warfare, and where the governing classes live by grinding out the last piastre from the subject-classes. You have to reform all that—to create a new system of law, to build up a new system of finance, and to organize a new Executive. All that, if Turkey fails to do it, falls on your shoulders, and you have to accomplish that colossal task in the full face of Europe, surrounded by international jealousies and intrigues. That is one of the most gigantic tasks which a nation in its senses ever accepted; and if you consider any of the ordinary details that must arise, I am at a loss to understand how they are to be grappled with. A large part of Asiatic Turkey is, I may say, in a state of chronic warfare; and the Turkish Government has long been powerless to enforce order. Supposing you have another fanatical outbreak, such as occurred at Damascus 16 years ago, or at Salonica two or three years ago — you can only subdue such an outbreak by military force. Turkey has no military force available, and, therefore, you must do it under your obligation. Take another point of detail. Slavery, which has been mentioned in this House once or twice in connection with this question, is the law of the land throughout Asia Minor. There is not a householder who is not wedded to the system of domestic slavery. But whenever England has asserted her dominion or given her protection, slavery has ceased to exist, the two things being incompatible. Two years ago, on the African Coast, we had a Protectorate in which slavery was found to exist, and that had to be abolished—but it had to be abolished with every precaution—with the presence of troops in the territory which could be employed at any and every point with the certainty of success. None of these things, whether as regards troops or geographical conditions, exist in the country in respect of which we have undertaken these engagements. But it is said that, by the possession of Cyprus, you will be able to watch over and control the government of Asiatic Turkey. There never was so idle a dream. If you intend to redeem the engagements which I maintain you have taken under this Convention in the first instance, and have since ratified by Treaty, you cannot remain at Cyprus or anywhere else. You will be compelled to land on the mainland. You will be compelled to use English agents. You will be compelled to make use of no small number of troops—and British troops, too. Remember what occurred 15 or 16 years ago in the Lebanon, when the French had to land, if I mistake not, some 20,000 men; and so, if you mean to be successful, you will have to adopt the same course in Asia Minor; and Indian troops will not answer your purpose, because Indian troops, however good, cannot be trusted by themselves—a certain complement of English troops is absolutely necessary. What does all this mean? Not only enormous moral and political responsibility, but also a colossal expenditure. It is a matter for very grave anxiety when a nation finds, in consequence of such engagements, its expenditure standing at the rate of a war expenditure in time of peace. Nor even is this all; because, as you cannot stop in Cyprus, so you cannot stop in Asia Minor. Those who know anything of the subject know that if you intend fully to fulfil your obligations, you must govern from Constantinople. But you will then find that your policy embraces a European as well as Asiatic Protectorate, and that you become, whether you like it or no, mixed up at once in all those intrigues and factions of the Palace which revolve around the Sultan. If the Sultan is a strong man, he will resist your dictation; if he is a puppet, the danger will be no less. There must be many who remember the deposition of the King of Delhi; and those who entertain so great a respect for Mahomedan feeling will do well to remember what Mahomedan countries will think when, for the second time, they see a Monarch in whom the faith and nominal sovereignty of Islam centre, dethroned by an English Army. I will not take advantage of this opportunity to go further into this matter. I have dealt with it broadly—for the discussion this evening has been broad. There is much more that I would gladly say; but I have said enough to place on record, in the most distinct manner—as I desire to do—my own deep regret, disappointment, and disapproval, of the terms of this engagement and of the Treaty of Berlin. Time will show who is right in this matter. Those who hold the views I do may very well be content, I think, to await their justification. I am satisfied myself that when the excitement of the present moment has gone by, when the glamour which now bewitches men's minds has passed away, when they open their eyes to the sober reality of this question, they will find themselves confronted with this most terrible and painful dilemma—either to carry through an almost hopelessly impracticable obligation, or to retreat from it at the expense of national credit and honour.

THE EARL OF MORLEY observed, that although there was no direct issue before the House, the discussion would have been justified by the speech of the Foreign Secretary alone, which possessed many points of interest. That speech, however, was characterized all through by the noble Marquess answering questions which had not been asked, and dealing with difficulties which had not been raised. The noble Marquess, he thought, had justly defended his statement that the summary of the Anglo-Russian Agreement published by *The Globe* was unauthentic; but it would have been interesting if he had gone on to justify his assertion that it was not worthy of their Lordships' confidence.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Does the noble Earl mean to say an unauthentic document can be worthy of confidence?

THE EARL OF MORLEY: It appeared to me that the noble Marquess's explanation of its unauthentic character was not inconsistent with its being worthy of confidence. I understood him to say it was unauthentic because it was not published on proper authority.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl must have misunderstood me. I said it was unauthentic, because, in the most essential point—a point of the greatest possible moment—it was an untrue account.

THE EARL OF MORLEY accepted the explanation; but, at the same time, he thought the words used by the noble Marquess, when questioned about the statement in *The Globe*, conveyed to him and other noble Lords a meaning which he could not have intended to convey. The noble Marquess had never explained why it was that when the full text of the Treaty had been published, it was described as incomplete, and, therefore, inaccurate. He understood now that the Government were unwilling to produce it, because they could not produce other Papers which they considered right to be added to it. That, however, was not a valid objection. If the document was confessed now to be accurate, why not formally produce it? If, in some degree, it was incomplete and inaccurate, why not produce the genuine Agreement? The other documents alluded to might be important, but they could not affect what was contained within the four corners of the Agreement. The noble Marquess had assumed that the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) had stated it to be contrary to the traditions of our diplomacy to enter into confidential communications with other Powers. He had not understood his noble Friend to assert anything of the kind. On the other hand, his noble Friend had admitted that secret Treaties might have their place in diplomatic transactions; but the noble Marquess must surely admit that this Anglo-Russian Agreement had now passed out of the region of confidential communications? In regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention and the Berlin Congress, although he was not dissatisfied with the results as far as Europe was concerned, but the Opposition would be wanting in their duty if they did not inquire into the modes by which those results had been attained. When the noble Marquess succeeded to the post of Foreign Secretary, he wrote a despatch explaining that England declined to go into Congress because Russia wished to reserve to herself the right of accepting or not the discussion of certain questions. That appeared to him to be a fair ground on which to base our refusal. The noble Marquess, in his despatch, went on to quote the Declaration of 1871, that it was an essential principle of the law of nations that no Power could liberate itself from its Treaty engagements without the consent of the other Powers. Now, it was on the 1st of April that the despatch of the noble Marquess was written, and, with the exception of an occasional answer in reply to a Question addressed to the Government, they heard no more of what was going on till the end of May, when it was triumphantly announced that a Congress was to be held at Berlin. The Government, it was stated or inferred, had gained a diplomatic triumph, Russia had consented to all our demands, and she had agreed to place every clause of the Treaty of San Stefano before the assembled Congress. But if they were under that impression, he should say, with due deference to the House, that they were under a false impression. Had it not been for the "pure accident" alluded to more than once that night, there would have been nothing official or unofficial to show that this secret Agreement with Russia had any existence at all. More than once the despatch to Lord Odo Russell had been alluded to; and, of course, it was well known that Plenipotentiaries had fuller instructions and more accurate knowledge than was contained within the four corners of their official instructions; but he thought they had a right to complain on this head, because this set of instructions, and the final Protocols, gave a false impression to the nation of the position held by our Plenipotentiaries in the Congress with regard to Russia. At least, that impression was false with regard to the points which Russia retained her right to withdraw from the cognizance of the Congress. They might fairly assume that the secret Treaty, to which the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) had called attention was a practical surrender of the points with which it dealt to Russia, a waiver of our rights, and that we entered the Congress with a foregone conclusion. Without the light of this secret Treaty, it would seem that the Congress yielded to Russian views on those points where we were most committed to resistance; whereas we had, by our secret Agreement, really conceded those points before the Congress was opened. The difference between the despatch of the 8th of June and the secret Agreement of May 30th was that while the first, couched in the form of instructions to Lord Odo Russell, was always intended to be published, the latter was not to have seen the light, and would not have seen the light, if it had not been for the misconduct of a copying clerk. He thought noble Lords opposite could not deny that, without the knowledge the public possessed of this secret understanding, their impression of the position of England before the Congress would have been false and misleading. He was justified in saying that without this Anglo-Russian Agreement, their Papers were "incomplete, and, therefore, inaccurate." He was also, he thought, justified in saying that this secret Treaty established a precedent that might, in the future, lead to painful and dangerous consequences. What did we do by this Treaty? We bound ourselves, said the noble Marquess, merely to an agreement upon points about which we would not go to war. No doubt, the noble Marquess knew more of it than they did; but it seemed to him that the words of this Treaty carried a great deal more meaning, and that, in consenting not to contest the desire of Russia to occupy the port of Batoum, we begged the whole question whether Russia was up to that time retaining the right she claimed to withdraw certain points from the discussion, or, at least, the determination, of the Congress. He did not quite follow the arguments as to the last Convention of a secret character—that with Turkey. It appeared to him that we had been sacrificing what the noble Earl the Prime Minister described as the "independence and integrity" of the Ottoman Empire, by taking Cyprus. And while we had been doing this, we were, at the same time, placing ourselves in one of the most difficult positions ever occupied by this country. Not merely had we gained nothing, but we had gone in a precisely opposite direction. Regarding the condition of Turkey, the noble Earl the Prime Minister became anxious to strengthen her Empire by concentrating her power, and by depriving her of territory. But this method of strengthening the Ottoman Empire had necessitated the enlargement of our borders, and given us elements of weakness with which we had hitherto been unfamiliar, by making us vulnerable to attack where we had never before been accessible to it. This was the most important point of all, because it transferred the initiative power from England to Russia—it made us in emergencies a defending, instead of an aggressive, Power. We had dealt with the frontier lines of the Powers recently engaged in war, and with what result? We were now placed close to the Russian lines and the base of Russian operations; and for this danger we had gained absolutely and entirely nothing but an enormous responsibility, and the vast expense which this responsibility would involve. He should like, before sitting down, to ask another Question, and that was, whether the noble Marquess would be able to give them any more information about this important Treaty with Turkey? Its meaning had been much questioned. They had been told its main condition was in the promise and the undertaking of the Porte to improve. On the other hand, they had been told that England was to be responsible—entirely and alone—for the good government of Asia Minor. In the one case, he confessed he did not see how this Treaty was more likely to have good results than the Treaty of Paris, or how the reforms contemplated by it could be more efficiently carried out than by that Treaty. In the other case, how great was the responsibility which had been laid upon the nation—not merely behind the backs of other nations, but behind its own; for neither Parliament nor the people had ever received the faintest intimation of what was to be done. Could we, when the honour of the nation was pledged, withdraw from the pledge? Parliament and the nation would support the course to which in honour we were bound; but he ventured to think that these Treaties, agreed upon behind the back of our own and other nations, would, as the noble Earl who brought this matter forward had pointed out, impair the character for candour and openness which had hitherto distinguished English diplomacy, and would create a precedent very dangerous in its results. It was a new reproach in our history that we were engaged in forming secret Treaties upon points upon which we and the European nations were actually assembled in Congress, and that, when a Congress was summoned to deal with the great interests of Europe, we, at the same time, separately and secretly arranged with other individual Powers some of the most important points which were to be discussed collectively. But, in addition to this, the Government had now set up a grave and dangerous precedent for involving the nation in enormous risks and responsibilites, and in a vast expenditure of money, without giving the nation an opportunity of expressing or of forming an opinion upon the subject.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH rose with reluctance to speak on the subject before their Lordships, because it was not a pleasant task to call in question the conduct of the Government and the Party he had so long supported, still less to question the conduct of his noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. But he could not avoid expressing the astonishment with which he heard the statement of his noble Friend that evening, when he justified the Memorandum agreed upon between himself and Count Schouvaloff. His noble Friend told them that until some agreement was come to between the Powers assembled in Congress, there was very little prospect of any good result from the Congress—that it was necessary that some sort of agreement should be come to between them in order that success might eventually crown their efforts. Now, he was extremely struck when the noble Earl the late Foreign Secretary—in his speech, he believed it was, in quitting Office—told them that, in his view, the Congress was more likely to be useful as a means of registering foregone conclusions, than as sharing in the discussion of events in reference to which it was necessary that some course should be decided upon. It struck him that in that statement the noble Earl laid down a policy entirely apart and distinct from that of Her Majesty's Government. But what had been the policy of Her Majesty's Government in the spring, when this country and Europe were kept on the tenter hooks, ignorant whether, and when, and why, we were to be dragged into war. They were told, at that time, that the language of Her Majesty's Government was clear, decided, unmistakable. They were told, then, that the Government were the advocates of the liberties and the public law of Europe; and they were told that the Government would consent to no alteration of the state of things previously established by Treaty, without the consent of all the Signatories to the Treaty. They were further told that the Government would not be parties to any private agreement, and the Government took credit, and great credit, to themselves for having perpetually and consistently repudiated all suggestion of partition, requiring that the Treaty of San Stefano should be discussed in Congress in its entirety, and objecting most strongly to any secret arrangement. Now, what had the Government done? They who objected to partition were parties to partition, which they called a re-distribution. They required that the Treaty of San Stefano should be discussed in its entirety, and they brought to its consideration two separate Conventions, by one of which different parts of the Treaty of San Stefano were essentially effected—two separate Conventions, one of which yielded a particular part of the Treaty, and the other dealt with interests, certainly not affected by the Treaty, but very much affecting foreign Powers assembled at the Congress. They who required the submission of the whole Treaty to the Powers of Europe, who came forward as the defenders of the public law and the liberties of Europe, behind the back of Europe, and behind the back of Parliament, made separate Conventions, one of which disregarded the decisions of the Congress, and the other of which dealt with matters which the Government themselves claimed should alone be dealt with by a European Congress. His noble Friend, in one of his despatches, proceeded to justify the conduct of the Government, presuming that complaints had been made against it, and that those complaints had generally proceeded from foreign countries. His noble Friend also attempted to justify the proceedings of the Government at the Congress, and particularly to show that they were not altogether at variance with his deliberate Circular of the 1st of April. He ventured to say that what his noble Friend had to justify was not so much the proceedings of the Government in the Congress, as the Circular he had issued. The charge against the Government was that outside the Congress, and not in the Congress, they had been false to their own professions, and untrue to the principles they themselves laid down. Now, how had their proceedings been received in Europe? Why, they had been received either with *nonchalance,* or with what he could only call silent contempt. Germany merely asked why we had waited hitherto. Russia was only too delighted with a portion of our proceedings which justified, not everything that Russia had done, but justified everything that the Government had charged her with doing. We had ourselves been committing the very offences which, as it seemed to him, in many respects unjustly, we had imputed to Russia. Then, look at France and Italy. Italy was discontented; France, bleeding at every pore, prostrated, and with no object but to recover herself from the losses of a great war—France, with nothing left her but the sentiment of her own dignity and the consciousness of her own honour, had no wish to enter the Congress. She did not in any manner whatever put herself forward; but she was drawn into the Congress, on the ground that we were advocating the public law and the liberties of Europe, and that no territory should be dealt with which was not affected by the Treaty of San Stefano—Egypt, Syria, and the Holy Places, being included in the reservation. France, having no desire to enter into Congress at all, stipulated that no territory, not affected by the Treaty of San Stefano, should be touched by the Congress, and she especially excepted from its consideration Egypt, Syria, and the Holy Places. They did not deal in Congress with any territory that France stipulated should be left alone; but, behind France's back, England took Cyprus, which was not affected by the Treaty of San Stefano. The real importance of that Island was not that it gave a *point d'appui* for action in Asia Minor, for it must be ultimately from Constantinople that any action in Asia Minor must be taken. The real importance of Cyprus was that it dominated Syria. He could not find language in which to describe the sentiment which such action as this raised in his mind. The noble Marquess issued his Circular; he tore up the Treaty of San Stefano into shreds; he repudiated it; he said—"I have nothing to do with your Treaty; I object to the Treaty in its entirety; I object to it in all its details." Yet he agreed to a Memorandum which re-enacted this repudiated Treaty with certain alterations—no doubt, some important alterations; but still he re-enacted the Treaty. Then he went to the Congress, and there they found him wrangling over every detail to get out of the engagements to which he and his Colleagues had assented. They had had all sorts of declarations from the Government, and all sorts of modest descriptions from their own lips of their intentions and aims. The Government had declared it was their intention to uphold the honour and interests of this country—a country with possessions in every quarter of the globe and in every sea; that they would perform their duty to their Queen and their country; that they had but one regard, and that was for the honour of England. These were wide words. But they were told, when the Government went into more detail, that the Prime Minister upheld the integrity and independence of Turkey—the *status quo* before the war; but what had they done? They had signed at the Congress a Treaty whereby very nearly as much territory was taken from Turkey as was even proposed to be taken by the Treaty of San Stefano. Her Majesty's Government declared that they would uphold the liberties of Europe; but they had since entirely thrown over the liberties of Europe. If there was any meaning in the words, it was that they would oppose the one Power whose influence was likely to preponderate over the others. What was the result? They found the one Power, which might be a menace to the liberty of Europe, re-established more completely in its supremacy. They were told that the settlement was to be final, and that peace was to be perfectly secured. If the condition of things was looked at, it would be seen that there was no finality anywhere. Peace was not finally or perfectly secured. On the shortest possible notice fresh disturbances and difficulties might be expected. Looking at the question from every point of view, they found nobody satisfied—nobody contented—no attempt being made to encourage the development of the freedom of the people, in whose contentment alone could any permanent security be found. It was a part of the Ministerial policy to check Russia. He had made no secret of the fact that he had entirely sympathized with the objects with which Russia began this war; and he had also held that the Russian demands at its conclusion were fair and reasonable. But what had Her Majesty's Government, which thought otherwise, done? They had conceded to Russia all practically that he had ever thought she could possibly hope to attain. They had conceded to Russia all she had any right to expect. If Russia, as they represented, was an aggressive and ambitious Power, they had given her the means of aggression and of developing her ambition in the future. Having made these large concessions to Russia, one would have expected it to be done in such a way as to entitle England to the gratitude of Russia. Nothing of the kind. The language in the published despatches was so contrary to the ordinary language of diplomacy; the language of the Government's supporters out-of-doors, the language of some of their own Members, the language of that portion of the Press known to write in their interests, had been from the first so offensive to Russia that instead of having gained what this country was entitled to expect — the gratitude of Russia—they had created a feeling of hatred which would probably last to the end of this generation. A kind of evil fortune seemed to have attended the action of the Government. Every cause they opposed prospered, and to every cause they took up some misfortune happened. The Government had opposed Russia; they had opposed the development of the Slav race; and they had checked it to a certain extent; but they had left it a great deal better off than any other race, and in a position, at no distant period, to acquire fresh power and influence. They took up the cause of Turkey, and what was the consequence? Turkey had been dragged into this most fatal war, and had lost a great portion of her Dominions. He had alluded to the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire. He had pointed out how the first had suffered, and he would now point out how Turkey's independence was gone, and by no one's act so much as by the act of Her Majesty's Government. The Treaty of Berlin, which gave to all the Powers the right to see to the carrying out of its stipulations by the Porte in the Turkish Provinces in Europe, was a blow to the independence of Turkey; but the Convention by which this country took from Turkey pledges for the future good government of its subjects in Asia Minor, and by which this country took upon herself the sole right to see them carried out, was a still greater blow to the independence of Turkey, however valuable it might be to Turkey's Asiatic subjects. Then, as to Greece, the noble Marquess had spoken about the question so far as Greece was concerned; but it was really very difficult to understand the position the Government occupied in this matter. He did not assert that when the war was going on any promises were made to the Greeks that they would obtain an increase of territory at its conclusion; but the Greeks were perpetually told that their claims would be considered when the settlement came to be made, and pressure, both diplomatic and otherwise, was brought to bear upon that country to prevent it taking part in the war. He ventured to say that if, after the fall of Plevna, the Greek Army had advanced into the Turkish territory, it would have contributed more than anything, at that moment, to the falling to pieces of that Empire. We were not done with the Greeks yet. When the Treaty of San Stefano was signed, the noble Marquess exclaimed against the neglect of the Greeks, and seemed to feel a great horror at the Greeks being subjected to the rule of the Slavs. It was very difficult to predict what might have occurred had the Greeks joined in the war, or had they remained, as the Treaty of San Stefano designed, in some measure under the rule of the Slavs; but he ventured to say there were no Greeks who would not infinitely rather be left permanently under the rule of the Slavs than permanently under the rule of the Turks. The only reason why the Greeks were ready to applaud the declaration of the English Government that they were not to be subjected to the Slavs was the hope that they would get their freedom. But now they found themselves subjected to the old tyranny against which, whenever they had had a chance, they had protested. They were told by the Prime Minister that they had a future; but they also heard from the noble Marquess that their only future was in the fancy of poets, of enthusiasts, and of philosophic historians. He (the Marquess of Bath) ventured to think that his noble Friend was entirely incorrect; that the Greeks had a great future, and a future for which they might not have long to wait. He wished to protest against the kind of cold-bloodedness with which the noble Marquess contemplated the possibility of a war between Turkey and Greece, as the result of an attempt on the part of Greece to obtain some measure of liberty and security of life and property for men of the same race and creed on their Northern frontier—the cold-bloodedness with which he contemplated the possibility of the country being devastated by Turkish armies and bombarded by Turkish fleets, when he knew that the slightest possible exercise of power on the part of the English Government would prevent anything of the kind occurring. He would like to ask what England had gained by the action of Her Majesty's Government? It had gained a Protectorate it could not enforce, and it had obtained pledges which the Government knew beforehand could not and would not be kept. For these ends we had lost our ancient alliances, and we had also lost the respect of Europe. The noble Earl the Prime Minister had told them on one occasion, amid the sympathetic cheers of his auditors, at a dinner in the Mansion House, that England was prepared to fight not one, not two, but three campaigns at any time. If the Government were to come forward now and say they were ready to fight not one, or two, or three campaigns, if they thought the interests and the honour of the country were involved, or that the question was sufficiently serious to justify the power of this country being exercised in the cause, he should have not a word to say against it. But in the Protocol which they had read, and in the speeches that they had heard, what did they learn? They were informed that Ministers, in order to avoid war, had assented to proposals of which they disapproved. It was put on record that though English Ministers objected to such and such a course, they did not object to it to the extent of going to war to oppose it. A great deal of the excitement and agitation we had had in the country had been caused very much by the wish to exalt particular Members of the Administration, and to draw unfavourable contrasts between their spirited policy and that of their Predecessors; but he should like to draw the attention of the House to the difference between the conduct of the English Government in the year 1871, and the conduct of the English Government in the year 1878. In the year 1871 there was a proposal on the part of Russia which involved a departure from the Treaty of 1856. There were no public meetings; there were no speeches at the Mansion House; there were no declarations that a particular Minister, whether he was the Premier or the Foreign Secretary, was the only man capable of upholding the honour and interests of this country; and they had no brilliant perorations in that House about the glory of England and the duties to Europe that devolved upon her. Yet there was obtained from Russia a Declaration in accordance with the view of England that no Power could release itself from the obligations imposed upon it by Treaty without the consent of all the Powers that were parties to that Treaty. But, on the present occasion, this country was placed in a most extraordinary position. By the action of the late Government the sacredness of Treaties was upheld; by the action of the present Government it had been trampled upon and destroyed. He did not know whether any of their Lordships had read through the Protocols lately published; but if they had they would have seen a most extraordinary document—the most extraordinary, indeed, that he had ever heard of an English Minister having anything to do with. It was at page 270—

> "Considering that the Treaty of Berlin will modify an important part of the arrangements sanctioned by the Treaty of Paris of 1856, and that the interpretation of Article 2 of the Treaty of London, which is dependent on the Treaty of Paris, may thus become a matter of dispute, I declare on behalf of England that the obliga-

tions of Her Britannic Majesty relating to the closing of the Straits do not go further than an engagement with the Sultan to respect in this matter His Majesty's independent determinations in conformity with the spirit of existing Treaties."

It might be possible to explain this; but it seemed to him that either this document had no meaning at all, or it was a simple declaration on the part of the English Government that they would not be bound by the Treaties. In view of this repudiation of the Treaties, Count Schouvaloff demanded, as they would see at page 277 of a Declaration on the part of the Russian Government—

> "The Plenipotentiaries of Russia, without being able to explain the meaning of the proposition of the second Plenipotentiary of Great Britain respecting the closing of the Straits, restrict themselves to a demand on their part for the insertion in the Protocol the observation that in their opinion the principle of the closing of the Straits is an European principle obligatory on all the Powers, and that the stipulations confirmed by the Treaty of Berlin are binding upon the part of all the Powers in accordance with the spirit of existing Treaties."

Here they had England repudiating Treaties—the ink of her signature to one of them being hardly dry—and Russia standing forth as the advocate and supporter of Treaties. Was that a creditable position to be placed in by the Government? He believed the action of the Government merited the strongest condemnation. What had they done? They had in every way that they could opposed the freedom and development of rising peoples. They had been niggardly to small States. They had taken a little themselves; they had allowed Russia to take more; they had left Austria to take a great deal—Austria, a Power that had been hated by every nation she had ever ruled, that never quitted a campaign except under circumstances of defeat, that never made a peace except by sacrificing her Allies. This was the broken reed, an alliance with whom the policy of this country depended.

Lord HAMMOND said, he had waited in vain to hear from the Government any satisfactory vindication of their conduct with reference to the Memorandum to which attention had been called by the noble Earl who had opened the discussion with so much ability. But while noble Lords on the Opposition side, and two noble Lords below the Gangway on the other side, had addressed the House, no one but the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had spoken on behalf of the Government. Irrespective of the manner in which it had been made public, it was to his mind a matter of satisfaction that the official secrecy with which even now it was proposed to enshroud the Schouvaloff-Salisbury Agreement had been baffled. They might accept the treason, though they condemned the traitor. The reasons of the Government for objecting to lay that Agreement before Parliament could not be accepted as satisfactory and sufficient. It was a document complete in itself, involving most important political engagements on the part of this country with a foreign Power, and it had led to other onerous and important engagements on the part of England, some of which had already been discussed in their Lordships' House, and others were about to be discussed in both Houses a few days hence. It needed no Correspondence with foreign Governments to elucidate or explain. The general authenticity of the document had been confirmed on oath in the Bow Street Police Court; and, although the revelation of its existence in the columns of *The Globe* might have caused some surprise—not to speak of any other feeling—in the minds of the Plenipotentiaries at Berlin, yet it was difficult to understand on what grounds any foreign Government could now object to its being officially communicated to the British Parliament in the customary manner. It was certainly satisfactory to receive from the noble Marquess, who he was sorry to see had left the House, the assurance that there existed no other engagements than those the House was acquainted with; and it might be assumed that it might be neither convenient nor agreeable to Her Majesty's Government to publish Correspondence with foreign Powers respecting the Agreement. But it was not asked of them to produce confidential Correspondence, but merely the Agreement which was the result of that Correspondence. The Agreement was, however, before the public, certified as to its general correctness by the oath of the persons through whose hands it had passed; and Parliament and the country were as free now to criticize and pass judgment on it as if it had been laid on the Table of the House; and their Lordships were at liberty to consider whether it was right, or according to practice, that Her Majesty's Plenipotentiaries should appear in Congress as the advocates of measures which ostensibly all the Powers were free to reject or to adopt; but in regard to which they had already agreed with the Power whose proceedings and demands were to be reviewed as to the extent to which British advocacy might be carried.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, there is nothing so dull as a monologue, and as I think this discussion has lasted long enough, I am not inclined to prolong it to the annoyance of your Lordships. The noble Earl who opened this discussion in such an admirable speech (the Earl of Rosebery), threw a fly, which was immediately swallowed by the noble Marquess. The noble Marquess, who, amidst the enthusiastic cheers of his supporters, was so indignant the other night with Lord Derby for leaving the House for five minutes, has not thought it respectful, on this important question of foreign policy, to wait to hear what might be said in answer to his own speech. The noble Marquess, I say, rose to the fly thrown by my noble Friend in the most speedy manner. The noble Earl said, he was sure he would be met with this reply—"Why don't you make a Motion—why don't you divide?"—and curiously enough the noble Marquess repeated that observation almost word for word. The same argument has been used by Lord Beaconsfield—I am in Order in using the names of noble Lords who have gone away—in advising and warning us on this subject; but allow me to say, in regard to this question of making Motions and dividing, that the point the Opposition has always held is this—that we will maintain our own freedom of action, and will not be governed by the injunction and advice of those who are opposed to us. I do not say that within the last two years there has not been strong temptation indeed to make Motion in this House; but in what we have done, I claim a conscientious desire to cause as little embarrassment to the Government as possible, and to ventilate these great questions in the manner peculiar to your Lordships' House without unnecessarily running our heads against a large and mechanical majority, which always has the effect to a certain extent of closing discussion. We have been advised, both by Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury, to divide; and Lord Beaconsfield showed that it was very wrong of us not to do so. He advised us to do it in our own interests. Now, it has always been my habit in life when people volunteer advice or try to force advice upon me, to ask myself two things—first, whether they are competent to give advice, and then, whether they have any particular object in offering it. On these two grounds, I do not consider that Lord Beaconsfield is the best adviser as to the course we should pursue. Lord Beaconsfield——

THE EARL OF REDESDALE: Order, order!

EARL GRANVILLE: I have a perfect right, in the absence of the noble Lord, to call him by name.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE: The general practice of the House, when speaking of a noble Lord who is absent, is to call him by his name when speaking of him for the first time; but afterwards to refer to him in another way.

EARL GRANVILLE: Since I have been in the House it has been the invariable practice to refer to a noble Lord by name, when he is absent.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: Hear, hear!

THE EARL OF REDESDALE: You may refer by name, but you must not go on repeating it.

EARL GRANVILLE: Does the noble Earl mean to invent a new Rule for this debate?

THE EARL OF REDESDALE: It is not a new Rule.

EARL GRANVILLE: The noble Earl will excuse me for saying again that I am not out of Order. The noble Earl may invent Rules, but I am not obliged to conform to them. There are two things which I want to consider, and one is, how far the Prime Minister was the best adviser I could have, even if he meant no good. He said to us—"Your nerves are so delicate that you will never turn your minorities into majorities if you go on in this way." Now, my recollection is that that the noble Earl led the Conservative Party in the House of Commons for 25 years before he got a majority at all; and that is not very encouraging to a more than Sexagenarian like myself, supposed to be pining for Office. But for the first half of the 25 years, the noble Earl was constantly making and supporting Motions and dividing, to the great injury of his

Party. Now, although since he has been in Government, he has been trying to lay down the principle that you approve a policy if you do not challenge it, yet during the past eight years—the period in which he was supposed to be accumulating his policy—he carefully abstained from making any Motion on the foreign policy of the Government he was so constantly blaming. Therefore, I deny that the noble Earl is competent to give me any advice on the point. Now, upon the general question before us. So far as I can make out, we are without any answer to the inquiry why we are not to have this Secret Memorandum laid upon the Table. All we are told is that there are certain despatches connected with the Memorandum which one foreign Government objects to have produced. Now, I quite agree that in secret communications between different Governments any one of those Governments is bound in honour not to publish such communications without the consent of the others; but this Memorandum, about which we are talking, is to all intents and purposes public. And here I would like to say a few words as to how it became public. Some time ago I asked the noble Duke the Lord President of the Council a Question on that subject, and he declined to give an answer as legal proceedings were then pending. Well, those legal questions being over, the Question was repeated last week in "another place"—and what was the answer? That the document was intrusted to this man, who had only been in the Office a year, who did not belong to the Establishment at all, for the sake of despatch. There is a noble Lord behind me (Lord Hammond) who knows more about the Foreign Office than any man in this country, and I should like to know whether he understands those reasons? When I went into the Foreign Office as Under Secrecretary in 1837—and I have been connected with it at intervals of 20 years since that time—I found there absolute confidence in all Departments, and a really wondrous power of getting through work in great emergencies. It was made a special point of honour with the officials that nothing which took place should be revealed; and I appeal to the noble Lord (Lord Hammond) to say whether, during his experience, that confidence was ever misplaced? Now, of course, I do not know how that Memorandum got into the Treaty Office —in my time, it was not the place to which it belonged; but I am told that it was considered to be of such special secrecy that instructions were given that the Foreign Office should not be trusted with it. The result of this wondrous secrecy was what we all know. Now, I should like to ask the question that was so forcibly put by the noble Earl who opened this discussion—where should we have been if it had not been for the immoral, surreptitious act of this 10*d*. an-hour clerk in the Foreign Office? We should have been absolute dupes. We should have read the instructions to Lord Odo Russell; we should have read the Protocols and the various despatches that were sent and received from time to time; but we should have been perfect dupes as to the manner in which Her Majesty's Government had proceeded in this matter. The other day I frankly confessed that I did not myself see any objection to coming to such an understanding with Russia as would enable the Congress to meet with the prospect of a happy issue, provided always that it was done in a perfectly open manner. But what I did object to was the arrangement, on the understanding of the comedy which was to be played when we got into the Congress. I fail to see in the Protocols the slightest proof of a greal deal of this transaction. In regard to Batoum, as I pointed out the other day, there appeared to have been no protest at all against its acquisition by Russia. Prince Gortchakoff announced that it would be made a free port, and the Prime Minister accepted that arrangement. I want to know whether the House is never to have this Secret Memorandum, or whether it is really to be presented in accordance with the pledge given, as I understood, on the part of the Government a few weeks ago? I consider that the House is entitled to ask for its production. The noble Marquess has twitted us with not bringing forward a Resolution and going to a division; because, he said, we have no supporters except on the front Opposition Bench. This, however, is a very unhappy occasion for such a taunt to be indulged in; because, until I myself rose, this debate had been exclusively conducted by noble Lords on the other side, and by Peers on this side not sitting on the front Bench of the Opposition, who have spoken against the Government. I think, under these circumstances, Her Majesty's Ministers might have condescended to take a little more part in the discussion. The fact is that it is difficult for them to do so; because two different accounts have been given of their policy—one to suit the cautious, and the other to suit the energetic—and it is very difficult to walk, as on the edge of a razor, between those two. It would seem that the real policy of the Government is now to be as unmeaning as possible. Since the declaration of the noble Earl at the head of the Government, that the Sovereignty of the Sultan is to be strictly respected, I am inclined to believe that all we are going to do for the future in regard to reforms is to trust to the promises of the Sultan—promises made in 1839, and repeated again in 1856. We are told there is great consolation in this, inasmuch as if the Sultan does not fulfil his promises, we shall be, by the terms of the Convention, entirely absolved from the engagements which we have entered into with him. But I want to know what our position would really be? Supposing that two, three, or four years hence we shall decide that the reforms have not been carried out to our satisfaction, we may then cancel the Convention; but if we do so, what, then, will be our position? It is a very different thing to cancel a Convention after it has existed for three years, and to avoid entering into it at all. Shall we, in such a case, cancel the Convention, thus giving a sort of invitation to Russia, or shall we forcibly interfere with the Sultan's authority? It appears to me that, in their desire for something like a display of fireworks in connection with the Treaty, the Government have made up their minds to avoid what they deem inconvenient discussion; but I insist that the country have a right to expect some answer to the questions which have been raised.

### NAVAL DISCIPLINE AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for explaining certain words contained in section forty-six of the Naval Discipline Act, 1866—Was *presented* by The Lord ELPHINSTONE; read 1ª. (No. 175.)

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday, 26th July,* 1878.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report*— Mutiny and Marine Mutiny Acts [No. 316].

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) * [277].

*Committee*—Contagious Diseases (Animals) [204] —R.P.; Commons Regulation (Expenses) * [273]—R.P.

*Committee — Report — Considered as amended — Third Reading*—Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) (*re-comm.*) [169], and *passed.*

*Third Reading*—Highways * [261], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

## *QUESTIONS.*

### LAW AND JUSTICE—THE SCOTCH JUDICIAL BENCH—LORD CRAIGHILL.

#### QUESTION.

MR. M'LAREN asked the Lord Advocate, Whether his attention has been called to the report of the trial before Lord Craighill, contained in the "Scotsman" of the 24th of July, to the effect that—

> "Lord Craighill sat in vacation on Monday, to hear evidence in an action from Glasgow having reference to certain plumber work, which, it is alleged as the ground of the case, was improperly executed. When the hour for rising came, the hearing of the evidence was not completed. His Lordship thereupon stated that as no clerk had as yet been appointed to his Court, and as Mr. Bell, the assistant clerk, would be required to discharge his own duties in the Register House, he should adjourn the further hearing of evidence until the ensuing winter sessions;"

and, whether steps have been taken to fill up the vacant clerkship; and, if not, whether he will state the reasons why this has not been done, and what other means are to be taken to facilitate the due administration of justice, and to prevent the additional expenditure to litigants which such postponements unavoidably occasion?

THE LORD ADVOCATE: Sir, the same Question, practically, was asked yesterday by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), who gave me private Notice of it. I regret that the business of the Court referred to should have suffered, and that some steps have not been taken before to provide Lord Craighill with an interim clerk; but I can inform the hon. Member that steps will now be taken to supply the present deficiency.

## ORANGE PROCESSIONS (IRELAND).

### QUESTION.

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the charge of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald to the Grand Jury of the county of Londonderry, in which he directed the attention of that body to the deplorable loss of life which occurred at Mahera in that county on the 12th instant, by reason of a procession of Orangemen, marching armed, and firing on a number of navvies then at work on the Derry Railway; whether the learned judge did not refer to the Party Processions and Party Emblems Acts, one as having been repealed, and the other allowed to expire, in the hope that the good sense of the people would prevail, and put an end to the state of things then previously existing; and, whether, considering these lamentable circumstances, the Attorney General for Ireland will take into his consideration that further Legislative powers are required to put a stop to such party processions?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON): Sir, I have read in the Irish papers a report of the occurrence referred to, and when the matter comes before me, I shall, of course, give it my most anxious attention. But I think the present law is quite sufficient to put down offences of this kind without resorting to any new legislation.

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING: Sir, in consequence of the answer I have received, I beg to give Notice that early next Session I shall move a Resolution and bring in a Bill upon the subject.

## ISLAND OF CYPRUS—SOVEREIGNTY AND ADMINISTRATION.

### QUESTION.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the native population of Cyprus since the Anglo-Turkish Convention owes allegiance to the Sultan or to the British Crown; and what will be their status in the event of a war in which the Sultan may be a belligerent and England neutral, and vice versâ; whether the right conceded by the Porte to the Government of Great Britain to "administer the island of Cyprus" is sufficient by itself to operate as a complete supersession of the Sovereign authority of Turkey over the laws and people of that island, or whether it is proposed by some further Treaty to define the relative powers of the Sultan and the English Government; whether the Ottoman Government can be taken to have delegated to that of Great Britain a territorial jurisdiction in its own dominions over the subjects of foreign states, which jurisdiction the Sultan has himself surrendered in favour of those states; and, if not, whether the European Christian States which by usage, treaty, or capitulation possess the right of exclusive jurisdiction over their own subjects in the Turkish dominions in the Levant will retain the same rights under the English administration of Cyprus; and, whether all those states will have the right to maintain Consular or other Courts in Cyprus, and to exercise jurisdiction over their own subjects independent of the authority of the English administrators?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): Sir, the Question of the hon. and learned Gentleman is of a highly speculative and imaginative character, and in order to answer it fully it would be necessary that it should be more elaborated, and the conditions under which the law is intended to apply should be much more fully explained. But the reply which I am about to give will, I think, be found to be an answer so far as the Question is really practical. First of all, the Anglo-Turkish Convention does not destroy the allegiance of the Natives of Cyprus to the Sultan. The Natives who will remain in Cyprus will, while they are there, be under the protection of the Queen, and bound to render allegiance to her so long as the Island is occupied by Great Britain. A war in which the Sultan may be a belligerent and England a neutral, or *vice versâ,* would not alter their status. Secondly, I think the right conceded by the Porte to the Government of Great Britain to administer the Island of Cyprus is sufficient to give Her Majesty all necessary powers over the Island. Whilst the Island is administered by Her Majesty, Her Majesty will exercise the sole jurisdiction, and administer all laws over the people, subject only to the exception specified in the Convention. Thirdly, if any other country, or the subjects of any other country, claim any exceptional rights under existing arrangements with the Porte, the position and claims of such country or subjects will be duly considered. Fourthly, the question whether European Christian States, possessing exclusive jurisdiction over their own subjects in the Turkish Dominions, would have the right to maintain Consular or other Courts in Cyprus, and to exercise jurisdiction over their own subjects independently of the authority of the English Administration, cannot be answered until it is known whether any and what right to exercise jurisdiction is claimed by the other States.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN — INSTRUCTIONS TO LORD ODO RUSSELL, JUNE 8, 1878.

### QUESTION.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he would explain why a Despatch of instructions, dated June 8th, from Lord Salisbury to Lord Odo Russell, and laid before Parliament was written in contradiction to the secret Agreement between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff, dated May 30th, and which was surreptitiously obtained from the Foreign Office?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the only answer that I can really make to the noble Lord's Question is that I dispute the fact. The Question is very like that put by King Charles II. to the Royal Society, as to how a certain thing was to be explained, and the answer was that "I deny its existence." I entirely deny that there is any contradiction between the despatch of Lord Salisbury, of June 8th, to Lord Odo Russell, and the secret Agreement between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff of the 30th May last.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: Does the right hon. Gentleman deny the contradiction between the two propositions; first, that England——["Order, order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the noble Lord that he is out of Order in putting a Question of an argumentative character. The noble Lord has put his Question, and is not entitled to enter on matters of debate. He should give Notice in a formal manner, if he desires to bring this matter before the House.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: I am only referring to a Question I asked the other day. I want to know, whether there is not a contradiction between the Agreement which said the Government would not contest the possession by Russia of Kars and Ardahan and Batoum, and the instructions to Lord Odo Russell telling him to contest their possession by Russia?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I must remind the noble Lord that what he calls a secret Agreement has never been produced or laid upon the Table of the House by Her Majesty's Government; and the reason they give for not producing it is that, taken by itself, it does not convey an accurate idea of their policy. I again repeat, what I said before, that there is no contradiction between the despatch to Lord Odo Russell and the policy of Her Majesty's Government as expressed in their confidential communications with the Russian Government.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION — ALLEGED TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRIA, GERMANY, AND RUSSIA.—QUESTION.

Dr. KENEALY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, before or on Monday next, a Copy of the Treaty or engagement between the Emperors of Austria, Germany, and Russia, under which the cession of the two provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria had already been arranged, as it appears from a statement of the late Foreign Secretary recently made in these terms:—

> "I will only notice as a curious fact, that, although as I understand that cession was proposed by the British representatives at the Congress, yet we well knew that their transfer to Austria was part of the original engagement between the three Emperors entered into some five years ago?"

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, nothing is known in the Foreign Office of any such Treaty or engagement; and I am quite unable to throw any light on the statement to which the Question refers.

## GREENWICH HOSPITAL—NAVAL PENSIONS.—QUESTION.

Captain PRICE asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, under the Order in Council of June 29th, "limiting the number and amount of Greenwich Hospital age pensions," the Admiralty are empowered to limit to 2*s.* 6*d.* a-day Naval pensions which might otherwise be in excess of that amount, irrespective of the age pensions?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that the Order in Council did not contain any such provision as that to which his hon. and gallant Friend referred. There was no intention on the part of the Admiralty to limit to 2*s.* 6*d.* a-day naval pensions which might otherwise be in excess of that amount.

## PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SATURDAY SITTING.

### QUESTIONS.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether there was to be a Morning Sitting to-morrow; and, when he intended to bring up the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill on Report?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that the Government proposed to take a Morning Sitting to-morrow to go on with the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill if not finished before. If that Bill were finished to-day, the Report on the Resolutions relating to the Duke of Connaught's Annuity would be taken, and also the Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) Bill. He was not in a position to say at present when the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill could be proceeded with. They might be able also to take other Business to-morrow; but he would inform the House more definitely at a later period of the Sitting.

The O'DONOGHUE inquired, Whether any but Government Business would be proceeded with to-morrow?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER believed it would be the general wish of the House to confine the Saturday Sitting to strictly Government Business, and he should discourage, therefore, any private Business being introduced.

In reply to Mr. M'Laren,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he still hoped to pass the Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) Bill this year.

The O'CONOR DON said, he wished to be understood that in regard to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill he did not in any way consent to the arrangement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that nothing but Government Business should be taken to-morrow. He understood that the Government did not intend to put the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill on the Paper; but he reserved to himself the right of moving the third reading to-morrow.

Major NOLAN hoped, if the Government were to take the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill to-morrow, they would adhere to their resolution to proceed only with Government Business. If it was to be understood that the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill stood a chance of coming on, there would be no chance of making progress with the other Business, as a great deal of unnecessary talking on the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill would ensue, in order to obstruct, if possible, the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. ANDERSON appealed to the Speaker, whether it was not perfectly regular for any private Member to put down a Notice for any day on which the House was appointed to sit?

Mr. SPEAKER said, if the House was appointed to sit to-morrow, it could take any Bill it thought proper to proceed with.

Mr. ANDERSON asked, whether the Speaker meant that private Members were or were not shut out.

Mr. SPEAKER explained, that he made no distinction between what the hon. Member called private Members and official Members, as regarded the Business of the House.

Mr. VERNER asked, if the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill would be proceeded with to-morrow?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The Bill, I understand, is being reprinted, and if it can be in the hands of Members in time, I hope to take it to-morrow.

MR. FAWCETT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer not to take the Bill to-morrow, as it would be very inconvenient to proceed with it until hon. Members' Amendments were on the Paper.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that he fully appreciated the hon. Member's objection. He would admit that it might be inconvenient for hon. Members who wished to move Amendments on the Report to frame them properly, unless they had the printed Bill in their possession. He would keep that consideration in view when determining whether the Bill should or should not be taken at to-morrow's Sitting.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### MESSAGE OF THE QUEEN—THE MARRIAGE OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.—REPORT.

Resolutions [23rd July] *reported.*

On Question, "That the Resolutions be agreed to?"

MR. P. A. TAYLOR: Sir, it may, perhaps, meet the convenience of the House if I should now state that, acting under the advice and by the request of most of those hon. Members with whom I have acted in opposing these Royal Grants, I do not propose to carry further the opposition of which I have given Notice on the Second Reading of the Bill relating to the marriage of the Duke of Connaught. I think, however, I am justified in saying that those who oppose this Grant have some reason to complain of the conduct of the Government in their management of the matter. For instance, we heard nothing of it until the close of the Session. It is then hurried through, without any opportunity for discussion whatever, and from the first moment until the third reading, probably not more than a week will elapse. It is never proper to insinuate motives, and it has never been my habit to do so; but it looks exceedingly like an attempt to prevent the people of this country from expressing their opinion. Any amount of opposition, any amount of indignation or of feeling expressed by the people—and there is such a feeling—will come only like the distant rumbling of the thunder long after the lightning bolt has fallen. It is quite clear the people outside have no opportunity of speaking; their Friends in the House have spoken; and, therefore, I am disposed to be content with the discussion that has taken place, and the vote that has been given, being quite sure that it is impossible for the people outside the House to re-inforce the opposition inside. I may, in conclusion, venture to say to the Government, that although discussion has closed in this House, they probably have not heard the last of it. The matter will be discussed throughout the country; and in the course of the not far distant General Election, many an hon. Member, when he appears on the hustings, will be asked this question—"Did you vote for wasting the people's money?"

MR. MACDONALD: Sir, it was my intention to have supported the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor) in his Motion for rejecting this Vote. I, therefore, did not take any part in the discussion which took place last evening; and I wish now to say that the action of the hon. Member for Leicester will not guide me in the course I may take to-morrow. If I take the course of dividing the House, it is not from any feeling of disloyalty to the reigning Family that I do so. I look on these large and frequently repeated Grants as one of the principal causes that are sapping the loyal feeling of thousands, nay of millions of people, towards the reigning house. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen call out "Oh!" They speak of their experience. I have a right to speak of mine. They speak the opinions of the narrow circles in which they move and the drawing-rooms into which they enter. Some time ago an enormous Petition was presented by the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt) and myself against these Royal Grants. I shall only say, in conclusion, that I feel bound, notwithstanding the course the hon. Member for Leicester has taken, to divide the House, as a further protest on a question that is of vital importance to this country, to the great body of our people who are now suffering from "cleanness of teeth" in the great manufacturing districts.

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, as one who has acted on this question with the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor), I trust the House will allow me to express my opinion that my hon. Friend has arrived at a very wise and judicious decision not to press his opposition further on the present occasion. No one who knows him, either in this House or in the country, will for one moment consider that he would ever shrink, from motives of fear, from carrying his opposition to its legitimate conclusion. No one has more the courage of his opinions than he has; but I think that, under the circumstances, my hon. Friend has acted most wisely in resting satisfied with the protest that was made yesterday. The debate which then occurred was ably and temperately conducted on both sides; and however much those who were in the majority disagreed with the minority, I believe they will accept an assurance that we were actuated solely by principle, and were free from any feeling of personal hostility towards the Prince or towards any hon. Member who voted with the majority. It is not for me to use words of compliment; but I can assure the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the House that I believe every one of the 33 Members who voted yesterday most heartily and sincerely reciprocates every good wish and congratulation he used towards the Prince. I think the hon. Member for Leicester is right in withdrawing further opposition under the circumstances; because, as the second reading of the Bill is to be taken on Monday, he would place himself in a wrong position by interposing between the important debate which is to commence on that day and the subject of this grant. He made his protest yesterday, and we then had a fair opportunity of voting against this Grant. I repeat, that he has acted most wisely and judiciously; and I hope my hon. Friend the Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) will be satisfied with the protest he has just made, and will not separate himself from those with whom he usually acts by again troubling the House with a division.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, it is not for me to say what course those who object to the Vote should take with regard to the Bill. That I leave to them to settle among themselves; but I must say one word of protest against what has been said by the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor), as to there being anything in the nature of hurry or surprise in the passing of the Bill. What has been done in this case is that which has been done uniformly during the present Reign on several occasions; and there could not be the least doubt that the course which has been followed on the occasion of other Royal Marriages would be taken with respect to this marriage. I think I may venture to point to the Petition to which the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) referred, as showing that the minds of those who take his view of the subject were alive to this question; but I must protest against the idea that any attempt was made to bring this matter forward at an inconvenient or improper time. It was brought forward at the proper time. It could not be done until Her Majesty had given her consent to the marriage; and it could not be brought forward in the other House in the absence of the Prime Minister. I must also enter my protest, in the most general terms, against its being assumed that those who thought it right to vote against the Grant are in any sense greater friends of the people than those who proposed it. There has been nothing done that has not been done from a sense of public duty and the responsibility the Government owe to the people of this country.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. RAIKES, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, Mr. Secretary CROSS, and Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 277.]

## CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL. [*Lords.*] [BILL 204.]

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 24th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 33 (Prohibition of importation; slaughter or quarantine).

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 17, line 4, to leave out from the word "Act" to the words "seventy-nine," in line 5, inclusive, said: If the Committee agree with me, the result will be that as regards the importation of foreign cattle it will be left in the position in which it now stands. But I wish to refer to what was in the minds of many hon. Members when this clause was originally under consideration. Although we have not had the clause directly before us, we have had a kind of floating allusion or reference to it in all our discussions; and, under these circumstances, I think I shall be justified in detaining the Committee for a few minutes, while I express the view I entertain in regard to the clause. I think that the arguments for and against leaving things as they now are have been pretty well stated, so that I can hardly expect that there will be any alteration in the opinions of hon. Members. But there is one remark that I wish to make. I may observe that some other hon. Members have said that this change in the condition of foreign importation is necessary, because it has been proved by experience that discretion ought not to be left entirely to the Privy Council; and that, notwithstanding the discretion given to the Privy Council last year, with a view of keeping out the cattle plague, the cattle plague still came into the country. I have heard that argument used two or three times; and I hope the Committee will allow me to say that really it has nothing whatever to do with the question which we have before us. I am not going to weary the Committee by indicating the action of the Privy Council with regard to either of the inroads of cattle plague which occurred in 1872 and 1877. My own opinion is, that no regulation can be prescribed by Act of Parliament, and nothing that could have been done by the Privy Council would have prevented those inroads. Whether we stamped it out quite as quick as we should have done if this Act had been passed is another question. The reason I mention the matter is this. Let no one suppose that they would vote against my proposal for leaving things as they are under the idea that what the Government propose would make the slightest difference with regard to cattle plague, and for this reason—at this moment the Privy Council have power to prohibit the importation of cattle altogether from cattle plague countries. The Government continue that power; and, consequently, the restrictions for slaughtering at the port of landing have nothing whatever to do with prohibition altogether. Then it may be said—"Oh! but if we suppose that cattle are to be slaughtered at the port of landing generally, that would take away one chance of the cattle plague, because the cattle come, not from cattle plague countries, but from countries in contact or communication with cattle plague countries." There, again, no alteration has been made. The past rule and custom of the Department has been, in the first place, to prohibit the import of cattle at all from any country which has the cattle plague; secondly, to slaughter, at the port of landing, all cattle coming from a country through which the animals from Russia, or cattle plague countries, can have come. That was the reason why Holland was scheduled, until Holland passed a law preventing the importation of cattle into Holland. That was the reason why France was scheduled. And the real fact is, that when cattle plague came into this country in 1872 and 1877, all those countries were scheduled which had cattle plague, and the cattle were slaughtered at the port of landing in all cases in which the slightest danger was apprehended of cattle plague. I hope I am not unnecessarily detaining the Committee; but I want to explain that really this question has nothing to do with cattle plague. Now, then, we come to the question whether it is desirable to make the alteration? As the Bill was first brought into Parliament, slaughter at the port of landing was the universal rule. There was no exception whatever. But in the House of Lords so much argument was brought forward in debate, and so many facts were brought out in Committee, that the Government felt themselves compelled to change the rule, and to admit cattle from the United States and Canada. The Committee are very well aware that, yielding to the pressure of argument and of facts, the Government have found that they must make two changes since the Bill first came into the House. The first change was to admit into the inland markets the cattle of five countries—Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; and then, when they found that that left matters in a most absurd and inconsistent position, the Government have, under certain conditions, restored the discretion of the Privy Council. But they still adhere to what they call the principle of exclusion, rather than inclusion. I do not think that it will make any very great practical difference ["Hear, hear!"] My hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Phipps) says he agrees with me.

If he really does, I do not think there will be much difficulty in persuading him to vote with me. [Mr. Phipps: It was the hon. Member for Leicestershire (Mr. Pell).] To my mind there must be some discretion placed in the hands of the Privy Council, in order to guard the necessities of trade. I can speak with some little experience on that matter. Whoever represents the Veterinary Department before the country is put in a most responsible, not to say difficult, position. From day to day, and from week to week, he has to interfere with almost the most important trade in the country — a trade in regard to which people are sensitive to an extreme degree—the trade of supplying them with what they want to eat. He is obliged to interfere with it, because he is responsible for doing his best to keep out disease. But he cannot have been in that office a week without feeling how very responsible a thing it is thus to interfere with the food of the people; and I do not know, with all the experience I have had in connection with the administration of the Department, that I ever felt more difficulty than in being aware, from day to day, that I might be called upon to take measures which I knew must cause an alteration in, and generally raise, the price of food—not, perhaps, throughout the whole country, but certainly in this large City in which we live. This being the responsibility of the matter — the responsibility of increasing the price of food, and, on the other hand, of doing your best to stamp out disease. I am perfectly sure that no Privy Council will very much care as to what is the presumption one way or the other. They will merely ask themselves—"What is our discretion, and what is our duty? Our duty is to let the country have as much food as it can get; let as much food come in as the people can possibly buy, without incurring danger from disease." Therefore, it will not make much practical difference to let them have this discretion. If this be the case, it is not too much to ask of the Government and of Parliament that the presumption should be in favour of free trade—that the presumption should be that we should get as many cattle as we can, and that we should not keep them out of the country, unless we are obliged to do so in consequence of disease. We have talked this matter over during the last two or three weeks, and we know very well, both from the Amendments which have been put upon the Paper, and from the statements of the Secretary to the Treasury and the supporters of the Government, that immediately the Act is passed, that cattle will be admitted from America, also from Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. There are 11 countries from which cattle are imported into this country, or 10, if you count the United States and Canada as one; and when this Bill passes there will be only four countries excluded, and from six the cattle will be admitted. Therefore, if you establish your presumption, it will be broken through at once by two-thirds of the exporting countries. I now come to the number of cattle. Last year there came 82,000 cattle from the four countries which would remain scheduled; while there were 116,000 from the six countries which you let in. I think I have said enough to prove my case; and it only remains for me to say that if the Committee will accept this proposition, I shall be quite prepared to allow to be embodied in the Bill instructions to the Privy Council to treat pleuro-pneumonia as a ground for slaughter, as has hitherto been done with cattle plague. I do not suppose anybody would think of prohibiting the import altogether on the ground of pleuro-pneumonia; but now we are going to take real measures to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia at home, I think the prevalence of it in an exporting country ought to be ground for slaughter at the port of debarkation, and that can be fairly met by some instructions in the Bill.

Amendment proposed, in page 17, line 4, to leave out from the word "Act," to the words "seventy-nine" in line 5, inclusive.—(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'but shall not take effect' stand part of the Clause."

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: No one can complain of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Forster) raising this, which is the point upon which has practically rested all the discussion and opposition to the Bill; but I do not suppose the Committee will, for one moment, feel that, having introduced the Bill in the form it now stands, the Government are prepared to give way to him on this particular point. We have argued from the first that, whilst not attempting or wishing in the least to interfere with the free introduction of cattle into this country from abroad, we are bound to take steps for regulating their movement when they are in this country, so as to protect ourselves, as far as possible, from the introduction of disease. We have argued all through that this is not a case of free trade, and we are not proposing to restrict free trade. What we do want to restrict, and what we have a legitimate right to restrict, is free trade in disease. The real distinction and difference as to the treatment of the two cases is this. With regard to your home trade, you have it immediately under your own eye, and you are able, through your Veterinary Department and the local authorities combined, to ascertain what are the regulations dealing with disease, and what are the outbreaks of disease in different parts of the country; and, as soon as you have done this, you can at once bring your laws to bear on these outbreaks, and check them by the strength of the Privy Council. But that is not the case when you are dealing with cattle in foreign countries. It is true we may be informed by the courtesy of foreign Governments what steps they are taking to deal with these diseases; but we have had, only a few years ago, conclusive evidence that, in spite of all the international arrangements for the imparting of information, the cattle plague has beaten the authorities, and has arrived in this country before their information respecting it has reached us. That justifies us in dealing with the foreign import in the way we propose. We are not, and cannot be, in the possession of information with regard to foreign cattle the same as we are in regard to cattle at home. We cannot deal with their cattle while they are in their own countries; we can only begin to deal with them when they arrive here. Therefore, we are subject to disease coming to our shores over which we have no practical control; whereas, with regard to disease which arises in this country, we have the power to control it in our own hands. That, I think, is a strong argument in favour of making the presumption, contrary to what it has been up to the present time. The presumption up to the present time has been in favour of letting all these animals in; and the result has been we have had cattle plague twice within recent times, and we are constantly under the risk of having pleuro-pneumonia introduced from these countries.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I think the Secretary to the Treasury has just made a statement which may mislead, although he has, no doubt, done it quite unintentionally. Cattle plague has come in twice from Germany; but, in both cases, the cattle were slaughtered at the port of debarkation.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: My impression is, that cattle from Germany were not slaughtered at the port before the introduction of the last cattle plague. However, the right hon. Gentleman is likely to be better informed on that subject than I am. But I place what we propose to do on the broad ground that we want some control over these animals; and we take extra precaution in making the presumption as we do, and giving the Privy Council discretion with regard to satisfying themselves that these counties are, both as regards sanitary matters and the regulations which they enforce, in a position to justify us in believing that we have got the same security as regards their cattle as we have in regard to home trade. I hope, therefore, the Committee will adhere to the principle as it is now in the Bill. It is not put there with any intention to hamper or stop the introduction of healthy animals into this country; but it is put there because the Government feel it is a power which is absolutely necessary if we are to attempt to deal with the introduction of disease from foreign countries.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he had hitherto cordially voted for the Bill, because he wished to create that free trade which did not now exist. From all the information he had been able to collect, the farmers of this country were in a state of terror about the introduction of disease; and until that was removed, it was impossible to expect them to increase their herds and flocks. If they could once establish confidence in the minds of the farmers, so far from the price of meat being increased, he believed the price would decrease, because the stock of meat would increase.

He knew no class who were less desirous than the farmers to increase the price of meat. It was in the belief that this Bill would not increase the price that he supported it; though, of course, whether it would attain its object was another thing. The Government had come forward and, upon their responsibility, declared that if they could once exclude the disease from this country the home stocks would increase; and therefore the Committee ought to support them in their attempt to accomplish that object.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Forster) had told them that foreign cattle were slaughtered at the ports of landing at the time of the last two outbreaks of cattle plague in this country. He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) believed that to be true; but the right hon. Gentleman did not go on to state that there were animals for store and breeding purposes which were admitted, and which were not slaughtered at the port, and that the attack first took place in the dairies. That showed how careful they ought to be. The right hon. Gentleman said that, practically, there was no difference between the proposal of the Government and his own Amendment. He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) would ask him, then, whether it was worth while fighting them on a point of that kind? If the right hon. Gentleman himself had brought in a Bill of that character, and had made great concessions in accordance with the views expressed by both sides of the House, as had been most wisely done in this case, would he have given way any further? Were they to stultify their proceedings by changing the whole face of that Bill? Let the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends now be satisfied and allow the measure to proceed, seeing that they had got all that they wanted, and the great object was now to make progress with the Bill. Hon. Gentlemen on his—the Ministerial—side did not mean to give way on that point, but would stand absolutely firm.

MR. RYLANDS considered the speech just delivered quite refreshing. Now, what were the facts? In the first instance, the Government brought in a Bill in which they had no faith, and which was contrary to their own convictions. The Bill had been drawn upon lines which could not be defended, and they had continually yielded one point after another, so far as they had been allowed by their supporters; and now, when they came to one of the most important proposals of the Bill, the hon. and gallant Baronet opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) said there must be no more yielding. He hoped, however, the hon. and gallant Baronet would allow them to give way on this occasion also. But however lightly hon. Gentlemen might treat this question of the interference with the import of cattle, it was one which was regarded with the greatest possible interest by the people of this country; and he was rather astonished that his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Kincardine (Sir George Balfour) should have persuaded himself that it was of advantage to keep out foreign food. This Bill, from the first, proceeded upon the line of absolute prohibition of live cattle; and there was no doubt whatever, if that line had been carried out throughout the whole of the foreign importation, the effect would have been very materially to raise the price of food in this country. The Bill, therefore, in its original form, was a Protectionist one; and the Government, by their concessions, had admitted it would have seriously interfered with the supply of food. As regarded the Amendment now before them, his right hon. Friend had clearly shown that its adoption would not have any very material effect upon the action of the Privy Council, and he was not quite sure that it need necessarily have any effect at all; while it would have the advantage of showing to foreign countries what was our opinion in regard to free trade in this matter. The prosperity of England depended upon free trade; and he trusted it would not go forth that the House of Commons was unwilling to give facility for the importation of foreign food.

MR. CLARE READ said, the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Rylands) had repeated a statement he had made before—that when the Government introduced this Bill into the House of Lords it was for the total prohibition of the import of foreign cattle into this country. There was not a single word then or now in the Bill which prohibited the importation of foreign cattle. The hon. Member could not have read the Bill, the object of which was simply to prohibit cattle from coming inland, which was a very different matter to preventing their importation. At the present moment sheep were prohibited from coming inland, yet there had lately been a larger import of sheep than they had had for years, thus showing that slaughter at the ports did not prevent mutton from coming into this country from abroad. He had to express his gratitude to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) for what had fallen from him with respect to pleuro-pneumonia. His conversion in that matter had been slow; but he hoped it would be sure and certain. The right hon. Gentleman was evidently coming round; but he had not quite reached the true point. He really felt that what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford said, although it was but little benefit to the agriculturists, yet it was also a great point for them. However other things might be, he desired to have the law right; and he certainly thought that the proposal of the Bill was just, for, even if there were no cattle disease whatever in any part of the Continent, it must be admitted that after cattle had undergone the privations and miseries of a long transit and sea voyage, they must be more subject to disease, and, therefore, they should, at all events, be regarded with considerable suspicion. This should be the case were there no cattle disease on the Continent; but when they knew how rife cattle diseases were on the Continent, it seemed clear that what the Bill proposed should be done for the protection of the farmers of this country. The right hon. Gentleman said that only four out of 10 cattle-exporting countries would have their cattle slaughtered at the ports of debarkation; but he forgot that cattle from Germany and Belgium were prohibited at the present time.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he must beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon; he reckoned Germany and Belgium, and there were only 10 exporting countries.

MR. CLARE READ said, he thought that if he were to reckon up the countries which might export cattle to us he should make about 12; but he would not further contest that point. What he wished to observe was, that cattle plague came in on two previous occasions. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman said he could not help letting in the disease; but that told in favour of the proposal of the Bill; for as soon as the disease overstepped its accustomed limit, it was almost certain to come into this country. On a previous occasion cattle plague broke out beyond its ordinary boundary, and it came into England even before the Germans knew it existed in their own country. [MR. W. E. FORSTER said it came from a scheduled country.] That was the case; but if the Lords of the Council had prohibited then, as they prohibited now, the importation of cattle from Germany, we should not have had the cattle plague in this country. There was no doubt about that. If the present regulations were kept in force it would only be by some wicked conspiracy, or some unavoidable accident, that we could have the cattle plague again in this country. He felt very warmly on this point. Surely, hon. Gentlemen opposite would allow that hon. Members on this side of the House had made all the concessions which were requisite; and he trusted the other side would let the farmers have what might seem to some a shadow, or a phantom, advantage. But it was something to have the law in one's favour; and, in the name of the farmers of England, he demanded it.

MR. ARTHUR PEEL said, the distinguishing feature of the Bill had probably been the many concessions which the Government had made. He did not say that in any taunting spirit; for those concessions had not been forced on the Government by any probability of their encountering an adverse majority, but by the force of right and reason. He gave his full testimony to the openness of mind and candour of judgment which the Secretary to the Treasury had shown in the conduct of the Bill. But what was the result of all these concessions? It was this—that they left a discretion to the Privy Council. What were the concessions? They were these—First of all, Canadian and American cattle were admitted. Then the Government consented to admit cattle from five European countries. Then the House found itself in a difficulty with respect to the Favoured Nation Clause and International Treaties; and the Government agreed to put all nations into one category, and make all equal before the law. But the Government would not get into that difficulty again by anything which they were now asked to do. The discretion which they had now established with respect to the Privy Council would not get them into any difficulty as to the infringement of any Favoured Nation Clause which might have been entered into with a foreign country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford had shown that no great practical difference would result if the change of presumption were made. He had shown that even if the law were left as the Bill proposed, as many as two-thirds of the exporting countries would still break through the rule, and that there would, therefore, be no practical difference in the importation of meat to this country. However that might be, he (Mr. Peel) did not put the case on that ground, but on a higher ground. Whatever might be the practical result, there was no reason why they should change the law; certainly no reason had been shown in the course of the debate why the law should be changed from what it was in the Act of 1869. The concession asked for from the Government was one that could do agriculturists no harm, while it would be of immense advantage on the other side, for the contention was simply this—that the Government should preserve the principle of Free Trade that had hitherto prevailed. Long after these debates had been forgotten, and the extenuating circumstances of the case had passed from men's minds, the principle would remain, if the concession were not made, that the Government had changed the presumption in favour of Free Trade into a presumption against Free Trade. The reason for doing this would be forgotten, and the Protectionists of a future day would be able to say that the English Government had changed the presumption from Free Trade to Protection. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury had referred to the outbreaks of cattle plague in 1872 and 1877. Now, it was an undoubted fact, that in 1877 the rinderpest came from Hamburg, and from a scheduled country. He could not understand what argument the Secretary to the Treasury could frame on such a fact as that. Why were the Government going to make this change? He understood the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) to say that cattle plague might exist in a foreign country; that we might not get adequate notice of it; and that some diseased cattle might slip into this country. That would be the case as the Bill was originally drawn. If they had compulsory slaughter, how were they to prevent a sick or diseased animal from coming in, and from being the means of conveying disease? He would remind hon. Members that when they said a single animal might convey disease, and that, therefore, thousands of animals ought to be slaughtered, they proved too much; for a single diseased beast might come into a port, and might be immediately slaughtered, and yet some man might have had communication with it, and might convey the disease elsewhere. That was the way in which disease had been communicated. In 1877 the spread of the disease was attributed, by those who ought to know, to the infection of a cowshed at Limehouse being carried to other cowsheds and other places in the Metropolis. He hoped that the concession asked for might yet be granted, for no reason had been brought forward why it should not be granted. Hon. Members on his side were as willing as hon. Members on the other side could be, that if disease was proved to exist on board ship the rest of the cargo should be slaughtered. When the hon. Member for South Norfolk taunted the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford on the subject of pleuro-pneumonia, and said that he was coming round, he would remind the hon. Member that the right hon. Gentleman introduced a clause into his Bill, or a regulation under the Bill, which had operated hitherto, that if a single beast in a cargo should be found infected, whether with cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia, the whole of the cargo should be sacrificed. If that was a slight concession, he should like to know what concession the hon. Member expected? He would urge on the House that the concession now asked for should be made; because it was no light thing to vary the presumption that had existed for so many years. If they left the Bill as it was, there might be no practical result; but they would have taken a retrograde step in their attitude towards freedom of trade.

Mr. PELL said, they had been told more than once that there was no reason for changing the presumption; but he thought there was one obvious reason—namely, that when the presumption was on the other side they had had cattle disease imported. It was said that cattle would still come from foreign countries; and also, that if a diseased animal was brought here for slaughter, the disease might be communicated; but he did not think these were sufficient arguments against the proposal of the Government. Another argument of an extraordinary kind had been urged, that they must be careful how they dealt with foreign countries in the point of free trade. He was a free trader before he had a grey hair on his head; but he did not find that foreign countries were so ready to accept free trade. He did not know that any foreign country would make a protest against this country's dealing with foreign cattle in the way proposed. In his opinion, the placing the presumption as it was now sought to place it was more important than many hon. Members seemed to think. He held that the responsibility of the Privy Council should be greater than it was at present, and that they should act on the side of prevention, as the Bill proposed, only admitting cattle as far as, after some inquiry, they were satisfied that a country was free from disease. Several concessions had been made already on his side of the House; and unless it was to be all give and no take on that side, he thought they might fairly ask for a slight concession on the other side. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) himself said it would not make much difference; and he (Mr. Pell) thought it would be good taste on the part of the other side to give way on this point, and to allow the Bill to be brought to a conclusion.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he would again urge that with perfect free trade, or as nearly perfect free trade as they could desire, they had not had cheap meat. On the contrary, year by year meat had risen in price. He must repeat that his wish was to obtain cheap meat for the people; and he believed that no Government ought to do anything which would prevent meat from becoming cheap. He was satisfied, from inquiries which he had made, that if they could keep away disease, as it was the object of the Bill to do, they would cause the home stock to be so much increased that a proper supply of meat could be obtained at home. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford had told them that the quantity of meat which was required could be supplied by 2,400,000. There was now a supply of 2,100,000; therefore, the whole supply expected was no more than 300,000. He found that already there had been a very considerable increase; and shortly, if only there was confidence on the part of the farmers, they might expect the required increase to be made up.

MR. FAWCETT said, he hoped the Committee, before going to a division, would allow him to make a few remarks, to show the extreme importance of this point. His hon. Friends the Members for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) and South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) urged that to give way to the Government on this matter would be a very slight concession, and referred to the question as being one of form, and not of much practical consequence. He agreed with them that it would be a very slight concession, if they looked merely at the direct consequences which were likely to result from the Bill remaining in its present form. But he thought he could show that in that case the Bill would produce most serious consequences, which would be felt in every commercial and manufacturing centre in the country. They read in the papers of meetings of Chambers of Commerce, complaining of the depression of trade, and stating that the decline in our exports was mainly due to the hostile tariffs which were maintained against English goods. There was no doubt that there were at the present time hundreds of thousands of men in this country who were suffering greatly, and who were deprived of their honest employment owing to the serious reductions which were imposed upon them by protection on the Continent and in America. He had given some attention to the subject; and he was sure that no one who had examined carefully into the state of feeling on the Continent and in the United States at the present time could resist the conclusion that the Protectionist party in the United States, in Canada, and on the Continent was as eagerly looking out for every excuse to maintain a system of rigid Protection, as was a drowning man to clutch the first substance that came within his reach. He would show that this was no theoretical or fanciful grievance; and he begged the attention of the Committee to this point. The other day his hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool (Mr. Rathbone) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the English Government could not do something with regard to the most serious impediments which were being imposed on English trade by the Spanish Government? who were treating the trade of England with a harshness and an injustice that they were applying to no other trade or country. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said, in reply, that the Government had remonstrated, as strongly as it was possible for remonstrances to be worded, against the conduct of the Spanish Government, but, hitherto, without the slightest effect. Now, let them consider for a moment the reason of the course adopted by the Spanish Government. What was their justification for thus singling out English trade for special treatment? This will show hon. Members the perilous path on which they were entering. The great excuse of the Spanish Government, in especially hindering the English trade, was this—They said that, whether intentionally or not, a great injustice was done to their trade by the two most illustrious free traders England had ever produced — he meant his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), and his late distinguished Friend Mr. Cobden. They said, as their great ground for treating English trade with injustice, that when the Commercial Treaty was negotiated between France and England, certain arrangements were entered into which, whether intentionally or not—of course, unintentionally—placed the Spanish trade at a special disadvantage. Now, that showed how extremely tender and careful they had to be in their commercial relations with foreign countries. It was enacted in that Treaty, that all wines of less than 26 degrees of alcoholic strength should pay a duty of 1*s*. Then there was a sudden jump to 2*s*. 6*d*. The Spanish Government said that their wines were of 28 degrees of alcoholic strength, and were unjustly treated by having to pay a duty exceeding by 150 per cent what was paid by French wines. On this circumstance the Spanish Government rested their main defence for maintaining a rigid system of protection against English trade, which was felt so acutely by all who had trade with Spain. Hon. Members said their opponents ought to be generous to them, and ought not to impute Protectionist intentions to them when they had none; they said they did not wish to raise the price of meat, or place home produce at an advantage compared with foreign produce; they said they were as anxious for free trade as their opponents were. He should be very sorry not to accept these assurances unreservedly. He did not believe for a single moment that it was their intention or wish to re-introduce Protection with regard to English agriculture. But what they had always to look at in Acts of Parliament was, not the wish or the intention of the Act, but what would be its practical effect. Now, it seemed to him to be impossible to resist this point: if a very considerable section of the House believed, just as sincerely as hon. Members opposite did, in their opinion that this Act would be a Protectionist measure—["No, no!"]—well, they denied it, and he and his Friends believed it, but they were equally bound to accept the sincerity of each other's belief. If 150 or 160 Members of that House, and a large section of public opinion out-of-doors, after giving this question the most careful consideration, were prepared to say, as he for himself was prepared to say, that they believed the effect of this Bill, although that was not the effect intended, would be Protectionist, did not the House think that that belief would also be shared in by those Protectionist countries which were at the present time eagerly looking out for the slightest excuse for making their tariffs more hostile against the interests of England? If 150 Members of the House of Commons believed that the House was about to pass a Protectionist Bill, was it not likely that at least as large a proportion of the American Congress, or the French Chamber, or the German Parliament, would come to the same conclusion? And if that was the case, the House would see how it would most seriously weaken the hands of that party on the Continent, and in the United States, which was at present contending, under every difficulty and obstacle, for the maintenance or introduction of a free trade policy, which would have a practical effect on this country. He had no hesitation in saying, after having given some consideration to the subject—and he believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he were present, would bear him out—that the renewal of all our Commercial Treaties, whether with France or other countries, stood at present in a most critical position. No one could tell whether, with regard to France, for instance, the Protectionists in that country would not be sufficiently strong to prevent the Commercial Treaty with England from again being renewed. It was not necessary for him to point out to the manufacturers and other men of business in that House what a serious effect would be produced on English trade if all those Commercial Treaties should gradually fall through. He knew that this Bill was already welcomed by the Protectionists of other countries, who were beginning to say—"This is a powerful weapon in our hands." What would now be the position of Protectionists in the United States? They would read the papers, and would see that hon. Members, like the hon. Member for South Leicestershire and the hon. Member for South Norfolk, spoke of this matter as a slight concession. But what was the principle of the "slight concession" that was insisted on? It was this. Hitherto, in our dealings with the United States, we had been able to say—"We maintain towards you, not only with regard to agriculture, but with regard to other industries, that free trade shall be the rule, and restriction the exception." Protectionists would now, in a thousand different ways, turn round and say—"Oh, England has reversed her policy." It would be of no use for hon. Members to say why they had done it; foreigners would say—"You have reversed your policy. England is now, without giving us the slightest notice or warning, about to make restriction the rule, and free trade the exception." And that was exactly what hon. Members were doing. He should not have troubled the Committee at such length; but he felt that, considering that perfectly unrestricted commerce was never in a more critical or perilous position than at present, it was impossible to exaggerate the mischief that had been done, and that might still be done to English trade by an increase of the hostile tariffs of other countries. He thought that after it had been admitted that the direct consequences of this concession were slight, the House would be pursuing a perilous and dangerous policy if they placed in the hands of the Protectionists of other countries an argument which they would not be slow to use. The free trade party in other countries, and the friends of unrestricted commerce, would find that they had a more difficult task to perform, and that their struggle was harder than it had been before England departed from a principle which she had hitherto resolutely maintained. If it was necessary for the prevention of disease to impose restrictions, they should still cling as firmly as possible to the principle of free trade, and say, as they had hitherto said, that if it was necessary to impose restrictions, they should be imposed on the distinct and intelligible principle, that unrestricted trade should be the rule, and that any restriction should be the exception.

MR. NEWDEGATE regretted that he should be obliged to tell the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), who had, perhaps, studied this question as much as anyone in that House, that this was not a question of free trade in cattle or in meat; it was a question of free trade or protection in disease. There was no restriction against the importation of healthy cattle, or of dead meat to any extent; but the restriction under the Bill was in the nature of a quarantine restriction, and it was entirely an internal and permissible arrangement. It had been pretended that the Bill would interfere with International Law. The Bill came, however, within the great exception of quarantine, and the only restriction was upon internal communication. Well, then, the whole argument, based upon free trade, fell to the ground. He had heard the free trade question argued ever since 1843; and he defied any sensible man to explain how the principles of free trade applied as an objection to the Bill, unless free trade in disease was meant. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford said—"Oh, we object to the principle being one of exclusion." What was the title of the Bill? Its title was the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill. Did the right hon. Gentleman object to the principle of excluding disease? If he did, he objected, not only to this measure, but to the existing Acts on the subject. The right hon. Gentleman went further, and said that the objection to all these Acts was the enormous responsibility which they imposed upon the Privy Council, because they made them literally traders in food. He felt the force of that objection, and he would have preferred the original principle of the Bill, which would have entirely relieved the Privy Council; but the pressure brought upon the Government by the importers and other traders in this country had been so strong that they found themselves compelled to abandon that principle.

Sir HARCOURT JOHNSTONE said, he felt bound to protest against the analogies that had been drawn by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) in dealing with the question of cattle disease, and held that it was the duty of the Government to prohibit the importation of disease through whatever medium it was conveyed. He claimed to be as staunch a free trader during the last 30 years as any hon. Member of that House; and he must say that he had both heard and read with regret of imputations which had been thrown out against the promoters of this Bill, and those who supported them, that they were actuated by a desire to raise the price of meat. Nothing could be more absurd or more untrue; and he was astonished that hon. Members should have been found in any part of the House to countenance such a transparent fallacy. There were some hon. Members on his side of the House who were quite as anxious for the welfare of the working classes as were his hon. Friends below the Gangway, and he would make the same remark of hon. Gentlemen on the other side; and he thought it was unworthy of any hon. Members of that House to start such a theory for the sake of getting up a Party cry. What he firmly believed was, that the Government would have done far better if they had had the courage to persevere with their original intention, which was to insist upon compulsory slaughter at the port of debarkation. If they had done this, they would, perhaps, for a time have subjected themselves to the contumely of certain trading interests; but they would have adopted the only certain means of remedying admitted evils. In this matter he wished to make an appeal to his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford, who once took a very active part in preventing the spread of Asiatic cholera in this country. It happened that some years ago he (Sir Harcourt Johnstone) was at a certain port, and he received from one of the authorities there information that cases of Asiatic cholera were on board a vessel in the offing. He immediately telegraphed up to his right hon. Friend, who instantly sent down an Inspector, and he believed it was entirely due to the rapid action which was then taken that Asiatic cholera was prevented from getting a footing in this country. But who could tell in what manner the discretion of the Privy Council might be exercised? Who could tell whether they would always have at the head of that Department a man who would have the courage to act in a time of emergency? The President of the Privy Council might be a timid man, or a man who might be carried away by false notions of free trade principles; and he might feel that it would be unworthy of him, or dangerous to his Party, to put any vigorous measures in force. Therefore, it was far better and safer that the presumption should be as the Government had put it—namely, that the cattle should be slaughtered. He was sorry to have detained the Committee one minute, as it was very desirable that the Bill should be got through as rapidly as possible; but he felt bound to protest, not only against the imputations which had been made against the supporters of the Bill, but against the doctrine that it was wise to leave any loophole open whatever for the importation of disease into this country.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, there was no hon. Member on his own side of the House who more appreciated the concessions which had already been made by the Government than he did; and in proof of that he need only refer to the fact that he had withdrawn all his Amendments from the Paper in order that the discussion might be taken on his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford's Amendment to this clause. He had done what he could to facilitate the progress of the Bill. He gave his hon. Friend the Member for Scarborough (Sir Harcourt Johnstone) full credit for sincerity in every word that he had addressed to the Committee; but his opinions were based upon a knowledge of one side of the question only. His hon. Friend was, no doubt, as zealous, honest, and earnest in his desire for cheap meat and cheap food of all kinds as he himself or any other hon. Member of that House; but when his hon. Friend drew the distinction which he had drawn and argued, that the opponents of the Bill were fighting a shadow, and anxious only for free trade in disease, he spoke from the point of view of the cultivator of the soil and a landowner. He (Mr. Mundella) wanted to point out the important bearing that the presumption of law which was now insisted upon would have upon the future industries of this country. The hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) had given it as his opinion that if there was no disease on the Continent at all the presumption of law ought still to be in favour of compulsory slaughter. What did that mean? What did words like those convey to the people of this country, and to the foreigner with whom they had to deal? Everybody in that House knew that in modern times free trade had been the greatest source of the increase in their national wealth, and all classes of the community had benefited equally thereby. What had been the result of the extension of that system to the Continent? They had Commercial Treaties with Continental nations, which involved a trade both ways of over £150,000,000 sterling; but, as his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had pointed out, Free Trade was never in such jeopardy amongst Continental nations as it was at the present moment. And let him tell the House why the manufacturing classes on the Continent of Europe had all along been opposed to Free Trade. Their whole strength in regard to Commercial Treaties lay in the agricultural classes, who sent to this country the produce of the soil. They would have very little chance of maintaining a Commercial Treaty with France, but for the fact that that they took her wine, her butter, her poultry, and a number of other products which amounted to a very considerable sum in the year. In like manner, as regarded Denmark and other countries, they took their cattle, and the fact was that the exports of agricultural products of the Continent of Europe were largely in excess of the exports of manufacturing products. In America the export of manufacturing products was less than 12½ per cent of the entire exports. It would be seen, therefore, that the only hope which they had of maintaining commercial relations with those countries upon a proper footing was the hold which they had upon the agricultural classes. Let him point out what had been happening, and why he ventured to bring this argument before the Committee at the present moment. It might be said that it was very little germane to cattle. If so, it was because hon. Gentlemen opposite knew nothing about the matter. They were purely agricultural Members, who had not a commercial idea in their heads. At the present moment there was, and had been for some time past, very great manufacturing distress throughout the whole world, and the manufacturers in every country with which England had a Commercial Treaty had been appealing to their Government to get rid of that Treaty. In France there had recently been an inquiry into the causes of manufacturing and commercial distress, and he held in his hand a Report of the French Senate upon that subject, which he had obtained at the Foreign Office the day before. To what did they attribute the manufacturing distress which prevailed? Mainly to English competition, and they demanded that the duties which now protected their industries should not be diminished in any case; but that they should be raised in all the cases of those industries which were now suffering, and that no further negotiation of Treaties of Commerce should be effected. Well, what were they doing by this Bill? They were proposing that the presumption of law should be in favour of exclusion. But the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) had, he thought, admitted that he was contending almost for a shadow. He (Mr. Mundella) said, honestly, that he had no desire to admit any diseased animals into this country. The hon. Baronet the Member for Scarborough (Sir Harcourt Johnstone) had said that this presumption of law should be maintained, because the Privy Council could not be trusted. But the Government had trusted the Privy Council in the Bill. As the Bill now stood, it was the Privy Council who alone must exclude diseased cattle. What, then, was the good of this presumption? Why should not the presumption be as directly in favour of Free Trade, with the strictest injunction to the Privy

Council to exclude diseased cattle, as it should be in favour of compulsory slaughter with power to that body to admit healthy cattle? It would only be reversing the presumption; but, at the same time, a most important principle was involved. What would happen when they passed this Bill? These discussions would go to America, and everything which had been said in the country or in that House implying a want of confidence in Free Trade would be seized upon by the Protectionists of that country and diligently circulated in the newspapers from New York to San Francisco. Why should there be any contention about the reversal of this presumption? If once this country was brought into a state of commercial distress through any foolish legislation of this kind, it would be not merely the industrial classes, or the mannfacturing interests, but the landowner and the farmer who would suffer. The latter would have to pay heavy rates, and they would suffer heavily from the depreciation of their property. They had not a single Act on the Statute Book which implied any want of confidence in the principles of free trade. Why should this Act be the first? He appealed to the Committee and to the Government to allow the presumption to be that England admitted Free Trade in every department of food, and simply insisted upon excluding unhealthy cattle.

Mr. CHARLEY said, he had great pleasure in supporting the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford. This was a Consolidation Bill, and he saw no reason why the Consolidated Acts should be made so much more severe with regard to the universal compulsory slaughter at the out-ports. If the Privy Council had been trusted to take foreign animals out of the Schedule, why could they not be trusted to put foreign animals into the Schedule? Were they to be put into the Schedule by Act of Parliament merely to give the Privy Council the trouble of taking them out again? The cattle were to be condemned to death by Act of Parliament, and they were afterwards to be granted a free pardon by the clemency of the Crown; because, practically, the Privy Council represented the Crown. He thought that such a provision was contrary to common sense, and that it would be far better to leave it to the discretion of the Privy Council whether cattle should be put into the Schedule or not. There was another point of still more importance. A concession was made in the House of Lords of a most valuable kind, and that was that Canada and the United States should be excluded from the Schedule. The Bill came down to that House with a clause in it giving a discretion to the Privy Council to put the United States into the Schedule or not. A discussion took place on going into Committee, and a further concession was made by Her Majesty's Government—namely, that five healthy countries might be exempted from the Schedule by the Privy Council. Then a cry was raised that the Government was violating the "Most Favoured Nation Clause" in Treaties, and they made a still further concession that the Privy Council should have the power of taking all foreign cattle out of the Schedule; but, in granting that concession, they proposed to do away with the concession granted in the House of Lords. [*Cries of* "Agreed."] They were not agreed. This was a matter which affected his constituents, and he had a right to defend their interests; and he would do so, notwithstanding any interruptions that might be offered to him. He repeated that it was a most unfortunate thing that the Government, while making the concession that the Privy Council should have power to take all cattle out of the Schedule, should have proposed to do away with the concession which they made in the House of Lords—that American cattle should not be put into the Schedule at all by the Act of Parliament. This change affected them very greatly in Salford. In the course of the year before last, there were in the Salford cattle market 3,243 American cattle, and last year there were 6,254. The means of transit had so greatly improved that he believed that in the course of time Salford cattle market would be very largely supplied by American cattle. Then why did the Government propose to level down the American cattle, and put them into the Schedule? The proper thing to do would be to level up the other cattle, and put them on the same footing as that on which American cattle were put when the Bill left the House of Lords.

Mr. NORWOOD said, that as he had not taken part in the debates on this Bill, he might be permitted to offer a few remarks, especially as he was a Member of the Committee which sat last year, in whose deliberations he had taken somewhat of an active part. He had listened with the greatest attention to the observations of his hon. Friends the Members for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) and Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), and he confessed that, Free Trader as he was, he could not agree with their arguments. He did not believe that the provisions of the Bill would ultimately affect the importation of cattle from healthy countries; and, so far from the principles of Free Trade being infringed, he looked upon those provisions merely as a matter of police and sanitary regulation with respect to the cattle after they had been imported. The Bill was an experiment. When they found that the agriculturists of this country were willing to submit to considerable restrictions for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth now existing, he thought it was only fair and reasonable that regulations should be imposed with respect to the import of foreign cattle, so as to prevent the introduction of disease into the country. When the Report was under consideration, it was clear that the majority of the Committee were in favour of the total exclusion alive of cattle from certain countries; and he ventured to submit a more moderate proposal in the interests of all parties—namely, that they should admit cattle from all countries, but that they should be slaughtered on debarkation, and he made an exception in favour of the United States and Canada. His proposal was ultimately rejected by the agricultural Members of the Committee, who affected to think it simply monstrous. He must say, in justice to his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford, that when he (Mr. Norwood) proposed his Motion simply as a compromise, based upon the understanding that the agriculturists should submit to *bonâ fide* restrictions, his right hon. Friend said—"I think you are going too far in the way of concession; but if it insures unanimity in the Committee, I shall not oppose." Notwithstanding the concession made by his right hon. Friend, the agricultural Members were so determined to carry their views to the full extent, that they voted against a scheme which their Party was glad to accept in the House of Lords, and with respect to which still further concessions had been made in this House. He did not think slaughter at the ports of debarkation would have any permanent effect in increasing the price of food. Until the regulations of trade were fully understood there might be some small advance in price, because there might be some little hesitation at first in sending foreign cattle to this country, subject to any restrictions at all; but that difficulty would soon vanish, and he thought the controversy ought now to cease by the acceptance of what he, for one, thought a most fair and reasonable compromise.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, the speech to which they had just listened was, in part, a reply to the remarks of the hon. Baronet the Member for Scarborough (Sir Harcourt Johnstone), who advised the Committee not to make of this question a Party cry. He thought it must be perfectly evident that it would not be either possible or expedient to make a Party cry of a matter upon which it was evident that the Party itself was divided. In this matter, for instance, he continued to differ from the opinions of many of those with whom he generally acted. As far as he knew, no hon. Members below the Gangway had ever imputed to the Government or their supporters any design or desire to raise the price of meat. He could not conceive the imputation of so much wickedness—for it would be nothing short of it—being made in that House. All that was said by the hon. Members to whom he referred—and they believed it—was that, in their opinion, a rise in the price of meat would be the result of this legislation, and particularly of the Bill as originally drawn. He had no intention to go into a lengthy discussion of the principles of Free Trade; and he was perfectly willing to accept the analogy set up by the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) between restrictions against disease and quarantine. In quarantine regulations, the presumption was always in favour of the healthy subject, and not, as in this case, against it. The hon. Baronet the Member for Scarborough referred to a case in which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford prevented the landing on our shores of a crew among whom Asiatic cholera had broken out; but the right hon. Gentleman did not, from a fear of Asiatic cholera, decree that no one from any country should come to this country, unless he could prove himself absolutely free from disease. Yet that was the presumption in this Bill. The arguments which had been used appeared to him to be inconclusive, or to go very far beyond the conclusions; because it was said that the fact of cattle plague and other diseases having been imported in spite of the present restrictions, justified the particular distinction now proposed to be made. But let them take some recent cases of the outbreak of cattle plague. The change of presumption, which would still leave a discretion to the Privy Council, would not prevent the possible importation of cattle plague from a country in which its existence was not at the moment known, either to the Government of that country or to the Home Government. It was intended by the Privy Council to make exceptions in favour of such countries as, say, Denmark; but could it be said with absolute certainty at any moment that there was no case of pleuro-pneumonia in Denmark? And it must be remembered that a single case of disease existing there might be imported into this country, even when the presumption was against Denmark and other countries, as proposed by the Bill. If it was wished to preclude the possibility of this, they must go very far beyond, and do very much more than, what was now proposed. They must go back to the original principle of the Bill, and prohibit the entrance of any live stock inland. That was consistent and logical; but it was not done, because the supporters of the Bill could not persuade themselves or the country that any regulations of the kind could be imposed without raising the price of meat. When the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) argued that a dead meat trade would take the place of a live meat trade, the only thing to be said in reference to such an opinion was that it ran entirely counter to all the evidence given before the Committee. He should be glad to believe, with his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford, that the point at issue between them was only a small one. The hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) held the same opinion, and urged those who thought with him (Mr. Chamberlain) to accept a compromise by making a concession. He, on the other hand, could not help thinking that the earnestness with which hon. Members opposite clung to this small point was due to an impression on their part that it might become a very important distinction, and it was perfectly evident that its importance depended upon the way in which it was interpreted by the present and future Privy Councils. If they were to be beaten, they would at least have called attention to the nature of the difference between them. The operation of the Act would be carefully watched, especially with regard to this important point of presumption; and they would have on record speeches to show that, at all events, when the Act passed, it was not intended that the presumption should operate against healthy cattle coming from healthy countries.

Mr. BELL said, he should be one of the last men to impugn the motives of those hon. Members who opposed the Bill, or of the Government and those who supported them. Certainly, he should not think for a moment of impugning the motives of his hon. Friend the Member for Scarborough (Sir Harcourt Johnstone). The hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood) spoke of the Bill as an experiment. All legislation of this kind must necessarily have something of a more or less experimental character; because it was almost impossible to predict, with any degree of certainty, what the effect of such legislation might be on the trade of the country. He would, therefore, ask whether the present time was a very appropriate one in which to commence a course of experimental research into a question of this kind? In his opinion, the country was never less fitted than now for the making experiments of such a nature. Owing to the high price of food in this country, the workpeople were very ill able to purchase a sufficiency of it to enable them to discharge efficiently their labours. He agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), that compulsory slaughter at the ports of debarkation must increase the price of meat; but this was not the limit of the evil. If the importation of meat to this country was restricted in any way, to that extent a bar was put upon the exportation from those countries which supplied us. If there was one thing more conspicuous than another, it was, that as the prices of animal food and the other necessaries of life in foreign countries were low, wages were low also; and at the other end of the scale the two facts, relatively, were observable. When in Belgium butcher-meat could be obtained at half its present price, the value of labour corresponded with that factor. In the year 1825, the entire earnings of a miner in France were only £15 a-year, and he was within the mark in saying that at that time the price of meat was not more than one-third of its present price. Now, however, that the price of food had risen to double its value at the time of which he was speaking, they found miners in the same district where they once earned £15 a-year, now earning as much as £45. The effect, therefore, of preventing a free export of cattle from foreign countries upon the wages paid in those countries would be to depreciate them, and so to have a tremendous effect upon our power to compete with those countries in the markets of the world.

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT pointed out that Parliament was about to make a fundamental change with regard to the law of trade in cattle, and yet nobody was to be a gainer by it. The presumption of law was that cattle were to be excluded; but the discretion vested in the Privy Council was to remain as before. With a hungry people—and they were very likely, from time to time, to have a very hungry people in this country—the Privy Council would be obliged to use its discretion wisely, and to admit from foreign countries cattle that were free from disease. Therefore, as there would practically be no change in the policy of the Privy Council, he saw no reason for making this change in the law. He could not agree with the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood) in thinking that the hon. Members for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) and Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) had not made out a case in support of their views. He, on the other hand, thought they had made out a very strong case; and he thought, further, that the time at which the Government had imposed tremendous responsibilities upon the country was not the one at which anything should be done to shake, in the slightest degree, the great fabric of Free Trade.

Mr. D. DAVIES said, it seemed to be assumed that, if this Bill passed, the quantity of cattle bred and fattened at home would increase. That might be true; but it was also true that they had already at home a larger number of both population and cattle than the natural products of the country could support. The farmers had, in order to fatten their stock, to buy large quantities of oil-cake, Indian corn, and other materials from abroad, notwithstanding the high prices paid for beef. There were, as a general rule, losses by the transaction. It must also be borne in mind that if Parliament passed an Act which would have the effect of injuring the trade of the country generally, the masses of the people would have no money, or very little, to spend in the purchase of beef, no matter how much of it was produced at home. He remembered very well the time when the Welsh mutton could be bought at 2½*d.* per lb. As for the dead meat trade, he could not approve it; and he did not believe that the people generally would approve it. Dead meat, imported from abroad, generally meant bad meat; and he felt sure that the majority of those who ate it once would be careful not to eat it a second time. The Government had already made several large concessions, and he hoped they would not refuse this last small one which was asked.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought the question had been thoroughly thrashed out; and, therefore, he should say nothing in reply. At the same time, he wished to say that the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood) seemed to be labouring under a misconception in regard to his course concerning the Bill.

Mr. NORWOOD said, he could not have made himself clear when speaking a short time back. What he meant then to say was that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford said he should not oppose his proposal, if he found the Committee in its favour. When it was found that some Members of the Committee were dead against it, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford became a perfectly free agent, and had since acted in perfect consistency with his position.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 191; Noes 111: Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 242.)

Mr. RITCHIE said, he did not propose to move the Amendment on the clause which stood upon the Paper in his name.

Clause *agreed to.*

*Expenses of Local Authorities.*

Clause A (Expenses out of local rate) *agreed to.*

Clause B (Relief of boroughs from contribution to county expenses).

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not know whether the hon. Baronet who had charge of the Bill had considered the point raised by the Amendment he was now about to propose to the clause. It was as follows:—In new Clause B, to follow Clause 43, page 21, line 16, after "(2)" to insert the following words:—

> "The local authority of the Metropolis shall be exempt from contributing towards the expenses under this Act of the local authorities of the counties within which the Metropolis is situated," &c.

His impression was that some such Amendment was necessary, the words of his Amendment being exactly those which it had been found necessary to insert in the Highways Bill, in order to exempt the local authority of the Metropolis from contributing towards the expenses of that Bill.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he thought that the hon. Baronet would see that the Amendment he proposed was unnecessary. The Amendment, of which the hon. Baronet had given Notice, would treat the Metropolis as though it were a borough within a county; whereas the Metropolis had never been treated on that footing. The Metropolis was a distinct and separate local authority, and no county rate had ever been levied within it; and, therefore, it occupied a very different position from a borough within a county. He was informed by the best authority that the Amendment of the hon. Baronet was quite unnecessary; and, therefore, he could not give his assent to its being introduced into the Bill.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that of course he was not qualified to give an opinion adverse to that of lawyers; but the Committee would recollect that an Amendment precisely similar to his own had been introduced into the Highways Bill for the purpose of exempting the Metropolis from being compelled to contribute to the expenses to be incurred under the provisions of that Bill. The fact was that the Metropolis did contribute to the county rate. Although there was a distinct clause in the Highways Bill providing that it should not apply to the Metropolis, it was nevertheless found necessary to insert words of this character, in order to exempt the Metropolis from the operation of the provisions of the Bill, as far as taxation was concerned.

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG said, that, in his opinion, the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was really required in order to exempt the Metropolis from the operation of this clause; and, therefore, he hoped that the hon. Baronet who had charge of the measure would not object to adopt it. In any case, the insertion of the Amendment could do no harm; and it, therefore, would be wise to accept it, in order to remove any doubt on the subject.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that he could not allow surplusage words to be inserted unnecessarily into the Bill, because they might lead to many misconceptions and difficulties. He had been informed by the best authority that there would be no liability on the part of the Metropolis to contribute to the rates to be levied under this measure. The Metropolis occupied the position of being a separate and distinct authority, and all rates levied within it were applicable solely to its own purposes. He must, therefore, ask the Committee to decline to insert in the Bill an Amendment which had been brought forward not in pursuance of a legal opinion, but merely to gratify an idea.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the Committee were left in a very unhappy position with regard to this Amendment. They ought to have had either the opinion of the President of the Local Government Board himself, or of the Law Officers of the Crown, whose duty it was to assist them in questions of legal difficulty with regard to the necessity for this Amendment. Here, unfortunately, was the fact that the hon. Baronet who had charge of the Bill had stated, upon the strength of the information that he had received, that the Metropolis was not liable, in any case, to contribute towards the county rates; whereas he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) knew that such was not the case. The hon. and gallant Baronet the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg), had asserted that the Amendment was absolutely necessary to prevent the Metropolis being compelled to contribute to the rates to be levied under the Bill; and, in these circumstances, the Committee were entitled to have some more reliable legal opinion upon the effect of the measure than they had yet had. He wished to impress upon the Committee the fact that, although a clause in the Highways Bill expressly declared that the provisions of the measure should not apply to the Metropolis, yet it had been found necessary to insert a clause expressly exempting the Metropolis from contributing to the rates to be levied under it. That clause had not been inserted in the Bill as mere surplusage, but as a matter of necessity; and, therefore, he asked the Committee to support him in pressing his Amendment.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that he rose in order to save time, which was being wasted in what appeared to be a useless discussion. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) evidently believed that he was doing right in pressing his Amendment, and the hon. Baronet who had charge of the Bill clearly was of a different opinion. He did not think that the objection of the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury to the Amendment was satisfactory, and as he appeared to think that the Amendment, if introduced into the Bill, would be mere surplusage, it could do no harm to insert them for the present; and if, after due consideration, it was found to be unnecessary, it could be struck out upon the Report.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, it appeared to him, on the contrary, that the best plan would be to bring up the Amendment again upon the Report, if it was found to be necessary. He had been informed most distinctly by a high authority that the Amendment was unnecessary. In those circumstances, he must oppose the Amendment, leaving it to the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to bring it up upon the Report, if he should still be of opinion that it was desirable to insert it. In the meantime, however, he would take the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown upon the subject.

MR. GORST said, that he did not think that the Committee ought to be asked to decide this question upon a mere suggestion from a particular Government Department. They ought to have had the legal opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown before they were required to give a decision upon the point. It appeared to him that the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was perfectly right in insisting upon his Amendment; because, unless some words of this kind were inserted in the clause, the Metropolis might be liable to contribute to the rates to be levied under the provisions of the Bill. He based his opinion upon the necessity there appeared to him to exist for inserting some special words, which would exempt the Metropolis from being rated under this measure. He should, therefore, support the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, that the City of London was a county within itself, but that was not the case of the Metropolis; and he was afraid that if this Amendment were not agreed to, those parts of the Metropolis which were within counties would be liable to the county rate, to be levied under the provisions of the Bill. If the hon. Baronet who had charge of the measure were to agree to insert the Amendment for the time being, he might consult the Law Officers of the Crown on the subject, and, if necessary, move to strike the words out on the Report.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that naturally he had no wish in the least to do anything but what was right by the Bill, and that he was perfectly willing to consult the Law Officers of the Crown upon the point if necessary, and to bring up the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) upon the Report, if, in their opinion, it was necessary for the protection of the Metropolis that the words should be inserted in the clause.

He could assure the hon. Baronet that he was only guided in the matter by the information—the very positive and distinct information—that he had received from the draftsman of the Bill, that the Amendment was not necessary, and that it would be mere surplusage if inserted in the clause. He must, therefore, repeat that he should be most happy to consult the Law Officers of the Crown on the subject, and to leave the matter as it stood until the Report.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that he had just sent down for the Highways Bill, and on looking into it, it appeared to him to be a precisely similar case to the present. The clause in that Bill stated most distinctly that no part of the measure was to apply to the Metropolis—and it must be remembered that the Bill under discussion contained no such provision—and yet, in the face of that clause, it had been found necessary to insert words identical with his Amendment, in order to exempt the Metropolis from contributing to the county rates levied under it. When application was made to the Local Government Board on the point, it was said they knew that the Metropolis would be liable to be charged under the Highways Bill, and they intended that it should be; and it was only after considerable pressure was brought to bear on them that they consented that the Metropolis should be exempted from the operation of the Bill, and that the words of his Amendment should be introduced into the Bill. And yet the hon. Baronet in charge of the present Bill had told the Committee that no county rate could be levied on the Metropolis. He maintained that the hon. Baronet was mistaken in his view of the matter, and his opinion was supported by that of the hon. and gallant Baronet the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works. In these circumstances, he felt bound to take the opinion of the Committee upon the matter, and must press his Amendment to a division.

Mr. A. GATHORNE-HARDY said, he must ask the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to be a little careful on this point; because his Amendment, if adopted, might have an effect which he did not contemplate. If words of exemption were inserted in the Bill, it might hereafter be held that Statutes in which they were not found applied to the Metropolis, and that it was, therefore, liable to contribute to rates not now levied within its area.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the difficulty to which the hon. Member for Canterbury referred had already arisen; because, as he had over and over again pointed out, the words of his Amendment had already been inserted in the Highways Bill; and if they were not introduced into the present measure, that fact might be used as an argument to show that the Legislature intended that the Metropolis should be liable to be charged under the Bill.

Mr. GREGORY said, that on referring to the 2nd Schedule of the Bill, he found that there the Metropolis was specially exempted from the operation of the Bill; and, therefore, the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea was unnecessary.

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH said, that the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill appeared to think that the Metropolis was a county in itself, just as the City of London was. Having himself helped the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) to bring in a Bill to make the Metropolis a county, he could assure the hon. Baronet that it was not a county at present. Seeing that whoever had informed the Secretary to the Treasury was entirely wrong upon the point, he did not think that the Committee would be much inclined to place reliance upon the information which he had received from the same quarter upon other matters connected with the subject.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that he would not give the Committee the trouble of dividing upon the Amendment; because, he should be very sorry if, after having done so, it should subsequently turn out that the Amendment was necessary, and that he had been misinformed on the point. He must, however, state distinctly that if, on consulting the Law Officers of the Crown on the subject, he was advised that the words proposed to be inserted were unnecessary, he would move their rejection on the Report. In answer to what had just fallen from the hon. Baronet the Member for Hastings (Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth), he wished to say that he was solely responsible for the assertion that the Metropolis was a county in itself, and that he had not been informed that such was the case by the draftsmen of the Bill. What he had been informed was, that this Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea treated the Metropolis as though it were a borough within a county, which it certainly was not.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he hoped that the hon. Baronet would not be satisfied, if he were told that the Schedule made the matter sufficiently clear; because the Committee should be very suspicious of legislating by Schedules, instead of placing the matter beyond all doubt by a distinct provision in the enacting part of the Bill.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved, as an Amendment, in new Clause B, to follow Clause 43, page 21, line 19, after "shall," to insert "in such case."

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he must ask the hon. Baronet whether the Amendment was really necessary?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not wish to press the Amendment if the hon. Baronet thought it was unnecessary; and, therefore, he should ask for leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

Clause C (Outstanding rates) *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

*Borrowing by Local Authorities.*

Clause D (Power for local authority to borrow).

MR. GREGORY said, that he had the following Amendment to move in the clause:—In page 21, line 40, after the word "to," to insert the words "any period not exceeding." He begged to move the Amendment.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he had no objection to the insertion of the words.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. GREGORY said, he had a further Amendment to propose in the same clause which was in the same line, to leave out the words "or less."

Amendment *agreed to;* words *struck out* accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

MR. STAFFORD HOWARD moved to insert a new clause after Clause 9, as follows:—

(Notice to be given of disease.)

"Upon any animal becoming affected with disease, the owner or the person in charge shall immediately report the fact to the local Inspector, or such other person as the Privy Council may by General Order direct.

"If the owner or person in charge of an animal so affected fails to give such notice within reasonable time after the outbreak of the disease, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Act, unless he shows to the satisfaction of the Justices before whom he is charged that he did not know of the same being so affected, and that he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained such knowledge."

The object of the Clause was to impose a penalty on persons who might wilfully conceal or omit to give notice of an outbreak of disease. In Clause 30, Sub-section i., the Privy Council might, from time to time, make Orders for prescribing for and regulating the notice of disease. Parliament aimed at stamping out disease, and it seemed to him the most important step in the process was to discover disease as soon as it broke out. In this view, the insertion of some such clause as he proposed was most necessary. He did not at all wish to interfere with the discretion of the Privy Council, as the hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) seemed to think, when he (Mr. Stafford Howard) raised the question on Clause 30; but he thought it most important that every man who had cattle, or who was in charge of cattle, should know that he was bound by law and not merely by the Order of the Privy Council, to give notice of disease the moment it broke out.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON asked the Committee not to accept the clause. It raised a question which had always been left to be dealt with by Orders under Act of Parliament, instead of by the Act itself. There was an advantage in leaving these Orders to the discretion of the Privy Council, because they could vary their Orders according to the necessities of a particular case. In the event of an outbreak of cattle plague, the ordinary notice would not suffice. The provisions of Clause 30 were ample to meet the necessities of the case. The clause proposed by the hon. Member would probably be evaded in this way. An owner would say—"I am not convinced that the animal is sick," or, "it is not to my mind diseased;" and thus time would be lost, whereas Clause 30 required that notice of any illness should be given to the Privy Council. The Privy Council Orders were enforced by the 54th clause, which made it an offence against the Act to violate them; so that, with the 30th and 54th clauses, there was absolute certainty that the required notice not only of disease, but of illness would be obtained.

Mr. CHAPLIN hoped the clause would be withdrawn, in favour of one to be proposed by the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), which he thought would meet the views of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Stafford Howard).

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he had been certainly inclined to support the hon. Member in this clause; but the answer given by the Secretary to the Treasury tended to show that Clause 30 gave all necessary powers. He, therefore, advised the hon. Member to withdraw the clause for the present, and to bring it forward again on Report, if, upon consideration, he found that his views were not sufficiently met by Clause 30. He believed there was a unanimous feeling on both sides of the House that there should be a clause requiring notice of disease.

Mr. CLARE READ agreed that it was necessary to have a clause of some kind providing for notice, and that there should be a statutable penalty for omitting to give notice of disease. The argument of the Secretary to the Treasury appeared to him to be an argument against any clause appearing in the Bill. He (Mr. Clare Read) did not wish to construct a form of notice; but he contended that the Bill ought to provide for notice being given to the Inspector or police constable in the neighbourhood. If the Act of Parliament said that notice must be given, there would be no possibility of people excusing themselves by saying they had not read the Orders in Council.

*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*

The O'CONOR DON did not know if it were right to discuss at that moment the Amendment given Notice of by the hon. Member who had just spoken; but if it were, he would say that it seemed to him not advisable to put such a clause in the Statute. A man might have cattle infected, and unless he were skilled, be perfectly innocent of the fact; and yet he would, under this clause, be liable to a penalty. He preferred the Bill as it stood. He denied that an Act of Parliament was more likely to be known by every individual farmer than an Order of the Privy Council.

Mr. GREGORY said, it appeared to him that a provision in an Act of Parliament would have greater publicity and produce more effect upon the public mind than an Order in Council. He would, therefore, prefer to see a provision as to notice incorporated in the Act; but he thought the proposed clause defective in two respects. First, it required that notice should be given to the Inspector, who might live at a considerable distance from the premises on which the disease broke out. It would be better to provide that notice should be given to the constable who was generally accessible. Secondly, it was doubtful whether the clause would, as it stood, include horses in its operation. It would be well to withdraw the clause, and take the discussion on the one to be subsequently proposed.

Mr. STAFFORD HOWARD said, he only wished to see it laid down by the Act that every owner should be bound to give notice of disease. He would gladly withdraw his clause in favour of that of the hon. Member for South Norfolk.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. STAFFORD HOWARD moved to insert the following clause:—

"If any person exposes in a market or fair, or other public place, where horses or animals are commonly exposed for sale, or exposes for sale in any sale yard, whether public or private, or places in a lair or other place adjacent to or connected with a market or fair, or where horses or animals are commonly placed before exposure for sale, or sends or causes to be carried on a railway, or on a canal, river, or other inland navigation, or on a coasting vessel, or carries, leads, drives, or causes to be carried, led, or driven on a highway or thoroughfare any horse or animal affected with a contagious or infectious disease, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence against this Act, unless he shows to the satisfaction of the justices before whom he is charged that he did not know of the same being so affected, and that he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained such knowledge."

The object of the clause was to impose a penalty on persons wilfully exposing diseased animals in public places. It could not be objected to the clause that it did not form part of the Act of 1869, for he had copied it from that Act. It seemed to him that the best mode of preventing the outbreak of disease in markets was to impose a severe penalty on the persons who wilfully and knowingly drove diseased animals about, and to and from public places. As the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury had laid great stress on the fact that the Bill was, to a great extent, a re-enacting measure, he hoped the clause would be accepted.

Clause (Horse or animal affected with a contagious disease exposed for sale,)—(*Mr. Stafford Howard,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was sorry to disappoint the hon. Member by asking the Committee not to agree to the clause. His objection was that it was now proposed to deal by Statute with parts of a subject that had been dealt with under the old Act by Order. The hon. Member, in proposing to enact a portion of the Order framed under the Act of 1869, left out other important portions of the clause in that Act dealing with the subject. In Sub-sections ix., x., xi., of Clause 30, there were ample instructions as to the Orders which were to issue. Seeing that the Privy Council had ample power to issue Orders to the effect of the proposed clause, and would undoubtly issue such Orders; and seeing that Clause 54 provided penalties for the infringement of the Privy Council Orders, there could be no want of security for the carrying out of the hon. Member's object. The Privy Council would have the power of enlarging the scope of their Orders to suit cases that arose if the Bill were left in its present shape; and he, therefore, hoped the clause would not be accepted.

MR. W. E. FORSTER thought the insertion of the clause would make the general public aware of the law, and would, at any rate, insure some minimum regulation. The Secretary to the Treasury said that the Privy Council would undoubtedly issue Orders; but, though it was expected that they would, it was not so absolutely certain that the desired provision would be made, as it would be if it was actually inserted in the Act. There was nothing in the proposal to insert this clause inconsistent with the principle of the Bill, and it would be a mistake to allow people who read the Act to see that it was without an important provision that appeared in the previous Acts.

MR. SYNAN thought the clause would provide for cases in respect to which no Order was issued by the Privy Council. He saw no objection to the clause, provided it were amended by the insertion of the words "wilfully and knowingly;" because he apprehended that a man might expose an animal in a fair, and not know that it was infected. This clause would actually subject a man to punishment, unless he showed to the satisfaction of the justices that he was innocent. Now, a man was not bound to prove his process. His guilt ought to be proved; and he never knew of a clause creating an offence that did not also state that the offence should be wilfully and knowingly committed.

MR. M'LAGAN preferred the clause as it stood. It was said that the prosecution should make out a man's guilt. But the possession of the diseased animal would prove him guilty, unless he proved that he did not know it was diseased.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON referred the Committee to Clause 26, already passed, and warned the Committee that if they adopted this clause, the whole framework of the Bill would be altered.

MR. ANDERSON maintained that the whole principle of the Bill was to leave the presumption against the cattle in the first place, and against the owner in the second. Unless that were otherwise altered, he thought the Amendment quite consistent with the Bill, and he would support the hon. Member (Mr. Stafford Howard) if he went to a division.

THE O'CONOR DON could not understand how hon. Members could hold that the provisions of a Statute would be better known than Orders in Council which would be published in the local newspapers. He hoped the Government would not accept the clause.

Mr. PELL, while appreciating the excellent motive of the proposer of the clause, deemed it exceedingly imperfect, and thought it would tend to mislead people as to the extent of the law.

Sir HARCOURT JOHNSTONE thought that a clause in an Act of Parliament would be held in greater reverence than any Departmental Order; and a clause of this nature, which existed in the Act of 1869, could not do harm, but would strengthen the Act.

Mr. GORST thought the clause inconsistent with the principle of the Bill, which was to give powers to the Privy Council, and to trust to that body to make regulations. The Committee must either pass a Bill in which the whole of the intended regulations should be expressed, or leave it to the Privy Council to exercise the powers intrusted to them of making regulations and carrying them into effect. The insertion of this clause would tend to make the Bill a measure of patchwork.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the circumstances contemplated by the clause proposed to be introduced into the Bill, were provided for by the wording of the 54th clause already decided upon. The making of regulations of this kind came within the powers conferred by the Bill upon the Privy Council, with whom the matter should be allowed to rest. He pointed out, besides, that the clause proposed by the hon. Member (Mr. Stafford Howard) rather unfairly upset the whole drafting of the 54th clause, which, if the alteration were made, would have to be re-submitted.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN considered the reply of the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury, to the effect that the Privy Council should be trusted to do all that was necessary for the suppression of disease, somewhat inconsistent with the observations he had made a few minutes previously with reference to the clause, when he spoke of *laches* on the part of the Privy Council. He (Mr. Chamberlain) thought that if that body were to be trusted at all, it should be as little as possible. In his opinion, it was certainly desirable, whenever it became proper to define an offence which might be committed against an Act of Parliament, that the subject should not be left to be decided by Orders in Council which might be already a great deal too numerous. He reminded the Committee that in past years the conduct of the Privy Council in this respect had not been altogether satisfactory. Again and again had disease been spread throughout the country in consequence of the exposure of infected cattle at fairs and other places. He had been informed of the case of a dealer who, failing to get rid of a number of infected animals at one place, had actually taken them, with all their contaminating influences, to no less than three fairs in Ireland. The offence, one of the most serious that could be committed, was perfectly easy of definition, and should form part of their statutory enactment. He hoped the hon. Member (Mr. Stafford Howard) would press his clause, and, if necessary, divide the Committee upon the question.

Mr. ANDERSON remarked, in reply to the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), to the effect that the clause was inconsistent with the principle of the Bill, that they had been told at the beginning of the debate, that as the Privy Council had not done and could not do their duty with respect to cattle diseases, a new Bill was required to enable them to do it. Hon. Members on his side of the House had endeavoured to make the Bill more effective in that direction than it was in its original form, but were now told that they would not be allowed to do so. The clause proposed by the hon. Member (Mr. Stafford Howard) was to be regarded as an instruction and guide to the Privy Council, in the very matter in which it was alleged they had not done their duty, and he, therefore, hoped it would be pressed.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 71; Noes 187: Majority 116.—(Div. List, No. 243.)

Mr. CLARE READ, in moving to insert, after Clause 29, in page 12, the following new Clause:—

"Every person having in his possession or under his charge an animal (including a horse) affected with a contagious or infectious disease shall, as far as practicable, keep that animal separate from animals not so affected, and shall, with all practicable speed, give notice of the animal being so affected to the Inspector or to the police constable of the district where the animal is.

"The constable shall forthwith give notice thereof to the Inspector of the local authority, and the Inspector shall forthwith report the same to the local authority and to the Privy Council,"

said, that although he was not at all wedded to the words of the Amendment, which were taken from an Order in Council that had existed in very much the same form for the last 12 years, he trusted the proposed clause would meet with the sanction of the Committee; and if the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury would say that he would, on the Report, introduce words embodying the principle that there should be a statutory obligation on the part of the owner of a diseased animal to give notice of the fact, he should be very well content.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the same objection applied to this clause as to the previous clause just decided against—namely, that it was at variance with the scheme of the Bill, which was that the Privy Council should possess the power of making as many Orders in Council, beyond those specified by the Act, as might appear necessary for dealing with cases of the kind indicated by the Amendment. Every publicity with regard to disease was insured by the powers given to the Privy Council in the 30th clause—

"for prescribing and regulating the notice of disease, or of the illness of an animal, to be given to or by any person or authority;"

and he ventured to think that, although by adopting the Amendment then before the Committee, the giving of such notice would be made a statutory obligation, its effect might be found to be in direct opposition to the very principle sought to be enacted. Beyond that, if the Amendment were agreed to, its application must necessarily be restricted by the actual wording of the Act; while if the subject were left to be dealt with by an Order in Council, the words of such Order could, when necessary, be varied and made more explicit. The Committee would see that by this means far more real restriction would be placed on diseased cattle than by the new clause, as suggested by his hon. Friend. Again, a man who was not quite certain that his animal was diseased, would probably keep it for some time to make sure, before giving notice; but, under an Order in Council, he would be obliged to give notice at once, and was subject to a penalty for not doing so. It was clear, therefore, that if the Orders in Council were made as public in the district in which they were to be enforced as the Bill required, the Committee had a security for notice being given, and attention being called to the existence and outbreak of disease, which went far beyond the fixed words that would be put in the Statute if the Amendment were accepted. He hoped his hon. Friend would see that an attempt had been made to meet the cases at which he and the Committee were aiming, in a way that he ventured to consider preferable to the insertion of the proposed clause. He hoped the Committee would adhere to the form in which the Bill was drawn.

MR. ANDERSON was sorry that the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury had not accepted the clause; because he understood that the hon. Member for East Cumberland (Mr. S. Howard) had withdrawn his Amendment, which was of a similar character, in favour of that of the hon. Member for South Norfolk.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON reminded the Committee that he had said he should resist the present clause on the part of the Government.

MR. ANDERSON would be justified in saying there was a general consensus of opinion in favour of the clause of the hon. Member for East Cumberland, who had withdrawn his clause to make way for that under discussion.

MR. CHAPLIN regretted that the Amendment, to which he thought great importance attached, would not be accepted. He could not follow his hon. Friend (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) on to his ground of objection that the clause interfered with the general scheme of the Bill. So far from that being the case, it would, in his opinion, work with the Bill, by providing security against the outbreak and spread of disease, in addition to the other restrictions contained in the measure and the Orders which might be issued by the Privy Council. [Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: The Privy Council might vary their

Orders.] That was precisely one of those things which it was not desirable to vary. They wanted to impose on people who had reason to suppose that an outbreak of disease had occurred among animals in their possession, the necessity of telling the nearest constable that such was the case. There was another point to which he would for a moment call the attention of the Committee. There were certain outbreaks which would not always come under the notice of the Privy Council. During the last few months a very serious disease had prevailed among horses belonging to the large breeding studs in the neighbourhood of London, and a frightful epidemic, which he believed to be pleuro-pneumonia, and contagious, had existed in the breeding establishments at the Royal Park, Middle Park, and at Hampton Court. The losses incurred had been very heavy, and amounted, in one case, to 40 foals out of a stud of 70. There was nothing to impose on these establishments, in which there were horses of very great value, the necessity of giving information. The consequence had been that the mares had spread the disease all over the country on their return home. He could speak from his own knowledge that people in Yorkshire had lost many thousands of pounds, which would have been saved if the owners had been under the obligation of declaring the outbreak of disease at the time it was first discovered. He hoped the Amendment of his hon. Friend would be accepted by the Government; if not, he was prepared to vote for it on division.

Mr. SYNAN agreed with the opinion that the clause was in no way inconsistent with the scheme of the Bill. He could not, however, vote for the clause, unless the word "knowingly" were inserted in it, because a man might have in his possession a diseased animal without knowing it; and because, if the word were not inserted then, in the case of his afterwards moving its introduction, he might not succeed with his Amendment.

Mr. PELL saw some objection to the Amendment, on the ground that it destroyed the completeness of the Bill; but the clause was a very important one, and he suggested that it should be added at the end of Clause 54, where it could not interfere with the drafting, so as to provide that every person having in his possession, and under his charge, animals infected with disease, should be bound, under the Act, to give notice thereof.

Mr. M'LAGAN pointed out that it was absolutely necessary to insert the word "knowingly" in the clause. In the case of the disease called glanders, for example, there were many persons who did not know what it was. Within his own knowledge, a glandered horse had been treated during six months for influenza; and, in another case, a veterinary surgeon decided that a horse was not glandered, when the animal was actually suffering from that disease.

Mr. CLARE READ said, it was very necessary to insert the clause he proposed in the Bill. At present, the Privy Council could issue Orders to the same effect, and anyone disobeying those Orders was really disobeying the law. Therefore, those who opposed his Motion ought to have known that hitherto the principle of it, in an Order of the Privy Council, was law, and if they objected to it, they ought to have raised the question before. He would accept the word "knowingly," which it had been suggested he should add to his clause, and he would willingly bring the matter up on Report; but, at the same time, he wished to have an intimation from his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury, as to whether he would allow the principle of his clause to be embodied in the Bill.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he must impress upon the Committee the fact that Orders of the Privy Council formed part of the measure, and, therefore, they were the law. It was because he wished to meet cases mentioned in the clause of the hon. Member (Mr. Clare Read) by an Order of the Privy Council, and not by any part of the Statute, that he asked the Committee not to accept the Amendment of his hon. Friend. What had been done in the past by the Privy Council they might guarantee would be done in the future. They had been trusted in the past, and had, as his hon. Friend admitted, made Orders which had the effect of law. Yet now, his hon. Friend asked them to destroy the whole framework of the Bill, by inserting a clause to provide for a thing which the Privy Council might accomplish by an Order, SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, the reason his hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) brought forward the clause was, because it was very well known that in many cases people, who well knew what they were about, had evaded the Order, and failed to give notice of disease. It was that each individual might be warned that he had to give notice as soon as possible of the existence of disease, that the clause had been proposed. He asked the Secretary to the Treasury to consider carefully the statements which had been made to the Committee, for he believed the object that the hon. Member for South Norfolk had in view could be inserted in the Bill without affecting any of its other provisions. He believed that no Order of the Privy Council would have that effect, and that the only way to meet the case was to have a clause in the Bill by which it could be publicly known that a heavy penalty would be inflicted on persons who failed to give notice of disease.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, there was that power in the Bill as it stood. Under the 54th section, it was an offence to evade any Order of the Privy Council. Power was taken in the Bill to make public, through the local newspapers, every Order in Council which was issued; and, therefore, there would be that publicity in every locality, the want of which was now complained of. Under those circumstances, he believed the Bill effected all that his hon. and gallant Friend wished.

MR. W E. FORSTER said, he was compelled to ask a question before the division, which was probable, was taken. He did not wish to move to report Progress, although if he had to do so he would. He wanted to know when the Bill would be taken again?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the Government proposed to take it at the Evening Sitting, in order to avoid the necessity of a Morning Sitting on Saturday.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, in that case, he must propose his Motion to report Progress. At the beginning of that Sitting the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Leader of the House, most distinctly stated that if the Bill was not carried at that Sitting there would be a Morning Sitting on Saturday. At the Evening Sitting that night there would very likely be a long debate on the affairs of South Africa. Considering the importance of the Cattle Bill, he did not think it was at all fair to ask the House to go on considering it at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, and he did not think the promoters of the Bill would gain anything by the attempt. He reminded the Committee that if it was distinctly stated that a Bill, if not carried at one Sitting, should be taken the next day, it was contrary to all precedent to depart from such an engagement.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. W. E. Forster.*)

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he must remind the Committee of what had been inferred by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford. It was, that he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) was acting apart from his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had done nothing of the sort. He had stated that the Bill would be taken again that evening, in consequence of a communication from his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He certainly should not have ventured to reverse the decision of the Leader of the House in a matter of so much importance.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he had not made any charge against the Secretary to the Treasury. All he had said was that it was contrary to precedent to do that which, at the beginning of the Sitting, the Leader of the House said should not be done.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON had not understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make any definite statement. He understood him to say he would defer his decision until the close of the Sitting.

MR. CHAPLIN said, there was a widespread impression that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did use the words to the effect that the Bill would be proceeded with on Saturday morning. Under those circumstances, he thought it might be well to report Progress, with leave to sit again.

MR. J. COWEN reminded the House that many hon. Members were engaged in it until between 3 and

4 o'clock that morning; and he thought it a most unreasonable thing to put an important Bill down for that evening, when it certainly could not be considered until after midnight. That being so, he hoped the Government would stand by the implied arrangement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. ANDERSON said, a most important part of the Cattle Bill remained to be discussed, and the Government actually proposed to take it at 3 or 4 in the morning. He pressed on the Chancellor of the Exchequer the fairness of abiding by what he said at the beginning of the Sitting.

The O'DONOGHUE denied that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made any definite statement, beyond saying that he should state what he intended doing before 7 o'clock.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he did not know the Question before the Committee.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he had moved to report Progress, in order to know when the Bill would be taken again, and, to his surprise, the Secretary to the Treasury had replied that night. He (Mr. Forster) had said he understood there would be important Business to be taken that night on the Motion for going into Committee of Supply, and that therefore the Cattle Bill could not come on before midnight, and he reminded the House that there was still very important matter to be considered in the Bill. He had also referred to the statements of his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, at the beginning of the Sitting, which certainly gave him and many other hon. Members the impression that if the Bill was not concluded that day it would be taken on Saturday.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, when he made that statement, he did not mean if the Bill was not finished at the Morning Sitting only, but at the two Sittings, as he thought it probable that it might come on in the evening. But he understood, from what he gathered in different parts of the Committee, that it would be very distasteful to have a Morning Sitting, and that they would rather go on that night. He had been told that they would be able to take the Bill that evening. Of course, when the House reached it that evening, they could decide whether they would go on; but at present he did not propose to fix a Morning Sitting for Saturday.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING said, the proposal for a Morning Sitting on Saturday was made with the view of promoting another Bill which was being forced on at the risk of losing a very important measure, in which all the people of Ireland were interested—the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill. In forcing on that other Bill—the Irish Sunday Closing Bill—in the place of this more important measure, hon. Members did a most dangerous thing, and they would bring upon themselves an inquiry, if not censure, from the people of Ireland.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would tell the Committee that he would not take the Cattle Bill that night, because it could not possibly be reached before 12.30. Not only were there Motions on going into Committee of Supply, but a large number of Bills were down for that night; and, therefore, the Government would really gain nothing by putting the Bill down. Although they might go through the clauses, they could not possibly take the Schedules, as there was a good deal of debatable matter in them. Then there was the question as to the form which the Government Amendments relating to the slaughter of foreign cattle would take; and although he hoped they would arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on those Amendments, and come to a compromise, still the agreement to such a compromise must be preceded by a considerable amount of discussion. It must be apparent to all that it would be impossible to take the discussion at 3 o'clock in the morning. He could assure the Irish Members in the House that in taking an active interest in that Bill he had no desire to obstruct either of the two Bills relating to Ireland, both of which had been alluded to. They had no idea of opposing the Irish Sunday Closing Bill, or the Intermediate Education Bill; and, as regarded the latter, he supported its policy, and would do nothing to prevent its passing.

Mr. SYNAN, as a honest supporter of the Cattle Bill from the beginning, felt it rather hard to be kept up until 3 or 4 o'clock discussing the clauses. He preferred very much continuing the discussion at a Morning Sitting on Saturday. He believed if there was a Morning Sitting on Saturday the Bill would be passed.

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, the difficulty could be got over if private Members who had Motions on the Paper would give way, and let Government take the Bill directly the Evening Sitting commenced. He was one who had a Motion down, but he would freely give way. Such a course would be much better than sitting on Saturday, when certain proceedings might be taken which would carry on the Sitting even on Sunday.

THE O'CONOR DON certainly understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say at the beginning of the afternoon that there would be a Morning Sitting on Saturday, irrespective of the Cattle Bill; and, in fact, the right hon. Gentleman mentioned other measures to be taken at the Sitting. Since then the right hon. Gentleman had been told that if there was such a Sitting, a Bill not at present before the House might come on; and, that being so, it was quite apparent why the proposal, which had been made quite irrespective of the Cattle Bill, had been abandoned. The real fact was that the right hon. Gentleman was afraid if there was a Morning Sitting, a Bill might come on, in which the majority of the House took a deep interest.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that what his hon. Friend (the O'Conor Don) had said was perfectly true. He had understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say there would be a Morning Sitting to take the Cattle Bill, if it was not finished, and also to take other Bills.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER admitted that at the beginning of the Sitting he contemplated a Sitting of the House on Saturday; but, at the same time, he said he must reserve any decision upon the matter. Since then, he had ascertained that it would, under all the circumstances, be inconvenient to a very large proportion of hon. Members to sit on Saturday; and, with reference to what the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) had said, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) would not flinch from what he had said. It was perfectly true that if there was a Morning Sitting on Saturday, other Business besides that appointed by the Government would probably be taken, and that had something to do with his not asking the House to meet. He did this, not out of any antagonism to the Bill which many were desirous to discuss—and he thought he had shown himself ready to help on the Bill—but because there was a difference between asking the House to meet on Saturday for the purpose of getting through Government Business, which might occupy two or three hours, and asking the House to meet for the purpose of taking Business which, as they knew very well, was likely to last for a great number of hours. He declined to fix a Saturday Sitting for the convenience of the House; and when he had to look at the convenience of the House, that certainly was an important consideration.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day.*

## ADMIRALTY AND WAR OFFICE (RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS) BILL.

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Secretary Colonel Stanley, Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

[BILL 169.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read, and *discharged.*

Bill *re-committed,* in respect of an Amendment to Clause 2; *considered* in Committee, and Amendment made.

Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. W. H. Smith.*)

MAJOR NOLAN asked the effect of the Amendment which had been moved by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty; was it to limit the retirements to the officers receiving £425 a-year, instead of £400 a-year?

MR. W. H. SMITH said, the effect of the Amendment was rather to make the scope of the Bill a little wider.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

## BISHOPRICS BILL.—[*Lords.*]—[BILL 197.]

(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE POSTPONED.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS fixed the Committee on the Bill for Monday next.

Mr. J. COWEN objected to the Bill being put down for Monday, when the right hon. Gentleman must know it could not be taken. It had already been put down on at least a dozen days when it could not be taken.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he knew very well the Bill could not be taken on Monday, and he only put it down as a matter of form.

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

The House suspended its Sitting at five minutes to Seven of the clock.

---

The House resumed its Sitting at Nine of the clock.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

## COLONY OF NATAL—ADMINISTRATION OF NATIVE AFFAIRS.

### RESOLUTION.

Mr. Alderman M'ARTHUR, in rising to call the attention of the House to the administration of Native affairs in the Colony of Natal; and to move—

> "That this House strongly condemns the policy of the Local Government of Natal in employing the machinery of British Courts in that Colony for the purpose of legalising polygamy and validating and enforcing native usages which recognise rights of property in women and children; and this House is of opinion that measures should at once be taken to promote the civilization of the native tribes, and to facilitate their withdrawal from the savage state, and recommends the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the subject,"

said, he would assume, as the basis of his argument, that the House, acting in accordance with its best traditions, was determined, not only to discourage, but to oppose slavery in all its forms; and that, whether Cyprus or Natal were in question, the British Parliament was resolved that the British flag should continue to be, as it had been for nearly half-a-century, the symbol of freedom to the slave and down-trodden races of the world. Wherever England had planted her Colonies, she had given them her institutions, throwing over the Native Tribes the shield of protection, and elevating them in the scale of humanity. Natal, however, although a British Colony, was an exception to the general rule. He did not ignore the difficulties which had to be encountered in that Colony, which swarmed with a semi-barbarous race. He did not ask the Government to engage in a Quixotic crusade against the Tribal system; for he believed that the best way to put an end to existing evils, arising from that system, was to educate and civilize the Native Tribes, giving their barbarous customs no countenance under English law. In the Colony there was a population of 350,000 or 400,000 souls, while the European settlers numbered considerably less than 20,000. The disproportion would at once strike hon. Members as being so great that it could hardly fail to prevent Natal, which occupied an area not larger than Wales, from ever becoming a White man's Colony. The Natives would always enjoy a large numerical preponderance, and it depended upon us whether that preponderance became an element of safety and progress in South Africa, or whether it involved us in danger and discredit. For 30 years Native policy in Natal had been determined and controlled by the will of one man. He would be sorry to ignore the fact that Sir Theophilus Shepstone had acquired enormous influence over the Natives, and had generally managed to preserve the peace of the Colony. It was to the credit of Sir Theophilus Shepstone that he had commanded the respect of the Natives for his authority; but still it could not be said that merely personal influence of this kind would insure security for the future. The loyalty of the Kaffir would be little worth to this country, unless it was attached by ties far stronger than the simple prestige of an individual officer of the Crown. The complaint he wished to make against Native policy in Natal was that, with the exception of those Natives who had come under missionary influence, the Kaffir locations were now very much what they had been 30 years ago. There were districts in which barbarism was segregrated, and where civilization, except by the punishment of offences against Native law, was not allowed to enter. The Natal Government evidently thought that if it could secure the peace of the country, suppressing or punishing cattle-stealing and like offences, it had discharged the obligations of a good and orderly government as far as the Natives were concerned. To that policy he (Mr. Alderman M'Arthur) entirely demurred. The Natives still lived, as they did in 1848, in clans; their Chiefs in grass huts; uneducated, and unable to communicate with the superior Chief except by verbal messages, they constituted more a heathen than a Christian Colony. What were the causes which had operated to perpetuate that unhappy state of things? The first was the continuance of the Native law, which was, for the most part, oral. There was no written code to which a magistrate could refer. Lord Carnarvon had established, more than two years ago, a Native High Court, presided over by English Judges, which, by reviewing the decisions of the magistrates, had acted as a check upon the local Courts; but an alteration of mere procedure did not necessarily improve the law itself, which was neither more nor less than the will of the Chiefs; and, unfortunately, the new High Court had served only to crystallize and to give permanence and the highest sanction of British authority to some of the worst customs of the Natives. One of these was polygamy, which involved woman slavery. Formerly, polygamy among the Zulus was generally confined to a privileged class—to Chiefs and other head men; but he had the authority of Mr. Akerman, a distinguished Member of the Natal Council, for the statement that the Natal authorities had permitted the practice among all orders of the people. The number of registered marriages under Law No. 1, of 1869, up to June 30, 1875, was returned as follows:—2,225 Natives had registered the purchase of the second wife; 818 the purchase of the third; 343 of the fourth; 156 of the fifth; 80 of the sixth; 45 of the seventh; and so on, two having registered a 24th wife. It was monstrous that polygamy should be recognized, and that the code of Utah should be grafted into the legal procedure of a British Colony. Practically, no Native marriage in Natal was legal, unless the ceremony took place with the heathen rites of the Natives, and thus the taint of illegitimacy rested upon Kaffir children whose parents had been married by a lawfully-appointed minister of the Christian religion; and the law, as administered by English magistrates and Judges, was dragging women and children, in certain cases, back into the darkness of heathendom. But the charge against Native law was even of a graver character. All the Native female population of Natal lived in a state of unquestionable slavery, being bought, sold, inherited, and their price recovered by law, like any other property. Although this practice of selling women like cattle could not be put down at once, yet he contended that it ought to be discountenanced by the English Government and receive no sanction from British Courts or officials. But this course had not been adopted so recently as the 14th of November last. In September of last year, a Native of Natal, named Charlie Dingeswaya, surrendered his property for the benefit of his creditors, and the sole asset was the price which he believed his infant daughter would fetch when she was married—namely, £50. A large proportion of the cases in the Courts related to the sale of women; and questions of property of this kind had often to be settled by evidence as to the sale of mothers, and even of grandmothers. The matter was made worse by the fact that civilized Natives found it difficult to obtain any advantage from the Law 28 of 1865, ostensibly passed to enable them to acquire the privileges of British subjects. In several cases, where Natives had applied for certificates of citizenship, and had fulfilled the conditions of the law, interminable delays took place, as if to wear out the patience of the applicants. Some of these cases were brought before the right hon. Gentleman who so worthily represented the Colonies in the House, and—thanks to his prompt interference—the Petitions of several of these Natives had, according to the statement of the Native Government *Gazette*, been complied with. The Law in question contained no less than 38 clauses, which made it so complicated that it was almost impossible for a Kaffir to avail himself of it; and, therefore, he thought the best means of putting an end to, or at all events greatly mitigating, the evils arising from that and from the Native law, might properly be made the subject of investigation by the Commission which he desired Her Majesty's Government to appoint. There were other questions besides those mentioned which he would like to have considered by a Commission. The Natives of Natal contributed largely to the taxation of the country. He believed the quota paid by the Kaffirs amounted to upwards of £60,000; and this sum was collected without difficulty. He asked the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies to inform the House how much, in return for that large contribution to the Revenue, was expended on educational agencies or works of public improvement in the Native districts? The Kaffirs, as taxpayers, were entitled to more consideration than they at present received at the hands of their Rulers. There were a few mission stations in Natal; but the efforts of the missionaries could not be expected to be attended with much success until the Government changed its policy and took up the question, and established industrial and other schools in the Native districts. If the Government provided the Natives with extensive facilities of an educational character, the expenditure, regarded simply as an investment, would yield a very large interest. The Kaffirs were an intelligent and improving people; they were not a race ever likely to die out, and they had real capacity for civilization. But, in order to develop that capacity, it was necessary that we should become their teachers, as the Basutos had been taught by the missionaries. The Reports of Mr. Griffith, the British Resident in Basutoland, showed that, under the guidance of the missionaries, the Natives had made immense progress in the industrial arts. One of the missionaries, Mr. Dyke, had stated that 20,000 Basutos were under the direct influence of Christianity. The House would remark the fact that, while the Basutos were large exporters of wool and grain, they were, in return, good customers and traders of our merchants. In fact, it was becoming a very valuable Colony, and if it got fair play it would take up a very good position. Another matter to which attention should be specially directed was the tenure of land. A Committee of Members of the Colonial Legislature had inquired into this subject, and had made some most important suggestions, which had been transmitted to the consideration of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and which, if adopted, would lead to the most beneficial and valuable results. They recommended that the Kaffirs should be given possession of lands in a form more binding than the permissive occupation under which they had held them, and should thus be led to feel that they had a real and permanent interest in the well-being of the Colony, and were no longer dependent upon the will of their Chiefs. That course had also been recommended by Sir Benjamin Pyne. But, in order to insure the success of any enterprize, peace was necessary, especially in the neighbouring territory of Zululand. Many persons were apprehensive that war would break out between ourselves and the Zulus in consequence of our having inherited a boundary dispute from the Boers. It was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to ignore the rights of the Zulus, or the fact that when the Boers ruled the Transvaal we had regarded their title to the disputed land as one which we could not support. We could afford to be just and even generous to the Zulus, and he had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies would be both. It was of such vital importance that our relations with the Zulus should be placed on a permanently satisfactory footing, that a Commission might well inquire into this important subject. Our past policy had been very injurious and required to be changed. Great Britain could gain no glory for victories over uneducated and savage tribes; her glory ought to be to raise, educate, and confer upon them the blessings of freedom and Christianity, and thus to make them happy and prosperous; they would thus be made the means of carrying those blessings into the interior of Africa. He, therefore, begged to move the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Mr. Alderman COTTON, in seconding the Motion, said, that looking at the Cape as one of the most promising of the English Colonies, he did not think a discussion on this subject would be waste of time. He quite concurred with the hon. Member for Lambeth (Mr. Alderman M'Arthur), that polygamy was one of the most serious defects in the life of the Colony, and that the condition of the Native women called for some consideration from the Government, for they were nothing but slaves. That fact, combined with their having a money value, being worth from £5 to £500, obliged the young men to resort to robbery and violence to obtain wives, and that was the root of most of the Native wars. The last war at the Cape was undertaken, in the words of the younger Natives, "to make widows," so that they might be able to possess the women they so ardently desired for wives. Owing to the serious events of the last few years, the mind of England had been too much distracted to pay due regard to the importance of our South African Colonies; but he trusted that would cease to be the case now that peace was settled. He was informed that the Cape Colonies were capable of maintaining a population of 40,000,000 of people; and in these days of rapid increase of population, it must be of immense importance to England to have such a Colony so near to her shores. The minerals at the Cape embraced almost every description known. There were coal in abundance, silver, gold, copper, and the diamond fields. He would rather that this debate had not been started until the House was in possession of the Report of the Colonial Inspector. Railways were all important to the proper working of the enormous quantity of land in South Africa that had fallen into the hands of the Government, and he hoped they would facilitate the construction of railways in the Colonies by means of guarantees. A railway from Delagoa Bay was contemplated, and it was of the highest importance to this country to obtain possession of that place and harbour from the Portuguese Government, which Government, he had been told, were willing to negotiate for its transfer. Natal was, indeed, a possession of immense importance to us; it was, he believed, destined to become one of the brightest gems in the British Crown, and would, no doubt, prove a great outlet for that emigration which was so necessary to the people of these Islands.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House strongly condemns the policy of the Local Government of Natal in employing the machinery of British Courts in that Colony for the purpose of legalising polygamy and validating and enforcing Native usages which recognise rights of property in women and children; and this House is of opinion that measures should at once be taken to promote the civilization of the native tribes, and to facilitate their withdrawal from the savage state, and recommends the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the subject," —(*Mr. Alderman M'Arthur,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. W. H. JAMES, who had upon the Paper a Notice, as an Amendment to Mr. Alderman M'Arthur's Amendment, to move—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the question of native law in Natal should be dealt with in connection with the general policy to be carried out towards the native tribes in South Africa, and that for this purpose a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the subject,"

said, that he had no desire to oppose the Motion; but this question relating to Natal was only part of a very large subject that ought to be brought before Parliament. Comparatively little attention had been given to South Africa, and he thought, therefore, that before Parliament separated, they had a right to require some statement from the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Colonies with regard to the war which had broken out in Cape Colony. He was anxious to submit to the House an account of the state of our South African Colonies, and he thought there was matter for serious consideration in the fact that the Government of Cape Colony had shown itself most incapable of administering the affairs of the Colony, and the consequence of their action had driven those who took an interest in South Africa almost to despair. The result of this incompetent government had been disastrous both for the Colonists and for the Natives, a system of filibustering and marauding having been encouraged which had produced results which he scarcely dared to contemplate. The Kaffirs were the most numerous and most thriving part of the Colony of Natal, and, to secure their allegiance, it was necessary to show them that England did not go forth merely for the purposes of territorial aggrandizement, and for the spreading of grog and gunpowder; but for the introduction of better systems of administrations and the adoption of social reforms. They should also be taught that the real wealth of the country consisted in the produce of the soil. The Native population should be treated not only with kindness, but with justice and uniformity. He thought, between the Imperial and Colonial Legislatures, they might do much to promote education among the Aborigines. He wished to know, now that the Transvaal had been annexed, what steps Government were going to take for the improvement of the various races in the countries it was proposed to confederate? It was most important that efforts should be put forward without delay to educate the children, and develop that peculiar mechanical power which was so remarkable amongst these people. He would suggest, that for this purpose, industrial schools should be established throughout the Colony, and the work of education should be undertaken by the Legislature, either Imperial or Colonial, instead of being confined to missionary societies and voluntary efforts. There was no wiser mode of bringing about a reconciliation than to do something for their industrial improvement, keeping in mind the peculiarity of the Native, and the character of the South African race. Now that the war had been nearly suppressed, he wished to know what steps the Colonial Legislature were prepared to take in order to punish those who had broken out in revolt? He hoped, as regarded any indemnity, whatever steps might be taken, they would not be punished by either the confiscation of their lands or flocks. They should be compelled, however, to disarm. The Tribal tenure of land should also be broken up. The present Tribal system was one under which the Kaffirs were entirely in the hands of their Chiefs, and were prevented from pursuing peaceful arts. He asked the Government to state that, whenever an opportunity occurred, that system should be broken up. The uncontrolled existence of the liquor traffic among the Natives was a great evil, and the more so because of the vile liquors that were sold, and the prevalence of adulteration with fusel oil, tobacco, and vitriol. The proposal to introduce a brandy tax was strongly resisted by those interested. Some degree of responsibility might, perhaps, be secured by restricting canteen licences to those who kept *bonâ fide* hotels. Many brawls and disturbances, that had led to difficulty, had resulted from liquor shops being frequented by Chiefs and their supporters. Whatever differences of opinion might exist in the House with respect to the licensing system, there could be no doubt that in Natal canteens had been, and still were, the curse of the country; and he would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary what steps Government intended to take in the matter? This House was involved in great responsibility to South Africa, where we had annexed more territory than anywhere else, except Australia. The late war broke out in October, and on the 13th of November it was announced that applications would be received for the settlement of the confiscated Crown lands. Surely, it would be better to do something to improve the industry of a population of nearly 2,000,000 than to carry on a war at a cost of nearly £100,000 a-month? The Report of Mr. Ashley, brother of the hon. Member for Poole, showed that improved administration and better locomotion would increase the produce of the land a hundred-fold. The question of what ought to be done might very well be relegated to a Commission, as had been done in the case of Demerara and the Mauritius, unless the matter were left to Sir Bartle Frere, who had been in the country two years, and than whom no one was better qualified to obtain the required information. There was a grand future before the South African race, and, while identifying our prestige with that future, we ought to do our best to secure equality and justice in matters of local administration as between Blacks and Whites.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND said, that, agreeing as he did with much that had been said by the last speaker, and heartily desiring to see the Natives of South Africa civilized and placed on a footing of equality with the Whites, he desired to recall the attention of the House to the question immediately before it. The proposal of the Mover of the Resolution was confined to Natal; but the Amendment of the last speaker was that there should be a Commission for the whole of South Africa. There was no precedent for a roving Commission of that kind. Jamaica was a Crown Colony in which there had been an outbreak, and a Commission was sent there for a special purpose. The Commissions to the Mauritius and British Guiana had special reference to the treatment of Coolies, and were appointed on behalf of the Government of East India, with the assent of the Colonial Governments, the continuance of the Coolie emigration depending upon the Reports of the Commissions. This assent distinguished those cases from the present proposal. In Natal there was a representative Government, a certain number of Members being elected to the Assembly; and at the Cape there was a purely responsible Government, so that it would be a most unusual proceeding to send a Commission there. The appointment of a Royal Commission now would be inopportune. It would certainly excite disaffection in the minds of the Natives, and it was impossible to avoid considering that there existed at the Cape at this moment a great jealousy of interference on the part of the Imperial Government. This feeling would materially tend to weaken the effect of the Commission, and to hamper its proceedings. As regarded Natal, there had been no disturbance except the Langalibalele outbreak, of which the circumstances were very special; and, considering the enormous majority of Natives over the Whites, we could not shut our eyes to the fact that the Natives had been well treated, for otherwise it was quite certain they would long before have risen against the Whites. Owing to the judicious conduct of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and the non-interference with the Native laws, the Natives had been quite peaceable and contented. No doubt, it was desirable that they should be more civilized; but he believed there had already been a considerable advance in civilization, and that the Colonial Governments were alive to the importance of advancing still further in that direction. What was a Royal Commission to do? As to the Native laws, no new light could be thrown on that subject. As to Colonial laws affecting the Natives, these all came before the Colonial Office for careful consideration. It was true that the Commission might suggest that there should be further means of education, but that could be done equally well by the Colonial Office. He failed to perceive, therefore, what good a roving Commission, with no special purpose, as in the case of British Guiana and the Mauritius, could be expected to effect. It would excite the Natives and really do mischief, instead of good. Lastly, he would observe that the terms of the Motion of the hon. Member for Lambeth were extremely unfair to the Colony of Natal, when it asserted that they employed the machinery of British Courts for the purpose of legalizing polygamy, and validating and enforcing Native usages which recognized rights of property in women and children. In point of fact, they did nothing more than secure to the Natives a just administration of their own Native laws. We, ourselves, objected to polygamy; but it was not so long ago that it was recognized by virtuous people quite as good as ourselves. If, then, the Natives professed polygamy, it would be very unwise for us to interfere in order to put an end to their Native laws on this subject. It would be impolitic and dangerous to force our English laws and higher code of morality upon them, except by degrees and with great care. He did not think anyone who had thoroughly watched over the Colony, as those had done who had been at the Colonial Office, could doubt that the Natives knew they would in the Courts of Law have the same rights dealt out to them as the Whites had. He really believed that, to appoint a roving Commission of this kind would be a great mistake, and would lead to mischief which the House was hardly in a position to realize.

MR. E. JENKINS, in supporting the Motion, remarked, that if, at that moment, there existed in Natal a state of things which was a blot on our escutcheon, it was owing to the manner in which we had established a large Native emigration there. We had positively, through a long series of years, under the able management of one individual, created and organized a vast Tribal system out of the emigration into the Colony. There appeared to exist a state of feeling between the Colonists and the Natives which demanded the interposition of Her Majesty's Government. Of that there was abundant evidence in the official despatches. At present, we were not in a position to generalize on the facts as regarded South Africa, the views of different men being so various that it was most difficult to arrive at a just conclusion. A Commission of Inquiry, therefore, would probably be productive of good results. Apart from the cruelties perpetrated by the irregular troops, and the fact that looting was recognized as a regular part of warfare, he found that the Legislature proposed to confiscate the lands of the Native Chiefs, Sandilli, and others. Sir Bartle Frere, to his honour, protested energetically against such a measure; but the fact that it was proposed illustrated the spirit in which the Colonists looked on these questions, and proved the necessity of holding a strong hand over them. For his own part, he thought a policy of kindness should be adopted with the Natives, and among the necessary reforms for the improvement of the Colony which he would suggest were these—1st, the gradual supersession of the arbitrary power of the Native Chiefs by British, not Colonial, magistrates; 2nd, the establishment of individual, instead of Tribal tenure; 3rd, that there should be an entire suppression of the sale of intoxicating drinks in the Native districts; and, 4th, the immediate abrogation, by force if necessary, of the laws relating to the sale of women. He beleived the inquiry, if granted, would yield much important, and, perhaps, unexpected, information, and that it would tend to avert the dangers and difficulties which appeared to be in store for us in South Africa.

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY submitted that this was a subject on which much information was still wanting even inside the Colonial Office itself, and that it was one, moreover, which had an important bearing on our Colonial relations. He admitted that it would be a mistake to send a Commission of Inquiry to Cape Colony, where there was an established Government. The case, however, was different with regard to Natal, which was a Crown Colony; and he saw no objection to a Commission whose specific object should be to consider what ought to be the policy of the future with regard to the Native Tribes. One of the first reforms to be effected, he believed, was the breaking up of the "locations" or congregations of Kaffirs living in a state of original barbarism; but the question was, how that was to be effected. It was difficult to form an idea of the amount of evil which these "locations" fostered. The only civilizing influence in them at present appeared to be polygamy, as nothing was so great an inducement to a Kaffir to go out to work as the prospect of being able to buy another wife. As for the administration of Native law by British magistrates, no doubt it presented very great difficulty; but the real danger in discontinuing that practice would be that of throwing the Natives back on their Chiefs. The feeling that bound them to their Chiefs was well illustrated by the fact that Sir Arthur Cunynghame had offered in vain 1,000 head of cattle for information as to the whereabouts of Kreli, who was known to be in the neighbourhood. If we had to administer the Native laws, the question arose how we were to treat laws repugnant to our feelings. The answer was that all such laws and customs would have to be much modified; and although it could not be done immediately, he thought it was quite possible to gradually bring the Native law into harmony with our ideas of civilization, especially when it was remembered that the people themselves were pliant and docile. In one district, the mere introduction of the plough had had the happiest effects on the local industry, as the men thought it not derogatory to their dignity to use the iron instruments, and so far relieved the women of their usual drudgery. He would only repeat that he knew no reason why such a Commission of Inquiry as was proposed should have any detrimental results; and whilst, as a rule, he thought no greater mistake could be committed than for the Colonial Office to interfere too much in the internal affairs of the Colonies, he was nevertheless of opinion that a Commission of Inquiry in this case would be of great assistance to Sir Bartle Frere in bringing to bear public opinion in favour of the measures of civilization which he was desirous to promote. Nothing of real importance could, however, be done until the powers of the Chiefs was broken down and the Natives were taught the habit of work. Another very serious question was that of the franchise. On the one hand, its extension as far as possible was desirable *per se;* and, on the other, care would have to be taken not to let the Natives get the upper hand of the Colonists. That, and all other questions, could be some day settled when the great capabilities of the Colony had been fully developed.

MR. COURTNEY said, that as the subject before the House was the Natal marriage law, which did not exist at the Cape, it would be somewhat irregular that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into the latter Colony. It was also too much to say that a Commission of Inquiry was justifiable when its sole object was to provide cheap labour for a British Colony, and that it could not be allowed when the end to be attained was the removal of a blot upon our rule and of a danger to the Colony. The main fact to be borne in mind was that, under present circumstances, a woman in Natal was always the property of some man; and thus, when women came to be of a marriageable or disposable age, they were taken away from any employment in which they might be engaged, and sold by the men to the highest bidders. He had heard of cases in which a girl, brought up and educated in an Englishman's household, was claimed by a male Kaffir and sold as his property. This extended to more than merely civil relations. Instances were on record in which, when crimes were committed against women, they were held to be no crimes, because the women were the property of the men by whom the crimes had been committed. It was said that when British rule was extended to Colonies, respect must be paid to the Native customs; and that, therefore, polygamy could not be at once, at any rate, abolished in Natal. He quite admitted the force of the argument or suggestion; but it must not be forgotten that, although we acknowledged the general principle in India, we had abolished suttee in that Dependency of the Crown. Having, then, abolished that dreadful custom, why should we not deal in the same way with the custom of woman-ownership, with its consequential polygamy in this case? The general question of appointing a Royal Commission of Inquiry was one which might be regarded from several points of view. The practical advantage of sending out a Royal Commission was that the Commissioners could see with their own eyes, take evidence, consult with the authorities, and, perhaps, suggest many things which might be hidden from persons here. There was one principle, at all events, which we might lay down—that, in the case of adults, there should be some sort of consent required on the part of the woman before becoming a wife. It might also be found possible to make the payment for a marriage licence progressively increase in second, third, and subsequent marriages. Again, we ought, by all means, to facilitate the transition of any woman who wished to go out from the Native system and put herself under our law. We had an Act on that subject already; but it was too complicated, and every sort of impediment had been thrown in the way of the Natives who wished to emancipate themselves from the law under which they lived. He did not think there need be any fear of irritating the Natives by such a policy. The Natives, on the whole, were content to live under our rule; they knew its advantages, and there were very many who wished to remove from the operation of the Native and come under the operation of the English law. He did not know whether the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Colonies was going to assent to the proposal; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would undertake to urge on the Government of Natal to suggest some system by which this woman slavery—so horrible, so repulsive, so degrading, and in its fruits so full of danger to the Colony—might be ameliorated, if not altogether removed.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that though the difficulties in the case were considerable, and such as we had not attempted to solve, yet the responsibility rested with us. It was a question which might fairly be considered whether a Royal Commission was the best way of dealing with the subject. He maintained that we had not yet given sufficient attention to the solution of the South African question, that the Confederation Bill had dealt with the question only from a European point of view, and not with reference to the Native inhabitants of the Colonies. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) succeeded at 3 o'clock in the morning in introducing some clauses tending to give justice to the Native population; but nothing adequate to the requirements of the case appeared in the measure. Remembering that polygamy was permitted and practised among five-sixths of Her Majesty's subjects, it would be difficult, and perhaps not expedient, to prohibit it in South Africa. As to the question of woman slavery, that practice was one which ought not to be tolerated either under the sanction of English laws, or by the operation of Native law. He doubted, however, whether the facts that had been stated amounted to slavery. If the payment of money in consideration of marriage amounted to slavery, we had something very like slavery in this country. It was a fair subject of inquiry whether slavery existed; but his view being that the terms of his hon. Friend's (Mr. Alderman M'Arthur's) Motion were not such as they should agree to, and that the question was not confined to the Colony of Natal, but was a South African question, he should infinitely prefer the proposal that stood on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. W. H. James), who suggested a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the position of the Natives and the Native law in South Africa. It seemed to him (Sir George Campbell) that this subject involved a question of the broadest kind —What was the nature of the Government we should establish in South Africa? The Government of India was a type under which Natives and Europeans were subjected to British rule. That government was intelligible, and, he thought, tolerably successful. There were other kinds of government. In Australia we had given the Colonies complete self-government, and reduced British authority to a minimum. But there were other Colonies of an intermediate character, where there was partly a European community and partly a Native community. In respect to intermediate government, he did not think the Colonial Office had been successful. He was inclined to think that the great question as to what sort of government should be established in South Africa might best be dealt with by a Royal Commission of the highest character. Sir Bartle Frere had been involved in very great administrative difficulties, and it was scarcely possible for one man, in the face of those difficulties, to be able to deal sufficiently with the matter. The Royal Commission, he thought, should include Sir Bartle Frere and those other able men who had considered the South African question.

*Sir George Campbell*

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No one can be surprised that the discussion of this evening should have travelled over a wide field. Important as the Native question in Natal may be, it is obviously inseparable from the larger question affecting the Natives in all the South African Colonies. And this subject occupies nowhere else the important and peculiar position that it occupies in South Africa; for there, perhaps, alone among the Colonies of the world, the White race and the Native race have prospered and increased side by side. While we admit that there is much in the present condition of Native affairs that needs improvement, it ought to be remembered—for hardly sufficient stress has been laid on this point to-night —that it is, at all events, something to the credit of English colonization and English humanity that in Natal and in the Cape Colony also, the Native race has not in the process of that colonization disappeared through the influence of civilization or whisky; but has been able to live alongside, and to increase and multiply even faster than, their White neighbours. All will agree with the hon. Member for Lambeth that measures should be taken to promote the civilization of the Native tribes, and to facilitate their withdrawal from the savage state; but, as has been observed, there are other statements in the Motion which cannot command the same assent. It contains assertions of opinion and concludes with a recommendation to which it is impossible that the Government can accede. It proposes strongly to condemn the policy of the local Government of Natal as employing the machinery of British Courts in that Colony for the purpose of legalizing polygamy, and validating and enforcing Native usages which recognize rights of property in women and children. We cannot accept this as a fair statement of the facts of the case. No doubt, Native law is recognized by the British Courts in Natal; but it must be remembered that over a large portion of our Indian Empire laws are recognized of the precise character of those which are deprecated in the Motion. It must be admitted that in dealing with such matters we can only act gradually. In our endeavour to bring to the Native races under our control the benefits of an improved civilization, we must gain their own support, and avoid such premature action as might enlist their prejudices against us. What has been the state of things in the Colony of Natal? The Native population there is largely in excess of the White population. Before 1873 the Native population of that Colony was only nominally governed by White authority. The Natives were left in their locations under the control of their own Chiefs, and were, practically, not interfered with by the Colonial Government. They were subject entirely to Native law, administered by their own Chiefs. It was found that this was a state of things, not only objectionable in itself, but positively dangerous to the Colony and to the whole of South Africa. Measures were taken to reverse that policy; to abolish, as far as might be, the Tribal organizations which existed, and to substitute for them the authority of White magistrates, who should decide cases and entertain appeals from the Native Chiefs. That was the first step which was taken; and, in taking it, I think it is clear that it was absolutely necessary to recognize Native law. We could not at once abolish all the Native laws and customs, and substitute for them White laws and customs; but we took an important step in endeavouring to substitute the authority of White magistrates for the Tribal organizations which have been so universally condemned this evening. What followed? A Law was passed by the Legislature of Natal, enacting that the Native law should be investigated by a Commission, reduced to writing, and carefully amended where necessary to bring it into harmony with civilized customs. The Commission was appointed, I think, in 1876, and not long afterwards those troubles began in South Africa, which, I fear, have not yet concluded. Some of the Members of the Commission had to leave their work to render still more important service in the Transvaal; and naturally, in the disturbed condition of affairs, the Government of Natal found it impossible to give that undivided and persistent attention to the subject which it might give in time of peace. Some weeks ago, a despatch was written, by my directions, to the Governor of Natal, calling his attention to the work of the Commission, and suggesting that if he thought it necessary other gentlemen should be appointed in the place of those who had been removed, and asking for a Report of what had been done. Our first step must be to ascertain what the Native law is, and the next step, I hope, will be carefully to amend that law in those particulars where it requires amendment, so as to introduce the benefits of civilization by degrees among a population who have hitherto been unaccustomed to them, and to introduce them in such a manner as to induce the Natives to work with us rather than against us. The hon. Member for Lambeth has complained that the Natives are unable to transfer themselves from the jurisdiction of Native to that of Colonial law. Endeavours have been made by Statute to facilitate that process; but the difficulty is that the Natives prefer their own law to a law of which they are ignorant. Any such transfer must, therefore, be gradual and even slow; and the point to which our attention will most usefully be directed is the harmonizing, as far as possible, of the Native law with civilized ideas. I cannot admit that anything that has been done can fairly be described in the words of the Motion as an employment of the machinery of British Courts for the purpose of legalizing polygamy and validating and enforcing Native usages. The rule is that all matters in dispute between Natives living under Native law shall be tried according to the provisions of the Native laws for the time being prevailing, so far as the same shall not be of a nature to work manifest injustice or repugnant to the settled principles of natural equity. This was as far as it was safe to go at the time the provision was made. I admit that having begun to move in this direction we should endeavour, as soon as possible, to bring our work to a satisfactory conclusion. But I am utterly unable to see what good a Royal Commission can do. It can give no further information with regard to Native customs than we have. Many of these customs may be objectionable, as some Native customs in India are objectionable; but a Royal Commission could not abolish them, nor in any way change them; and it might, on the other hand, create irritation and awake prejudices both amongst the Colonists and amongst the Natives, which would, in reality, retard the work we all desire to see accomplished. If that is true with regard to Natal, much more is it the case with regard to Cape Colony. This is the time of all others when an apparent interference of the Imperial Government with the responsible Government of Cape Colony might produce disastrous results. A Commission sent to inquire into questions of such difficulty, delicacy, and importance, as the Native question in a Colony possessing responsible government could scarcely at any time do good; but, under present circumstances, it would do infinite mischief. In Sir Bartle Frere we have, at the Cape, a Governor who is better than any Commissioner. He has dared to act, under very difficult circumstances, with a moral courage which few men would have displayed, and he has earned unanimous approval in this country and the confidence of the great majority of the people of the Colony. He has throughout these difficulties shown that high humanity and that regard for the Native races which everyone who knows him and his past history would expect from him. He has done, perhaps, more than could have been conceived possible to mitigate the horrors of the war, which, I hope, is now happily concluded, and to secure its conduct under proper regulations by the Forces engaged in it. He has devoted special attention, under a great pressure of other work, to this question of the future of the Native inhabitants of South Africa. The hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. W. H. James), I believe, quoted some despatches of Sir Bartle Frere's; but I may venture, although at this late hour, in justice to Sir Bartle Frere, to read extracts from other despatches to the House, because I think it ought to be known not only what attention he has given to this subject, but how thoroughly his views in regard to it are in accordance with the views of some of those hon. Members who this night have argued in favour of a Royal Commission to supersede him. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] Well, what is the good of a Royal Commission, if you have confidence in him, and believe he will carry out what is desired? In a despatch of November 14th, 1877, addressed to my Predecessor (Lord Carnarvon), Sir Bartle Frere expresses his opinion that the agents employed by the Government in dealing with the Natives should be energetic and trained officials. He states that the Tribal system was a great obstacle to improvement, and could be easily broken down, and the authority of the Government made to supersede that of the Chiefs; that while the Government could do little to bridge the gulf separating the White from the Black, it could do much to regulate the sale of liquor; and that, looking only to the interests of the Native population, it was of vast importance to uphold the character and support the power of the Imperial Government. Then, Sir, in a despatch of the 9th of January, written in reply to a letter from the Aborigines Protection Society, Sir Bartle Frere develops his own conclusions on the Native question. He recommends that the carrying of arms only used for inter-tribal warfare should be stopped; there should be a good police and good Native tribunals; individual property must be respected, and obstacles against the holding of it removed; education of every kind, but especially industrial education, must be encouraged, and educated Natives employed in places of trust. He says that nothing could do more to prevent future Kaffir wars than the extension of industrial education to agriculture. Well, Sir, I could quote much more of the same kind; but I think I have read enough to the House to show what Sir Bartle Frere's policy is, and how much it is in accordance with the views which have been expressed this evening, which cannot but strengthen his hands in bringing that policy into action. I have shown how entirely unnecessary it would be to substitute for Sir Bartle Frere anything in the nature of a Royal Commission. If it be that Sir Bartle Frere requires any assistance either from this country, or in the Colony itself, in order to carry out his policy, I can only say Her Majesty's Government will most cheerfully afford it; but I entirely deprecate any interference with him in the work which I believe he is doing so satisfactorily, and I trust nothing of the kind will be sanctioned by this House. Now, Sir, I do not think it is necessary for me to detain the House much further. I am glad, so far as I am concerned, to express my hearty sympathy with much which has been said to-night. I cannot but think that, however late in the Session this debate has taken place, it will not be without good effect both in England and South Africa. I trust that now, when this war, which has occupied the attention of all who have been connected with the Cape Colony, including Sir Bartle Frere himself, for so many months past, appears to be happily ended, no time will be lost in attempting to deal with this most important question.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I agree in what the right hon. Gentleman has said, that the hands of the Government and also the Colonial Government will be strengthened by what has passed tonight. With very much of what the right hon. Gentleman has said I entirely agree. I do not know that there is more than one remark to which I should take any objection, and I hope in that I misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman. In alluding to the terms of the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Lambeth (Mr. Alderman M'Arthur) the right hon. Gentleman commenced by sympathizing with his object; but said that he went too far in advising that measures should at once be taken to declare polygamy illegal, and also the enforcement of Native usages which recognize rights of property in women and children. The words which I took down as used by the right hon. Gentleman in alluding to both these questions were that they were subjects which were recognized in our possessions in India. I think that is rather a mistake. Polygamy, undoubtedly, is recognized; but I do not think the slavery of women is recognized; and I shall be corrected if I am wrong in the statement. I can quite understand that there are enormous difficulties in the way of withholding from polygamy some sort of legal sanction; but I cannot imagine any hesitation in taking away legal sanction to anything approaching female slavery. I imagine, from the facts brought to my notice, that there is no doubt women slavery prevails to a great extent in Natal. I do not deny for a moment the enormous difficulty of dealing with it in this country; but I feel sure this House and the country, and the right hon. Gentleman himself, will not rest until we have done all we can, all that is possible to destroy it—in fact, that we shall not stop until we have succeeded in the effort. I confess I do not agree with the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) that, by abolishing polygamy, we should be decreasing the population of South Africa.

Mr. COURTNEY wished to correct the right hon. Gentleman. He had not said anything of the kind.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I understood him to say that one good effect of stopping polygamy would be that there would not be so large an increase in the population. Such a thing, I do not think, will follow. It is a fact that the population increases very slowly in polygamous countries, and that the real increase in South Africa is not in consequence of polygamy, but because of the country coming under our rule of peace, order, and prosperity. I am sure there is no hesitation on the part of the Government to do what they can in the matters to which my hon. Friend has called attention. And now we come to the mode by which my hon. Friend proposes to effect his object. I confess I should think it a strong step to take to send out a Commission. I do not think it could go out merely as a Commission of Inquiry. It would have to be, as my hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) said, a strong Commission. If we were to have a Commission strong enough to do the business at all, it would have to be so strong as to to almost overshadow the Governor. It is possible that Sir Bartle Frere himself might wish such aid, and if he did, I understand the Government would seriously consider whether they would not meet that wish. But at this moment we are, in one respect, in a fortunate position with regard to this Colony. We have certainly, as the Governor of the principal Colony, a man whom we can entirely trust for motive, for sense, and for ability, in this most difficult matter. I entirely agree with what the right hon. Gentleman has said. I think we might search the whole of our public servants, and with difficulty find any man who has that combination of feelings of justice and firmness of character which fits him to deal with this most difficult question. I do not know that the Government can do more than strengthen his hands as much as possible. I have no doubt that they will in their despatches, both to Sir Bartle Frere and the Governor of Natal, state that, although these are to a great extent self-governing Colonies, yet England cannot give them the assistance we see they require, unless we are sure they act in perfect justice to the Black population. This question of the Native law is not exactly a question between Black and White. It is a question of difficult government of Blacks; and one of the great arguments which made me feel strongly in favour of doing what I could last year towards the Confederation of the Cape Colonies, was the hope that a large Colony—the Cape Colony—would be able to materially assist in solving that question. That, again, is a reason why it might be a very dangerous step to send out from this country a Commission to override the authority at the Cape; and I do not think that ought to be done, except in a case of extreme necessity. The hon. Member for Gateshead alluded to some acts of injustice which he thinks have been committed in the Kaffir War. That has been the case hitherto with regard to all these wars; but I have the satisfaction of believing and trusting that there has been much less of that injustice in this war than in previous wars. I am not saying anything in palliation of what has been done; but anyone who has looked at the history of previous wars will, I think, find there is an improvement. But there is no reason why there should be any of those acts of outrage, and I do not believe the Government will allow them to be committed, if it is possible to prevent them. I am quite sure that Sir Bartle Frere, and I believe our other Representatives, will do the same. I think we can look for much more from Sir Bartle Frere and our other Representatives than from a Commission, by letting them feel they are fully supported not only by the Government at home, but by the public opinion of this country. I hope my hon. Friend the Member for Lambeth will feel, after the manner in which he has been met by the Colonial Secretary, and the statement that the Colonial Office intends to do all it can to strengthen the hands of Sir Bartle Frere, that his object will be gained by withdrawing the Motion.

**Mr. Alderman M'ARTHUR** said, after the speech of the Secretary of State for the Colonies he would withdraw his Motion. He was aware that he had not got the right of reply; but in explanation, he might say that he had not the slightest idea of reflecting in any way upon Sir Bartle Frere. On the contrary, he desired to strengthen his hands, and after the way in which the Colonial Secretary replied, he believed the debate would do good both in England and the Colonies.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

## BREWERS' LICENCES.

### RESOLUTION.

**Sir EDWARD WATKIN,** in rising to call attention to the question of Brewers' Licences; and to move—

> "That licences to conduct recognised trades are unjust and impolitic in principle, and that the licence tax inflicted on the interests of the Brewers ought to be repealed whenever the state of the Revenue will permit the remission of taxation,"

said, that in bringing forward the Motion, he was only actuated with a desire to remedy an injustice. He had always maintained that it was a mistake to tax any authorized or proper trade, and that this particular tax was vexatious and exceptional. From the many speeches on the subject by hon. Members sitting on the other side of the House, and notably by some Members of the Government, he was astonished that the subject had not yet been dealt with. The House would remember that in 1862, the duty upon hops was abolished; but in order to make up for the expected loss to the Revenue by the abolition of the duty, the tax was re-imposed on brewers. That was to say, that a man who brewed for sale, and not for his personal consumption, was taxed; while the man who brewed for his own consumption, or the consumption of his neighbours and friends, escaped taxation. The result was that the sale of beer as a trade was constantly diminishing, and as in the case of all taxes of the kind, the effect had been to give an advantage to the large producer to the detriment of the smaller one. The difference between the private brewer and the licensed brewer was very remarkable. In a few words, he would give a comparison between the licensed and private brewer, and the producer of cider and perry. The licensed brewer payed £113 6*s.* 8*d.* for 100 quarters of malt, which came to a taxation of 5*s.* 7¼*d.*, in addition, of course, to income-tax. The private brewer, on the contrary, paid but 1*s.* 4½*d.* taxation. Then, beside this injury to trade, the licensed brewer was interfered with in the exercise of his industry by the Government supervising authorities. He had to give 24 hours' of his intention to brew, and two hours notice of the quantities of ingredients used. Then he had to pay his tax six months in advance, so that there was a direct levy out of capital, irrespective of private losses. In the case of a private brewer, he must buy his malt of a licensed maltster, and no other restriction was imposed. Home-brewed beer was used in part payment of wages to both in-door and out-door servants, and that was a matter of importance, seeing that the beer was brewed without a tax on the brewer. Then, in the case of cider, perry, and wines, there were no restrictions and no tax of any kind. As he was told the House was to be counted, he would move his Resolution without other words.

MR. CLARE READ seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "licences to conduct recognized trades are unjust and impolitic in principle, and that the licence tax inflicted on the interests of the Brewers ought to be repealed whenever the state of the Revenue will permit the remission of taxation,"—(*Sir Edward Watkin*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I do not wish to appear neglectful of the important question to which the hon. Gentleman has directed our attention; but I must say I hardly expected we should be called upon at this time of the Session, and considering the state of the Business of the House, to discuss a question of such importance as that which he has raised. I have more than once had occasion—once every year, I think—to discuss this matter, and the House has several times been called upon to pronounce an opinion upon the subject. I am afraid I cannot depart from the position which I have taken since we have been in Office. I do not at all hold this or any other tax to be in itself a desirable thing, if we could do without it; but I do think there would be great difficulty in altering this system, and, at the present time, I do not see my way to making such an alteration. There are two difficult questions involved. One is, whether we can abandon the Revenue which is derived from the tax altogether, without any substitute? the other is, whether we can alter the incidence of the tax, so as to make it fall, instead of upon the brewer in the shape of a licence duty on the article he produces upon the article which he uses? You might possibly, no doubt, convert a licence duty into a malt duty, in order to get rid of the licence duty; or, on the other hand, you might do away with both the malt duty and the licence duty, and substitute for them a duty on beer. There is no doubt that, in argument, a great deal may be said for both of these propositions; but I think if anyone came to deal with the subject, he would find that either of them would involve him in very great difficulty, and would be more unpopular than the system which at present prevails. I cannot agree with the hon. Gentleman in thinking that the effect of this licence duty has been to drive out the small brewers; if driven out at all, it has been by competition with the large brewers, and in accordance with the natural law which operated in these cases. I do not think we have arrived at a time when it is possible to take away the duty.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he thought much might be urged in favour of the abstract proposition which had been urged by the hon. Member for Hythe (Sir Edward Watkin); but, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had remarked, the evil which was complained of could only be met by a proposal which might prove more objectionable.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock till Monday next.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Monday, 29th July,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) * (176); Highways * (177).

*Committee* — *Report* — Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland) * (172); Corrib (Galway) River * (166); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money)* (169).

*Third Reading*—Commutation of Tithes * (151); Weights and Measures * (161), and *passed.*

## THE CONGRESS AT BERLIN — THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION.

### OBSERVATIONS.

**Lord CAMPBELL** rose, pursuant to Notice, to call attention to the Protocols of the Congress at Berlin, and to the Convention of June 4th between Great Britain and the Porte, and said: My Lords, when the Protocols were laid upon the Table, many speeches were delivered. Even on Friday last, from a Question of a noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) upon an isolated point, there arose a rather general discussion to which my present Notice refers. If, on either of these occasions, the topic which appears to me the most important had been noticed, I should, for many reasons, have been indisposed to encroach at all just now upon the patience of the House. That topic is the Russian occupation, and the degree to which it has been sanctioned.

My Lords, I have not put a Resolution on the Paper, because it did not seem to be a moment when any Resolution, even if adopted by your Lordships, would lead to practical results. Even if Parliament advised the Crown to withhold ratification from some parts of the Treaty, and, if it was withheld, as far as I can learn among diplomatists, the Treaty would not fail to operate in Europe. As to arraignment of the Government on the Eastern Question, it requires the transactions of many years to be exhibited, and involves materials beyond human force at this time of the Session, even to advert to. It could only be appropriate in order to bring about a change which nobody yet aims at. But I will move for some documents which it would, perhaps, be easy to produce, and which would throw a certain light upon the occupation I have mentioned.

It is not requisite to dwell upon the Protocols, because they were alluded to on Friday, and the subject thus in some degree anticipated. The first, in which the Prime Minister, in spite of all the eloquence he is said to have brought to bear upon the Congress, was unable to effect the withdrawal of the Russian troops from the positions which they occupied, may be regarded as a sample. It illustrates the spirit by which the Congress was directed, and which the three Plenipotentiaries habitually encountered. What I propose is during a few minutes to examine, as a whole, the Convention and the Treaty under some divisions which make it easier to judge of them, although it is to one point alone I wish to draw the more particular attention of your Lordships.

The first division which occurs is that of stipulation to which a qualified degree of praise may be accorded. It contains, however, nothing as I view it; but the arrangement by which, as the noble Marquess who went to Berlin (the Marquess of Salisbury) has explained, the Porte is sheltered from the weight of the indemnity demanded. It may not be agreeable to the bondholders of the Sultan, since one class—at least, one individual—must be perpetually unpaid, to keep his Empire from destruction. The interpretation of the noble Marquess is disputed as to the contract which exists; but, if accurate, it cannot be denied that a mischievous effect of a destructive war has been ingeniously parried.

The next division would refer to several arrangements which admit of plausible defence, although they may be seriously criticized. As I regard the subject, it includes the whole mass of stipulations upon Cyprus and upon Asia Minor. It is here important to remark that no new obligation to defend has been contracted. Ever since 1856 the obligation has existed. From that period we were bound to defend the Ottoman Dominions, either in Asia or in Europe, either with others or alone. Of course, the more recent the engagement, the less decorous to connive at it. But that is all the difference. So, too, the right to interfere as a defending Power previously existed. In the same division, one might reckon what has been done in Bessarabia. It is to be regretted as a Russian triumph over Europe. But it was necessary that Roumania, after making war upon her Suzerain, should incur a penalty of some kind. Nothing better might have been acceptable at Berlin, where the Vassal has, of course, considerable influence.

The third division would consist of several arrangements objectionable on the face of them, and highly mischievous when separately viewed; but which may have a latent plea as conducive to some great and distant object, if Ottoman authority should fail to be perpetuated on this side of the Bosphorus. To this category I should venture to refer the independence of Servia and Roumania—in itself at once an element of conflict, and a premium on rebellion; at the same time, the creation of another Vassal Principality, which is sure to follow the example of the former ones; again, the mode in which Eastern Roumelia is to be virtually subjected to the Embassies at Constantinople, and the strife it will produce. To that class I should assign, too, the Austrian possession of Herzegovina and Bosnia. They all would seem to merit censure; but all may have a hidden vindication in some beneficent design to which they may be gradually subordinated.

The last division to be noticed is that of measures which no policy excuses, which no kind of argument can possibly defend. The Russian occupation is the only one I shall advert to in this category. The essential point to keep in view is that there is no security whatever for its ceasing. There will be innumerable pretexts for extending it. The new Austrian possession of Herzegovina and Bosnia is among them. Austria has never been a check to Russian progress during the whole of these transactions, although it might have frequently been urged it was her interest to be so. Those who feel convinced that in a year the occupation will determine should be referred to Polish history. It is the specific medicine for credulity of that kind. But there is something else to be considered. At this moment the Russian occupation is causing the iniquities and horrors which the two Mr. Bartlett's, authoritative witnesses just returned from European Turkey, have, in their own names, so vividly delineated. These gentlemen are brothers. One is a contributor to literature on the Eastern Question. The other was engaged by Lady Burdett-Coutts to assist in organizing and distributing her well-known fund for refugees and victims of the conflict. They have both addressed themselves to that journal whose circulation is allowed to be the largest. According to these gentlemen, 100 villages can be named which subsequently to the Armistice have been razed by Cossacks and Bulgarians. There is now, in consequence, to the extent of many thousands, a starving and a houseless population. Eight hundred people, who were lately sent back to their homes under promise of Russian protection, were robbed of everything and brutally ill-treated by Bulgarians in sight of Russian troops. Near Constantinople, mosques and graveyards have been knocked to pieces. There is a statement with regard to the Bulgarian police and Russian officers, which I refrain from communicating to your Lordships. The occupation of the Russians during the last five months is responsible for 500,000 deaths. Even if the occupation was doomed to cease, when, in an inverse sense, it had repeated the atrocities of which we heard so much two years ago, it could not be defended.

Instead of dwelling upon these gloomy scenes, let me remind the House that the existence of Russian Armies, where the Treaty will permit them to remain, is certain to preclude the action of the now suspended Ottoman Assemblies, the best and latest check to the despotic power so long regarded as incapable of adequately governing. It is, at the same time, a bar to every improvement the British Embassy might call for. It utterly annihilates their influence. The proposition will come home to everyone who knows Constantinople, and the noble Marquess the Secretary of State is now himself among the number. But there is a larger and a graver sense in which the occupation ought to be regarded.

Whatever prepossessions or convictions he may have in favour of that system, everyone must see that late events have weakened the arrangements the Crimean War was undertaken to establish. No one, although he may decline to initiate or countenance, can help canvassing and listening to schemes by which it is proposed to guard Constantinople against Russia without the slightest reference to Ottoman dominion. On the character of these schemes I do not hazard an opinion at this moment. The point to be insisted on is that the Russian occupation as effectually defeats them, as it is a positive impediment to every improved and salutary form of government under the direction of the Sultan. We have heard of Byzantine Empires, although the term has not been properly defined. How can you possibly establish a Byzantine Empire, in the face of a Russian Army which, for years to come, may hold Adrianople? A Danubian federation was long ago suggested by a very eminent Hungarian, but certainly will not be framed while Russian soldiers still command the passes of the Balkans—which they may do without a limit. But projects of that magnitude would be difficult to realize in any case, even without an intercepting Army to prohibit them. Considerable reasoners have urged with a more practical, more statesmanlike acumen, that if Austria only had the Suzerainty of Moldavia and Wallachia which have been withdrawn from the Sultan, and which cannot stand alone, the Russian march to Constantinople would be barred, since war with Austria—possibly with Germany behind her—would be a necessary incident of trying it. But even such a combination would be useless, when Russian Armies are so placed that they no longer have the Pruth and Danube to get over. It is not my aim or hope to-night to do much justice to the topic. Let me only add that the occupation whether of Bulgaria or Eastern Roumelia, for the time allowed, has not a shadow of a ground, in the advantage of the inhabitants, or in the interest of Europe, since, if it had, the Protocols would have revealed it.

Even if the occupation is irrevocable, so far as it is sanctioned by the Congress, it is not useless to refer to it. The question leads to several conclusions as regards the British Fleet maintaining its position; as regards the hazard of a struggle at no distant time; as regards alliances to be created or revived in order to prepare for it. Above all, a due attention to this subject may correct a doubtful spirit which has recently been manifested—the spirit which is ready to give up political engagements for material possessions, to exult in Cyprus, to forget the Dardanelles and Bosphorus, as if all the Islands of the Archipelago could be a set-off for abandoning the European interests of which, 20 years ago we were—of which so much more recently we meant to be—the guardians. But that disposition would also be restrained by anything which brings in an authentic shape before the House the effects the Russian occupation is producing, and enables it to see how far the witnesses I have invoked have faithfully described them. I move for Copies of any Diplomatic Correspondence with Her Majesty's Government on the state of European Turkey since the termination of hostilities.

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, I thought some Member of the Government would have risen to reply to the speech of the noble Lord. I wish, however, to refer to another matter. The noble Earl at the head of the Government is reported to have made a speech on Saturday at a banquet at Knightsbridge, in which he complained that he had in this House opponents who never "unsheathed the sword," and that the Government were met only by "innuendo and question," although the two chief Plenipotentiaries of the Queen sit in this House. I am anxious to know whether the noble Earl can quote many instances—or even one instance—when, during the five years of an eventful foreign policy pursued by the late Government, the noble Earl ever unsheathed his sword at all. I am not aware that he ever did so, although he has made many disparaging remarks of that foreign policy. I own that I do not quite understand all these complaints about what takes place in this House. I do not understand this complaint that we have not done more than ask Questions. I think, for instance, that last Friday's debate gave no proof of what the noble Earl referred to. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury), on a recent occasion, criticized the disappearance, for a very few minutes, of the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) from his place in this House. On Friday last, following the example of the First Plenipotentiary, the noble Marquess escaped from the House before half the discussion, which was of a very interesting character, was over;

and it was perfectly impossible to extract any remarks from the two Members of the Government who remained. It appears to me that Her Majesty's Government do not wish to enter into discussions, while they clamour for Motions and for votes which they themselves, when in Opposition, never made or insisted upon. It is said that we confine ourselves exclusively to innuendo and question. As regards Questions, we did not act in a very embarrassing way—I even observed perfect silence—during the time the Plenipotentiaries were away from the House. Since their return, we have certainly put Questions—Questions which we thought were of some importance—in order to elucidate the action of the Plenipotentiaries. I am bound to say that to those Questions we have either received no answer at all, or an answer to which the maxim of a great moralist might have been applied—"If the first rule is truth, discretion is the second." As regards innuendo—I will not refer to the speeches — the very weighty speeches — made by the late Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the late Secretary of State for the Colonies, nor will I refer to the speeches made by the noble Duke and the noble Marquess who sit opposite; but I do think I have heard in this House something of argument and something of reasoning, not only from the late Lord Chancellor, from the noble Earl (the Earl of Kimberley), and the noble Viscount behind me, but from several Members of your Lordships' House sitting on the back Benches of the Opposition—some of which speeches have up to this time been met with no reply. Then it is said that we confine ourselves to innuendo. What is an innuendo? Your Lordships may have heard of the word, though it is so insufficiently acclimatized as not to be found in five different English dictionaries which I consulted on the point. I have an idea as to what an innuendo means, and it may be possible to give your Lordships some idea of an innuendo. Your Lordships will remember what appeared to me a rather painful scene when, in the course of a debate, the noble Marquess thought it right to compare the vilest character in English history to a great personage in this House. I think something of innuendo lurked in that remark. The noble Earl at the head of the Government is also at the head of a large majority in this House, and a majority normally of 100 in "another place." He boasts that he has the confidence of his Sovereign—which I do not doubt. The Queen has graciously and constitutionally shown Her confidence to every successive Ministry which has existed. The noble Earl also spoke of the confidence of the country. At the beginning of this Session he defied us to prove that there had been any real difference between himself and any of his Colleagues; and he further assured us that since the very beginning there had never been the slightest hesitation as to the course which Her Majesty's Government should pursue with regard to the great events in the East. On Saturday, he is reported to have stated that he came back from Berlin with the firm conviction—I presume, imparted to him by Prince Gortchakoff—that the Crimean War and the late War might have been prevented if England had been more firm in her language; and he deprecated the renewal of Councils where there might be hesitation, a want of decision, and a want of firmness—he described Ministers doubting, considering contingencies, and then acting, but, perhaps, too late. It does appear to me that if this is not an admission of great weakness on the part of the noble Earl—that is, not to have used language when it was in his power to prevent war—it is something like an innuendo against his own Colleagues in the way in which they have supported him during the last two years. A great political contemporary of his, in a speech made a week before, used a very strong epithet—"insane"—and applied it to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The speech was devoid of any personal allusion. That Convention seems to have been defended by the noble Earl on Saturday, on the ground that it forces all future Governments, whatever may be their opinions or the opinion of the country, or the circumstances of the time, to do that which Her Majesty's Government a year ago firmly declined to do—admit a policy was right, whether the circumstances were favourable or unfavourable. The noble Earl thought it became himself and his own great position to give an offensive personalty to a *tu quoque* which he had very carefully and with almost painful elaboration prepared, and which reminded one in its violence, though not in power, of the attacks made some 30 years ago against a very great statesman of this country. I do not know whether this is innuendo, or whether it is more than innuendo; but I utterly deny that we on this side of the House have indulged in such practices as these, and I certainly do hope that we shall not be led by such example to do anything of the sort in the future.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: I am rather at a loss to ascertain what is the exact object of the observations which we have heard from the noble Earl. Possibly they form one class of innuendo themselves. The noble Earl wishes to insinuate some remarks, for which probably I shall show there is no foundation, which may disturb the digestion of the dinner of last Saturday. The noble Earl, in the first place, has remarked upon some observations which I made upon a charge that was urged against the Convention of June 4, by a right hon. Gentleman who described it as an "insane Convention." The noble Earl admits that was rather a strong epithet—one of a character that could scarcely be passed unnoticed. He says that the person who made it indulged in no personal remark. No personal allusion, it seems, escaped his lips, and he spoke with all the abstraction of a political philosopher. It is very possible that on that occasion, although so strong a charge was made against the Convention for which I and my Colleagues are responsible—a charge that I think required notice—it is possible, I think, that the charge may not have been coupled by the speaker with any personal allusion at the moment. But, although I could not have thought of introducing the question myself, as the noble Earl has introduced it, I must say that that speaker on several occasions has taken the opportunity of making personal allusions to myself—allusions which were intended to be extremely offensive—though I am glad to say that they were allusions that did not much disturb me. I may refer, amongst other instances, to a speech at Oxford, which I believe was not even an after-dinner speech, but which was made in cold blood. He singled me out of the Cabinet—he charged me with all the offences of the Cabinet, he described me as a dangerous, and, I believe, even a devilish character. If I had taken a very early opportunity of noticing the expressions of the right hon. Gentleman, and noticing them with some acerbity, I do not think the world would have been surprised. For a long time I did not take any notice at all of the criticism which came from that quarter; but when his criticism was levelled at a political act which, I believe, is of the highest importance to the welfare of the country—coming, as it did, from one occupying a great position with great Parliamentary experience—it appeared to me that it was one that should be noticed. Previously, during a more or less exciting rhetorical campaigning of a period of two years, the right hon. Gentleman levelled the most offensive epithets and criticism upon my conduct and in a description of my character; and I thought it was not remarkable that I should take an opportunity of expressing what I thought a very just view of the position of the individual, of his conduct, and of his language. The next charge against us in this lengthy innuendo of the noble Earl seems to be one which he has made before. It is perfectly erroneous; but it is impossible to notice, at the time, every erroneous statement. They are always sure to re-appear again when the noble Earl is concerned. He has taken this opportunity of declaring that my noble Friend (the Marquess of Salisbury) and myself have asserted that there never was any difference of opinion in the Cabinet. No such statement ever was made by me or by my noble Friend. We said there had been no change in the policy of the Cabinet. We adhered to the policy which we understood those two distinguished Noblemen who resigned had accepted, and which I understood they were prepared to carry into effect. We thought they had given their adherence to a policy which, when the time came to carry into effect, they shrank from the responsibility of so doing. That I deeply regret. It was a policy that declared, until British interests were in danger, we should not feel it our duty to counsel war with Russia. It was said that was a contracted policy, but it was a distinct and definite policy. When the time came, and we thought British interests were in danger, and we appealed to our Colleagues to act according to such circumstances, they did not think it consistent with their duty to do so. But the policy of the Cabinet was not changed. The statement that I or my noble Friend ever declared to this House that there had been no difference of opinion in the Cabinet between its various Members is one utterly unfounded. No such statement was ever made. I think I have noticed pretty well the different points of the noble Earl's remarks. This criticism upon a dinner is difficult to meet. What we complain of the noble Earl and his Friends is not that they ask Questions, but that they ask Questions on the most limited subjects, and of the most limited interest. For instance, what was the Question which the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) introduced the other night? Really I forget what the subject was, but it was one of a limited character. I think he asked for some explanation about that Memorandum which was surreptitiously obtained and published to the detriment of the Public Service. Now, that Question was of a limited character. It was answered completely by my noble Friend the Secretary of State, who took the opportunity of explaining the matter in a way that must have been gratifying to those who were not acquainted with the details of the case. But the occasion was taken to produce what my noble Friend calls a debate of considerable interest—that is to say, a well-prepared debate—a debate conducted by noble Lords who had prepared their speeches, and who were ready to assail, as they did assail, the Government—but a debate ending with no Motion and beginning with no Notice. That, I say, is a very unsatisfactory way of conducting business, and I repeat my objection to such tactics. The noble Earl says that during the last five years of the late Administration, when there were Questions of great interest in regard to their foreign policy, I never unsheathed my sword. Well, I was not aware that, during the five years in which the late Government administered our affairs, Questions of foreign policy did considerably attract their attention. Indeed, I think it was very much regretted by the country that those Questions were generally neglected by the late Government. The most important Question of that kind that probably occurred during their Administration was that relating to the policy which referred the American claims—the Alabama claims—to arbitration. Certainly, I did not unsheath my sword at that time to attack Her Majesty's Government. But when Her Majesty's Government were attacked at a time of considerable peril, and when many of their Friends were not ready to support them, I did then unsheath my sword to defend and uphold a policy which, though I could not approve all its details, I believed to be, on the whole, a wise policy. We heard, as I say, very little of foreign policy during the Administration of the late Government. Those Questions were generally neglected, and we have suffered in consequence; but, on the most important occasion, I was, at least, their humble defender. I think I have now touched upon most of the points comprised in the noble Earl's definition of innuendo. I do not myself wish to speak in the way of innuendo on this matter; and I would say, that if the noble Earl and his Friends do not approve of the policy of Her Majesty's Government, if they think the Convention of June 4th is an "insane Convention"—and I understand they have adopted the policy which that epithet describes—I think it is their duty to ask the opinion of this House and of Parliament on the subject. That is the constitutional mode of proceeding. It is not by little petty criticism—it is not by asking little questions and making long speeches—it is not by calling your Lordships' attention to questions of the greatest importance without giving due notice of an intention of making speeches, and shrinking after making those speeches from the Motions which would test your Lordships' real opinion—it is not, I say, by such methods that I think an Opposition can recommend itself to the confidence of the people of this country.

LORD NAPIER AND ETTRICK said, it was impossible not to deeply regret that the ability and energy displayed in bringing about a settlement of the question that had occupied so much of the attention of Europe had not been applied from the beginning in defending the Treaties which had been attacked. Though he held sentiments on this subject which were not shared by many noble Lords on his side of the House, it certainly was not his intention to defend the whole course of action pursued by Her Majesty's Government. It was not his intention to enter into any analysis of the past; he should content himself with dealing with the two Treaties as they stood at that moment. He was of opinion that the general settlement which had been effected for Turkey in Europe was not one which could be perfectly defended from any point of view. From a Turkish point of view, the concessions made by Her Majesty's Government were too extensive; from a Russian point of view, they were not large enough. The arrangements were too delicate and complex to have much chance of permanency. In his opinion, the European portions of the Treaties were not destined to be practically useful, or of long endurance; but his chief purpose was to call their Lordships' attention to the Convention of the 4th June—that Convention for which Her Majesty's Government stood singly responsible, and respecting which many erroneous impressions had been disseminated. Now, what was the character of that Convention? It bound the Government of the Porte to make reforms in the administration of Asiatic Turkey, and to make them to the satisfaction of Her Majesty's Government. On the other hand, it bound England to defend the Asiatic territory of the Porte in case of necessity. Now, it was contended, in opposition to Her Majesty's Government, that the Porte could not effect those reforms alone, and that England could not assist it to do so without taking the government of Asia Minor into her own hands, which was much to be deprecated. It became important, therefore, to ascertain what was the nature of the reforms which the Porte would be expected to effect in her Asiatic Kingdom. If those reforms were to be of a very extensive, complex, or elaborate character, he should despair of the Porte being able to carry them out, either assisted or unassisted. They had heard a noble Earl on that side of the House, not long since Governor General of India (the Earl of Northbrook) descant on the immense responsibilities which the Porte had undertaken in promising those reforms. The late Governor General of India had spoken of the necessity of establishing a good revenue system, a good judicial system, a good system of popular education, a good system of public works, the creation of an order of intelligent and useful proprietors to stand between the Turkish Government and the people, the reform and re-organization of the Army, which was to be placed under the command of English and other European officers, and the erection of a line of fortresses to secure the country from future Russian attacks. If all these reforms were necessary for the prosperity and happiness of Asia Minor, the task would be indeed difficult, if not impossible; but, as a fact, they could not be reasonably expected from the Government under present circumstances. First, in regard to the Turkish revenue system. That system, he believed, was the only system possible in the state of society now existing in the country. It was almost identical with the revenue system in India, the main feature of which was the exaction of a certain proportion of the produce of the country by the Government from the country. If the matter were fully examined into, and the totality of taxation in Turkey was compared with the weight of taxation which existed in some European States—in Russia and Italy, for instance—it would be found that the Turkish system was not more oppressive than the systems which obtained in the countries he had named. The Turkish system was not in itself oppressive; it was the manner in which was imposed that made it crushing. Again, it was very desirable to establish good laws and a good judicial system; but that was the most difficult task of all. Why, in some parts of British India, which had now been under English influence for so many years, the judicial system was still so corrupt that the humblest subject of Her Majesty was not allowed to be tried before a criminal court in a Native State. God forbid that he should say that it was not necessary that Turkey should have better tribunals; all he asserted was that the reform presented one of those problems which in any country, but especially in a semi-barbarous country, it was very difficult to solve. Then, again, the Turkish Government was to be called upon to immediately establish a good system of popular education. Talk of popular education in Asia Minor!—why, at this moment, there were large provinces of British India which had been subjected to our humane and intelligent rule for half-a-century, in which not 6 or 10 per cent of the population could either read or write. He himself went to India with an ardent and a sincere desire to see a good system of elementary education established in those parts with which he was connected. He was assisted in that desire by a gentleman of the highest ability, who had devoted his whole life to the cause of education; yet he was compelled to leave the country without having accomplished his object. In fact, he was driven to this conclusion—that it was better, on the whole, that the people should remained untaxed and ignorant. Next, Turkey was called upon to promote a good system of public works. Nothing was more desirable and politic; but where was the money to come from? They would not find it in Turkey; it would, indeed, be an insult to the indigence and misery of the country to ask the Government to raise the money. Were Her Majesty's Government, then, to be asked to give guarantees? Were the people of this country to be asked to find the money for making public works on the territory upon which they had already poured millions without any return, or the slightest prospect of return? The noble Earl the late Governor General of India insisted with much earnestness upon the absolute necessity of establishing a class of landed proprietors to stand between the Government and the labouring classes. Far be it from him to undervalue the importance and utility of a class of intelligent, humane, and philanthropic landed proprietors, to any country; it certainly was of the highest importance that such a class should exist in the Dominions of the Sultan; but, unfortunately, those landed proprietors, unless their power was very much limited and controlled, would not be the sort of men that his noble Friend would like to see instituted. The existence of large classes of landed proprietors had not been found beneficial in Oriental countries. In fact, people flourished best in those parts where equality prevailed, and where there were either few or no proprietors at all. He might cite the case of Bulgaria in contrast to that of Bosnia, where the people were oppressed and discontented, and, consequently, given to assassination. Bulgaria enjoyed a very fair share of material prosperity, yet there were no gentlemen in Bulgaria. Once more, it was insisted that Turkey ought to reform and re-organize her Army, placing it under the command of British officers. Now, of all the bad advice which it was possible to offer to the Government of the Sultan, that was the worst. It meant an increase of expenditure where there ought to be a deduction. It was this preposterous expenditure on military and naval purposes that had been the curse and the ruin of Turkey. He could not too strongly deprecate, too, any proposition for committing the Turkish Army to the command of British officers. He trusted that in this matter Her Majesty's Government would exercise great caution and judgment, and that they would abstain from pressing upon the Turkish Government the desirability of inviting foreigners to fill places either of civil or military authority. If the foreigners were not Englishmen, they might expect that they would not respect either the policy or the interests of this country; and, therefore, their introduction into the Government of Turkey would be a serious and dangerous innovation. Her Majesty's Government had no notion of anything of the kind. If we were prematurely and imprudently to urge on a policy of this nature, we should inspire the Porte with the profoundest, most incurable, suspicion of the intentions of our Government, and drive it from our side to seek protection and support from Russia or some other European Power. With reference to the proposal to immediately set to work to fortify Asiatic Turkey and create new ramparts, it seemed to him to be most unreasonable and unnecessary; for, not to speak of the expense such a course would involve, we have given a guarantee, which was the chief defence of Turkey, and would enable her for a time to do without other defences. The necessary remedy for the misfortunes and sufferings of Asia Minor was to his mind very simple. It was one which was enjoyed by the Children of Israel after they had taken possession of Canaan, and after they had become wearied by many struggles and vicissitudes. It was described in the Book of Judges in these words—"And the land had rest 40 years." Asia Minor required rest from the tax-gatherer, from the recruiting officers, from enforced labour; and there was no insuperable difficulty in obtaining this repose for some years. It might be said that rest was a very good thing, but the Turkish Government was incapable of giving it. He did not believe there would be any difficulty in that way, although the condition of the populations of Asia Minor had been an unhappy one, and their history had been darkened by atrocities; still, relatively, that condition had not been so bad as might be supposed. It would be unjust and unreasonable to suppose that the inhabitants of Asia Minor had ever enjoyed the same security for life and property, and the same certainty of justice, as Her Majesty's Indian subjects did; but, in many places, they had enjoyed as large a share of material prosperity as in some parts of India and Russia, and even in some parts of this country. When he visited Asia Minor, he always asked the Consuls what was the condition of the people, and one Consul told him that their condition was middling. The Mussulmans were better off in some particulars, because they did not drink, and the Christians were better off in another sense, because they were not compelled to serve in the Army. If that was the condition of the country, the great thing they wanted was repose, and he did not see why the Turkish Government could not obtain and secure that rest. He saw no reason to fear for the future. In Asia Minor there was no organized political conspiracy, no wild spirits of revolt. The Kurds might come down upon the Nestorians, the Druses upon the Maronites, and the Bedouins upon all who possessed houses; but these were partial, accidental, and controllable evils, and, with a moderate military establishment, the Porte could stop these acts of brigandage and sectarian animosity if they had a mind to do it, and secure for the community a tolerable amount of material peace. The question arose, then, what could the Turkish Government do, and what could Her Majesty's Government do to assist the Porte? He thought it was very undesirable that Her Majesty's Government should force in any new controlling power between the Porte and her subjects; but there was a permissable organization already to hand through which we could act more freely, and that was the Consular body, which, in many cases, had rendered most substantial and valuable services, and which gave great energy and efficiency to its actions, without infringing upon the Sovereignty of the Porte. It might be that we were to engage in more active interventions than hitherto, and that some improvements should be effected in the character of our Consular arrangements; and, if so, he would advise that the Consular body should be strengthened by a large importation of the military element, and that we should look to the officers who had been engaged in political and administrative functions in India. There were many instances in which, in India, Consuls had exercised salutary and beneficial influences, and an example could be found in the House in one who filled an important political office for more than 10 years, as Consul General of Beyrout, during which period it was said that not a mouse could stir in the Lebanon without the knowledge of Colonel Rose. For many years he might be said to have pacified and ruled the greater part of Syria. He created no jealousy whatever, and was equally confided in by the Mussulman authorities and the Christian populations. By improving and extending their Consular establishments, they would do much to procure for Asia Minor that repose, and eventually those reforms of which she stood so much in need. He did not undervalue the responsibility that would attach to our Ambassador at Constantinople. It would be necessary that he should incessantly enforce upon the Turkish Government the duty of fulfilling their promises and effecting legitimate reforms. The other evening he had heard an expression fall from a noble Earl on his side of the House, but who was not now present, which caused him sincere regret. He said that Sir Austen Layard was more of a Turk or a philo-Turk, than the Turks themselves. He was sorry to hear such an expression fall from one of so much authority with reference to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, who had been exposed, in the performance of his arduous and responsible duties, to so much misrepresentation. He had had the advantage of knowing Sir Austen Layard for a very long period. He had recently, by the course of events, been identified with the Turkish Government. It had been his duty to give that Government energetic and invaluable support;

but it must not be supposed that because he had performed his duty in that respect he was insensible to the highest claims of the Christian population. Sir Austen Layard belonged to the school of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe; and he would venture to say that when the proper time came it would be found that there was no more ardent defender, no more enlightened and liberal advocate, of the claims and rights of the Christian subjects of Turkey than the British Ambassador at the Porte. If the task was to be an arduous one for the Ambassador, so also the Foreign Office must bestir itself. It must not be satisfied to hold its hands. It must, for years to come, keep its attention fixed on the question of Asiatic Turkey. He would even go so far as to say that the Government might be obliged to have recourse to some military demonstration, and they did not suppose the reform of Asia Minor could be carried out without some risk of that sort. They remembered the terrible explosion of Turkish fanaticism in the Lebanon, and the French Government did not shrink from the responsibility of sending a large Force to Syria to show that they were not to be trifled with. They amply fulfilled the duty they undertook, and the result was that peace had prevailed ever since. Then it was said that we had guaranteed the Turkish frontier in Asia, and this was objected to on these grounds. This Guarantee, it was said, placed us in a position of permanent antagonism to Russia; in the second place, it imposed on us obligations dangerous, and exactly in case of difficulties arising from other Powers; and, thirdly, it was urged that the Guarantee was not necessary for our own interests. He could not agree with any of those arguments. So far from embroiling us with Russia, he thought it would have quite the opposite effect. From the moment this Guarantee was signed, our relations with Russia would probably be better than they were before. It was only necessary to tell Russia what we wanted, and there would be no disposition to interfere with us. The responsibility we should incur by this Guarantee was only greater because it was single; but we knew what the contingency was, and we could be prepared for it; and his experience of Russia was that she would not come into collision with England, if she knew definitely what England insisted upon. Lord Palmerston's despatches proved that, and he was certain the attitude now adopted by Her Majesty's Government would result in their being on better terms with Russia than before. It was said that by the Convention we had enormously increased our responsibility. But the responsibility was only greater because it was single and more direct; and whereas, formerly, we scarcely knew what it might involve us in, we were now aware what was the contingency which would render it necessary for us to act, and must be prepared for it accordingly. It might be observed that the responsibility extended over so large a range of territory that no wise Government would have incurred it. But there never was a more prudent Administrator in the world than the Earl of Aberdeen, and yet he signed a Treaty by which he engaged the honour of England in defence of the 49th parallel as the boundary of our North American possessions; and if that vast territory, extending across an entire Continent, was defended by anything, it was defended simply by the Guarantee and prestige of England. Nor was the multiplication of such Guarantees necessarily dangerous. His belief was that the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs might go into his cabinet, pull down the map fixed to the wall, and, with his pencil, trace a line across the wilds of Afghanistan or the woods of America; and if that line in any measure expressed the true interests and real resolutions of the British people, it would not be lightly transgressed by any Power. That line might run where no human foot, had ever before trod; but still it would remain inviolate, because it would be protected by the unseen yet irresistible genius of our country's destiny. He trusted that Her Majesty's Government would not be prevented from undertaking responsibility of this nature by the apprehension that it might tend to excite the enmity of foreign Powers. The Guarantee might not be immediately necessary in view of British interests; but it would eventually be so, and it was just as easy to establish it now as at any other time. It might have been better to have given the Guarantee to Afghanistan instead of to Turkey in Asia Minor, yet the road to India in that direction would probably be established at some period or another, and when it was established, the further Russian power was kept from it the better. The Russians were not at present in a condition to endanger our interests in Asia Minor; but still, the whole of that territory had been over and over again traversed by hostile armies; and if Russia were allowed to encroach on the provinces of Asia Minor, the time might come when her attitude would create a feeling of insecurity as to our communications with India. It might be said that it was not possible to defend the Convention of the 4th of June, inasmuch as by it we had not only undertaken a separate responsibility, but left the European concert. Was that objection a well-founded one? Was it true that, having contracted a separate Treaty, we had isolated ourselves from European action? He thought the objection was not well-founded, it being perfectly consistent with previous policy to frame and sign a separate Treaty. What occurred in 1856? In that year there was a general Treaty of adjustment and peace; but Her Majesty's then Government, not being satisfied with its stipulations, negotiated and signed a separate Treaty of Guarantee, with Austria and France, for the protection of the Turkish Empire. On this occasion, Her Majesty's Government had followed, though in a different form, exactly the same course. Having signed a general Treaty of adjustment and peace, they had negotiated a separate Treaty, not with two Powers—because two Powers were not available for their policy—but with Turkey, because that Power was necessary for their policy; and, therefore, he said that this separate Treaty was strictly conformable to precedent. The last objection upon which many persons had founded their opposition to the Convention was that it had been negotiated in secret, and not in communion with other Powers. It had even been stated that it was a departure from the character of British diplomacy. He did not deny that the diplomacy of England was more open than that of other Powers; but it certainly would be very erroneous for one moment to infer from that, that Her Majesty's Government were not entitled to negotiate in secret a Treaty when, as in this transaction, secrecy was expedient. It was not necessary to go far back for an example of an important Treaty negotiated in secret. The first great diplomatic transaction of which he had any knowledge in early life was the Treaty of 1840. How was that Treaty negotiated? In this way. The Liberal Government of that time had exhausted every means of coming to an understanding with France for the pacification of affairs in the East. What did Lord Palmerston do? Did he negotiate a Treaty in public? No. With the greatest energy, he undertook the negotiation of a secret Treaty with the Northern Powers, and the French Ambassador knew nothing about it until Lord Palmerston handed it to him himself across the Table. The negotiation of that Treaty placed Lord Palmerston at the head of European diplomacy, and England, for years, in the van of Europe, just as at the present moment the diplomacy of the noble Earl opposite had done. It was always a painful thing for a person to advocate opinions which were antagonistic with the opinions of the Leaders of the Party to which he was attached by birth and education. He was unable to state exactly how far his opinions were antagonistic with those of the noble Lords who sat on the front Opposition Benches, because he had not heard those opinions expressed with sufficient accuracy. It was even possible that the opinions of the noble Lords did not entirely agree the one with another. But he must admit that he was at variance with that great Leader of his Party in "another place"—a statesman to whom he must always look with the greatest reverence and gratitude, on account of the immense service which, in past times, he had rendered to his Party and to his country. No one regretted more than he did that he was unable to agree with the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman; but the interests which had been brought under discussion in those debates were interests with which his official life in former times had identified him so much, that he did not feel at liberty to subordinate his impressions to those of any other person.

The Marquess of RIPON said, that when he rose to address their Lordships, a short time ago, he had certainly no intention of travelling over the wide field which the noble Lord who had last spoken (Lord Napier and Ettrick) had traversed. He would endeavour to correct some misapprehensions into which the noble Earl the Prime Minister seemed to have fallen, and to point out some forgetfulness to which he had been subject with respect to the course taken in that House on the Eastern Question. The noble Earl complained that although Questions had been addressed to the Government, no Motion had been made nor issue joined. The noble Earl could scarcely have recollected the nature of the Questions which had been put to Her Majesty's Government on the subject when he passed them over so lightly. Those Questions had related to the character and circumstances of the Island of Cyprus, which had recently been taken possession of on the part of Her Majesty. Noble Lords on his side of the House had been anxious to learn from Her Majesty's Government the capabilities of the Island; what was the law under which Her Majesty's subjects and the other inhabitants of the Island —who, he supposed, would remain subject to the Sultan, though under a special form of Administration by Her Majesty —would henceforth live; and on what principle justice was to be administered in the country. There had been, also, Questions which constituted an attempt to obtain from Her Majesty's Government some sort of explanation of the nature and meaning of what was called the Anglo-Turkish Convention, and the circumstances under which it had been negotiated. The noble Lord who had just sat down had given the House his interpretation of that Treaty; but Her Majesty's Government had not, so far as he was aware, condescended to give Parliament any information at all on the subject. The noble Earl observed that a Question was raised the other night by his noble Friend (the Earl of Rosebery). He said—"I forget what the Question was, but it was something about the Memorandum between the noble Marquess the Foreign Secretary and Count Schouvaloff." He was not surprised that the noble Earl should not desire to recollect that discussion, and the able speech of the noble Earl by whom it was introduced. No doubt, the noble Earl and the noble Marquess ran away from the discussion at the earliest possible period, and did not wait to receive the heavy shots fired at them from their own side in the latter part of the evening. The nature of the discussion was surely not unimportant, because it involved the inquiry, whether the manner in which Her Majesty's Government had intended to treat Parliament was frank and open, and whether, if it had not been for the surreptitious disclosure of the Memorandum between the noble Marquess and Count Schouvaloff, the Papers laid upon the Table would have given a complete and honest statement of the course pursued by the Government? The noble Earl seemed to intimate that the Question was brought forward without Notice. He (the Marquess of Ripon) believed, however, that the Notice stood upon the Paper for a considerable number of days. Certainly, the course pursued by those who sat on that side of the House was not one which was not contemplated by the Rules and Practices of the House, because the fact that those Rules and Practices differed from those which prevailed in the House of Commons, showed that it had been found convenient to initiate discussions in their Lordships' House without terminating with a Motion. His experience of their Lordships' House was more extended than that of the noble Earl opposite, and he could only say that he had heard most interesting discussions raised and carried on in that manner. Then the noble Earl, when he was challenged with not having himself followed, when in Opposition, the course which he so kindly recommended to the present Opposition, said—"I could not do that, because no important questions of foreign policy occurred under the late Administration." Well, he was not quite sure whether it was the best test of a foreign policy that it should be very noisy, and bring the country very near the verge of war. He was by no means sure that a foreign policy of which little was heard, but which kept the country at peace, and on good terms with its Allies, was not really the best and soundest foreign policy after all. In point of fact, however, there were a considerable number of important questions, relating to foreign affairs, going on during the period the noble Earl referred to. The noble Earl himself mentioned the question of the Treaty with America. Then there was the Franco-German War; and one of the most important Treaties ever entered into by any Ministry in this country was made by his noble Friend behind him (Earl Granville), for the purpose of maintaining the independence of Belgium. Again, there was the Treaty of 1871, for the revision of the Treaty of 1856. He was not going to find fault with the noble Earl because he did not violently attack the foreign policy of the late Government; but he might remark that the noble Earl, as Leader of the Opposition, did take advantage of many of those occasions to make serious criticisms and complaints, though he did not bring his criticisms and complaints to the test of a division. Of course, every Opposition must be the best judges of the course they ought to pursue; and he was sure that the noble Earl himself would have been the last man in the world, when in Opposition, to have shaped his course in accordance with recommendations emanating from the Treasury Bench. He would now ask their Lordships to allow him, for a few moments, to make some observations on the larger and more important questions which had been touched upon in the speech of the noble Lord behind him. He, for one, very much agreed with the noble Lord in the estimate which he appeared to place on the future results of the Treaty of Berlin. The noble Lord said, that if that Treaty stood alone, it would not be likely to be a very permanent arrangement, and that it was the kind of thing upon which future difficulties might, from time to time, arise. That appeared to him to be also the opinion of the noble Earl opposite; because, in his speech last Saturday, as reported in the morning papers, he said the very same thing. The noble Earl said—

> "If we had made the Treaty of Berlin, and had not made the Anglo-Turkish Convention, we should have been told that there was no permanent security, and that after the lapse of 10 or 11 years these questions might turn up again."

The noble Earl also stated, that if the Government had spoken out, and adopted the course which, he believed, they ought to have taken, the war last year would not have occurred. The truth seemed to be this, that the noble Earl had shrank—he considered most wisely—from involving this country in war for the objects for which we must have fought if we had taken up arms on behalf of Turkey; and, in his opinion, that was the strongest condemnation that could be pronounced on the policy of the Anglo-Turkish Convention. Our vital interests might be attacked in other quarters; "but," said the noble Earl, "on no such ground as that must we withdraw from our obligations in Asia Minor." Whatever the circumstances of the time, the future Governments of England were to be debarred, so far as the noble Earl could debar them, from exercising, on behalf of the country, the discretion which statesmen ought to possess. Furthermore, if the policy of the Anglo-Turkish Convention was a sound policy, it was in itself the strongest possible condemnation of some portions of the Treaty of Berlin. If the noble Earl could bind the future Ministers of this country as he desired to bind them, surely, when he proposed to convert the Asiatic frontier of Turkey into the frontier of this country for military purposes, so far as attack from Russia was concerned, he ought not to have yielded up, in the Treaty of Berlin, the strongholds of that frontier to the enemy he professed to dread? With regard to the complaint which had been made by the noble Lord behind him (Lord Napier and Ettrick) as to the absence of his noble Friend the late Governor General of India (the Earl of Northbrook) and other Peers on the present occasion, he would remark that it was not usual in their Lordships' House to refer at great length to speeches delivered in a previous debate, and that noble Lords could not be expected to be present when reference was being made to their conduct of which they had received no warning. On the general question his noble Friend's (the Earl of Northbrook's) argument appeared to be this—Her Majesty's Government had undertaken, by this Anglo-Turkish Convention, special obligations for the good government of Asiatic Turkey, and it would be impossible to carry out those obligations without providing a sound system of finance, and education, of public works, and a satisfactory administration of justice. But it was said Turkey could not provide anything of the kind. No doubt, that was so; but it was just because Turkey could not do anything of the kind, and just because England had undertaken to accomplish such a task, through the Turkish Government—a task which was almost beyond human power—that he, for one, objected to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. There was one feature of that Convention which had not been much alluded to, but which he thought well worthy of consideration. It was this—the principle upon which it was founded was, in reality, a reversal of one of the main principles of the Treaty of 1856, which was the substitution of the collective Protectorate of Europe for the individual Protectorate of any particular country. In the Treaty of Berlin there were certain collective engagements on the part of the Powers, of which he would only say that they were very good indeed on paper, but that their value depended entirely upon the mode in which they were carried out, and that they did not seem to him to go very much beyond the engagements made in 1856. But in Asiatic Turkey, by virtue of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, England had undertaken a special and individual responsibility of a nature so serious, that to fail in it would be a disgrace and a shame to us. That responsibility was one which it did not seem wise or sound policy for this country to undertake. He would not venture to pronounce the Anglo-Turkish Convention an "insane Convention," because that was a phrase which did not seem to have secured the approbation of the noble Earl (the Earl of Beaconsfield); but he would say it was one of the most dangerous and unwise engagements into which any Minister of this country had ever entered. The noble Earl said he did not know what were the views taken by the Opposition as to the course to be pursued in regard to Asiatic Turkey. Well, it was not the business of the Opposition to provide measures of detail in regard to a question upon which they had such a very limited amount of information as the present one. At the same time, the information they possessed seemed to him sufficient to show that the engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government were of the character which he had ventured to state. If, however, the intentions of Her Majesty's Government had been misapprehended in this matter, the explanation was to be found in the persistency with which Her Majesty's Government had kept Parliament in the dark with regard to the whole scope of their policy, as it affected the relations of this country with other Powers. It was this want of frankness on the part of the Government which had all along constituted the difficulty in the discussion of this subject, and which increased the conviction, looking to the whole scope of the engagements into which this country had entered, apart from the other countries of Europe, that Her Majesty's Government had once more departed from that European concert, which, if they had maintained it, would have prevented all these troubles.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the noble Marquess who has just sat down has, I think, rather misapprehended the nature of the complaint we have ventured to make with respect to the conduct of Business by Her Majesty's Opposition in this House. We complain that they have departed, in two respects, from what we have always considered to be the legitimate mode of conducting Business, and from the traditions of other Oppositions. Formerly, it used to be regarded as the duty of the Opposition, whenever they entertained a strong objection to the policy of the Government upon any great and capital question, to lay their objections before Parliament, and put them to the test of a division. This has always been done on all great questions where the Opposition of the day has challenged the policy of the Government of the day. I will speak only of what is within my own recollection. I remember two capital questions upon which the Opposition differed from, and condemned strongly, the policy of the Government. There was, first, the Chinese Question. That was condemned by us very strongly; but did we satisfy ourselves, in either House, by putting small Questions night after night, and getting up desultory discussions? On the contrary, a formal Motion of Condemnation was moved—and a formal division was taken in both Houses—and, if I remember rightly, we were defeated in one, but were successful in the other. The next great question upon which we differed deeply from the Government of the day was the Danish Question—a question of prime European importance. No doubt, there were during the whole of the Session preceding the ultimate negotiations occasional discussions. When, however, we were in a position to challenge the policy of the Government, a formal Motion was made, and a division taken, and in that case, again, we were successful in one House and unsuccessful in the other. If you will go further back, you will find that the run of precedents is unmistakable; and there can be no doubt that the precedents agree with that which is the rational and intelligible course to take—namely, that this House should, like the other, be allowed to express its views in a formal manner, and have the result recorded on the Journals of the House. But that is not our only complaint. We complain that these desultory discussions invert the usual order of proceeding. The strange fate seems to pursue them, that the discussions never have any logical connection with the Notice by which they are introduced. The first Notice given was that by the noble Earl (the Earl of Camperdown), whom I do not see in the House. The noble Earl brought under our notice a very limited question—whether the Government would lay on the Table details of the financial arrangements with the Turkish Government about Cyprus?—a question about as small as it is possible to conceive; and upon that question was raised the whole matter of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, the question whether slavery existed in Cyprus, and what we intended to do with it, and the whole question of the future government of Cyprus, and the powers now vested in the Government of the Queen. Then the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) called attention to a certain document which had been surreptitiously obtained from the Foreign Office; and I am bound to say, in his own remarks, he did not wander much beyond the narrow record he had prescribed to himself. But what did we have? We had the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Ripon), and the noble Earl who recently left the Cabinet (the Earl of Carnarvon), making speeches which had come too late for the debate on the first night after the return of the Plenipotentiaries, when the whole question of the Congress of Berlin was discussed. The same fate has pursued them now. The noble Lord (Lord Campbell) has put down a large Notice on the Paper which would cover a debate of great extent, and we are treated to a lengthened criticism on what took place at a dinner at Knightsbridge. We prefer that the time-honoured practice should be pursued. If noble Lords opposite entertain deep objections to the policy that has been pursued—if they pronounce it unsound—if they think it worthy of the great efforts made in the other House—we think that this House ought also to be allowed the opportunity of recording on the Journals its own judgment on the policy pursued. But if the Opposition will not take this course—if they persist in bringing forward this succession of petty debates—at least, we have a right to ask that the Notices on the Paper shall give some indication of the speeches which are to be made. But, my Lords, the speeches we have heard to-night have been devoted to a criticism of something beyond what took place in the House; and since it pleases the noble Marquess who has just sat down (the Marquess of Ripon) to answer speeches not made here, but at the dinner at Knightsbridge—where I am afraid there was no chance of finding him—I regret he did not study more carefully the documents he proposed to answer. As I understand my noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Beaconsfield), the ground on which he asserted that we have not increased our responsibility by the Anglo-Turkish Convention was this—that the policy of preventing Russia from acquiring an influence would diminish instead of increase our responsibilities.

The Marquess of RIPON interposed a remark which was not heard.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I regret if I misrepresent the noble Marquess; but I repeat my impression is that the charge he brought against my noble Friend behind me was that he had defended the Convention on the ground that it did not increase our responsibilities but would diminish them.

The Marquess of RIPON: What I did say was this. I understood the noble Earl opposite to say that he admitted the Berlin Treaty alone would not be of a permanent character, and that, therefore, it was necessary to make up for its defects. That was the part of the speech to which I referred; and I stated that the policy of the Government had increased our responsibility; but I did not say this with reference to the speech of the noble Earl on Saturday.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: Then it comes to this—that we have increased our responsibility. Our ground is simply this—whatever happens, whatever Party be in power, we feel convinced, knowing what the spirit of the people of the country is, that they will never tolerate that Russian influence shall be supreme in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris. We take that as a firm point of departure, and we challenge you to contradict it if you think we are wrong by an appeal to Parliament. But, if that is true, so far from increasing the responsibilities of England, we have diminished them by announcing beforehand to Russia the policy which, in all cases, the nation is determined to pursue, and we illustrate the value of that precaution by referring to all that was lost in the Crimean War by want of similar frankness. It has been established again and again, and on the best authority—on the authority of the Emperor Nicholas himself—that if he had known what the policy of the English Government was—what the English people would definitely oppose—he never would have taken those steps from which he could not retreat, and he never would have pledged his honour to the pursuit of a disastrous war. We desire to save the Russian Government in the future from that danger, and therefore we have placed upon public record, in the most solemn and unmistakable manner, the policy which we believe the English people are determined to pursue; and in so doing I think we have given character and plainness and frankness to English diplomacy which, perhaps, in recent years, it was in danger of losing. Those misty and shadowy guarantees which bound you to everything in theory, and which turned out, in practice, to bind you to nothing, were anything but honourable to the character of European diplomacy. There was, for instance, the Tripartite Treaty, which engaged in the strongest language possible the Governments of Austria, France, and England, to make it a *casus belli* if any of the provisions of the Treaty of Paris were broken. But when the hour of trial came, and the provisions of the Treaty of Paris were broken, it was found that the Guarantee was collective; and that, therefore, it was not binding on those who made it. I think it is time that the practice of making pledges of this kind was abandoned in the diplomacy of Europe. We claim, at all events, that we have made a pledge which will be easily understood by those whom it concerns; and therefore it is that I am not alarmed even by the condemnation passed on it by the noble Lord, when he declares that we have departed from the "European concert." What will the future historian think of the "European concert" when he comes to record what that concert has promised and what it performed? The "European concert" in 1856 was to preserve the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire; and certainly a more imposing machinery could not be devised. But 20 years have passed, and not one member of the "European concert" has lifted its hand in defence of the integrity of the Turkish Empire. I am not complaining of this result, but of pledges being made, which must have misled Turkey, on the one hand, and taught Russia, on the other, to despise them. I think it is better that we should come to a simpler form of engagement, in which, only two Powers being mixed up, there can be no doubt as to the pledges being fulfilled. It is, perhaps, characteristic of these debates and Motions that we should, in our speeches, have wholly forgotten the Motion of the noble Lord who introduced it. There was much in the noble Lord's speech which was complimentary to the Government; therefore, I need not notice it; but there is one observation which I should not pass over without remark. The noble Lord seemed to be under the impression that the Russian occupation would last over nine months, and he said we were guilty of great credulity in thinking that it would terminate in that time. It is impossible to compete with prophecy, and I will not put my prophecy against that of the noble Lord. But if he will examine the Protocols he will find that the subject of the evacuation of Turkey in Europe was one to which the Government of Austria attached intense importance; and if England and Austria agree that the Russian Army shall not remain there, the Russian Army must retreat. Therefore, I think the noble Lord need be under no apprehension in that respect. I have not the faintest suspicion that Russia desires in any way to depart from the engagement so solemnly made. On the contrary, the Russian Plenipotentiaries came forward at the end of the Congress, and offered to bind themselves by engagements more than ordinarily solemn that, on their part, the Treaty would be observed; but we did not think it desirable to depart from the ordinary diplomatic practice of Treaties in this respect, and most of the Powers declined to entertain the proposal Russia made. There was nothing in all that passed at the Congress Table, there is nothing in the present aspect of the diplomatic world, which justifies the slightest suspicion that Russia desires in any way to depart from the engagements into which she has solemnly and frankly entered.

VISCOUNT CARDWELL: My Lords, we have arrived at an hour at which your Lordships do not desire to continue the debate, and I have not risen to do more than notice one or two remarks that have fallen from the noble Marquess who has just addressed you. He complains that we depart from the usual practice in not putting down a Motion on the subject, and he tells us what his side did when they differed from the late Government on questions of foreign policy. He did not tell us that his Friends knew perfectly well that they had a very considerable majority in the House at the time they so confidently appealed to it.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: We were beaten on the Chinese Question.

VISCOUNT CARDWELL: But you did not expect to be; so that my noble Friend's answer is not quite so successful as he expected it to be. We were told by the Prime Minister earlier in the evening that our objections were very small; but, in spite of the view which the Government profess to take of them, we fail to obtain any information. The first Question raised by my noble Friend (the Earl of Rosebery) the other night related to the financial position of the Island of Cyprus; but though the Question was so small, we failed to obtain an answer. A similar result attended an effort to obtain information about the harbours and resources of Cyprus, as affecting our own liabilities. Next, a Question was asked as to the future laws under which Cyprus would be placed; objection was taken that no Notice had been given of the Question. But it was one which had been asked on a former occasion, when no answer whatever was given to it. Is it inconsistent with our practice to ask Questions about that which we want to know? I have been glad to hear from the noble Earl opposite one definite statement — that this Anglo-Turkish Convention is a certainty and reality; and that, being a Guarantee given by ourselves, and not mixed up with foreign countries, it is one that will be carried into effect. To enable us to form a judgment, we wanted an answer to the Question whether it was to be a reality or not? We were anxious to know whether it was to realize the picture we have read of what is to happen, when the Turkish Government is reformed and purified, in that most fertile, most classical, and most interesting portion of the world? But these Questions were deemed not worth answering at all. Were the answers consistent with the Notices given and with the expectations we might justly entertain? The other House, presumably, will have to ask some Questions as to the bearing of these arrangements on the responsibility of the taxpayers of the country, and whether it will find the money or accept the new duties devolved by the Convention on the country? Surely, we are within our right in endeavouring to obtain clear views upon the subject? Are we to sit still and say nothing? Are we to propose Motions of Censure, condemning things of which we are as yet only imperfectly informed? Our duty is exactly that which we have discharged. It is very kind of the noble Earl the Prime Minister to take so much pains to impress upon us, line upon line, precept by precept, what it is our duty to do, and how we are to conduct our own affairs. I am not surprised at it; he has educated his own Party with infinite skill and success; but if he finds us less amenable to his instructions, he cannot be astonished or disappointed.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: It is somewhat singular that that which my noble Friend does not accept as the duty of this House he affirms to be the duty of the other, and that the deficiency of information which he pleads as an excuse for inaction in this House does not deter the Leader of the Opposition in the other from moving a Resolution to condemn the Government; and that he is at this very moment, despite his want of information, engaged in thoroughly condemning every portion of our policy. It seems to be an unsatisfactory way of dealing with questions that affect the Government of the country, that those who may in their turn be called upon to administer affairs should be so doubtful as to the course that they would take on a great question that they confine themselves to criticism, and carefully refuse to commit themselves to anything they would do under any circumstances in which they might be placed. There is every readiness to take advantage of all the condemnation they can bring forward in the way they have done it in this House without showing the country in any respect what it is they think ought to be done at this time, and how far the country ought to be advised to go in order to get rid of the engagements which have been entered into. They will not say whether they will support them hereafter or they will not; but they throw out insinuations of every kind which favour the supposition that this is not a sincere movement on the part of this country, and that no reliance can be placed on this country fulfilling its engagements. We take a different view; we enter into these engagements meaning to fulfil them. We have no idea of making Asia Minor a Garden of Eden or a Paradise; no such expressions have been used by Members of the Government. We are too well aware of the condition of things that has existed there—at the same time, we are not unwilling to do what we can to bring about a better. A gradual and a slow process it may be, but it is one which will promote the interests not only of England, but of the world; for it is well known that if that country were occupied by the great Power to which allusion has been so often made, that would materially affect the interests of this country and the destinies of the world. It was under these circumstances that my noble Friends undertook to enter into that Convention. They did it with the full assent of the Cabinet, and, having done so, they think it a poor kind of criticism which they are called upon to meet night after night —a carping criticism, which, instead of making definite charges against them or the document they have signed on behalf of the Government, indulges in vague insinuations. Nothing is done like to what was done in the cases of China and of Denmark, when we affirmed our views of the policy of the Government of the day. We have nothing now but criticism. Considering, also, the ingenious personal insinuations thrown out against some of us on more than one occasion, I am obliged to conclude that the only reason why the Opposition do not venture to propose a distinct Resolution is the consciousness that they will have, in so doing, the support, not of a majority, but of a very small minority, either of this House or of the country.

LORD ABERDARE: My Lords, we have heard many charges in this and the other House as to the policy that was pursued by the late Government; but I am delighted to hear from noble Lords opposite that, although questions of the greatest importance in foreign policy were dealt with during the five years, no occasion arose upon which it was possible to found any clear and definite charge against the foreign policy of the Government.

LORD HAMMOND pressed for an explanation of how the occupation of Cyprus would enable the Government to defend the Turkish frontier in Asia Minor and to watch over the internal administration of that country?

LORD CAMPBELL, in reply, said, he understood that the Government acquiesced in his Motion for the Correspondence.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that no Notice having been given of the noble Lord's Motion, it was contrary to the Rules of the House to entertain it.

LORD CAMPBELL continued, that on points of Order he was always ready to enhance the authority of the noble and learned Lord upon the Woolsack, so much wanted in the House; but might still be permitted to make one observation on what had fallen from the noble Marquess the Secretary of State. He concurred with the noble Marquess that Austria and Great Britain, if united, would suffice to close the Russian occupation; but he could not forget that the whole history of the transactions which had so long engaged them prohibited reliance upon Austria as a controlling Power over Russia, in any policy the latter might be inclined to adopt.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, that Papers of the kind indicated in the noble Lord's Motion were on the point of being given to the House.

LORD CAMPBELL said, that in that case the object of the Motion was attained.

## POOR LAW—THE BOARDING-OUT SYSTEM.—QUESTION.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether the Local

Government Board have issued any fresh instructions or regulations with reference to the boarding-out of pauper children since the statement of the Lord President of the Council on that subject on the 5th of July, 1877?

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK replied, that two classes of pauper children were boarded out—those boarded out within the Union, and those outside the Union. The cases which had given rise to the noble Lord's Question were of two children who had been boarded within the Union, and they had undoubtedly been subjected to gross neglect. Since then—in September last—rules had been made with regard to pauper children boarded within the Union, which will, it is hoped, work very satisfactorily. In these rules it was laid down that the medical officer should report on the sanitary state of the house where it was proposed children should be boarded, and that not more than two children should be boarded together unless they belonged to the same family. The children were to be brought up as members of the family where they were boarded. The boarding-house was to be within two miles of a school; and the children were to be placed in families of the same religious opinions as their parents. The relieving officer was to pay the money weekly, and at the house, so that he would have the children continually under his eye; the medical officer was to visit them once a fortnight. Each case was to be reported to the Board of Guardians at the end of every quarter, and a general return was to be made annually. Two thousand five hundred children were now boarded out within Unions; outside the Unions the number of children boarded out were 423.

## SCIENCE AND ART—HISTORICAL GALLERY OF CASTS.—QUESTION.

### OBSERVATIONS.

EARL COWPER asked, Whether, considering the admitted importance of establishing a Historical Gallery of Casts from the Antique, according to the plan proposed by Mr. Walter Perry, the First Lord of the Treasury will take immediate steps to have a Report prepared which could be laid before Parliament, on the scope and limits of the collection, how it could be obtained, and the probable cost? The matter was one as to the desirability of which there could be no question; and he was encouraged to put forward the subject, because two additional Memorials had been presented since he had last brought forward this subject. One was from the heads of the British Museum and the National Gallery; the other was signed by the Head Masters of Public Schools, and had attached to it the names of 26 gentlemen eminent in their profession. What he wanted was in the nature of a preliminary inquiry, which he believed there would be no difficulty in making. With regard to a site, there were rooms available at South Kensington quite large enough for a beginning. A grant of £10,000 for the purpose of establishing the collection would be all that would be required. The Commissioners of the Exhibition of 1851 were favourable to the design. The authorities of South Kensington were ready to perform their part, and the chief authorities of the Museums in this country and abroad were ready to give assistance. He hoped he should receive a favourable answer from the noble Earl at the head of the Government, who, it was well known, took much interest in the promotion of the arts.

EARL GRANVILLE supported the application of the noble Earl, and hoped the noble Earl at the head of the Government would give his consent to the preliminary inquiry—which was all that was asked at the present moment.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD said, it was unnecessary to impress on Her Majesty's Government the interest and importance of the object which the noble Earl had in view. There had never been any hesitation on the part of the Government upon that head. Nor did he think there had been any difficulty on the score of expense, although he did not pledge himself on that point. He quite agreed that this was a matter in which many took a great deal of interest. The difficulty first felt by the Government arose in this way. There were at this moment many Collections and Museums urging their claims on the Government either for pecuniary assistance or for having sites conferred on them. Both these claims were difficult to deal with. The expenditure for an object such as that brought forward by the noble Earl might not be excessive; but a precedent once set would influence other bodies to put forward their claims; and, therefore, they must be considered together by the Treasury in estimating the probable increase of expenditure. The matter was not so easily settled. There was another cause of delay. He had, perhaps imprudently, personally undertaken the attention of this business, and shortly afterwards he was very unexpectedly obliged to go abroad, and so it was neglected. He could say little more, therefore, than he said at the end of March; for, although several gentleman had been applied to to form a Treasury Committee, still nothing had been brought to a head, and the question was in the same state as at the end of March. Having candidly confessed his backsliding so far, he assured his noble Friends opposite it was a question which he fully appreciated, and he hoped during the Recess they should bring it to a satisfactory conclusion.

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Monday, 29th July,* 1878.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report—* Indian Native Troops (Transport and Employment Abroad) [No. 321].

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee—* Consolidated Fund (£14,500,000).

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee*—Elders Widows' Fund [Deficiencies]*.

*Ordered—First Reading*—Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices* [281]; Disqualification of Medical Relief Removal* [282].

*Second Reading*—Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) [277]; Arranmore Polling District (Ireland)* [270].

*Committee*—Elders Widows' Fund* [226]—R.P.

*Committee—Report*—Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) [157]; Prison Authorities Act (1874) Amendment* [246]; Commons Regulation (Expenses)* [273].

*Third Reading*—Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers)* [268], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn*—Ancient Monuments (*re-comm.*)* [209].

## *QUESTIONS.*

### THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN—THESSALY.—QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any complaints have been made to Her Majesty's Government to the effect that during the sitting of the Congress Consul Blunt suggested to the Turks to get up a Petition in Thessaly in favour of the establishment of an autonomous province under the protectorate of England; and, if so, whether Mr. Blunt has been asked to explain his conduct?

MR. BOURKE: No, Sir; no such complaints have been made at the Foreign Office, and no such proceedings on the part of Mr. Blunt have been reported to the Foreign Office.

### THE JUDICATURE ACT—RULE I., ORDER 36—SURREY ASSIZES.

QUESTION.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware that at the commencement of the present Guildford Assizes the senior judge made the announcement that, notwithstanding the terms of Rule I., Order 36, under the Judicature Act, he should only try causes which had arisen in Surrey; that in consequence of such announcement several cases were struck out, including a case where a judge of the Supreme Court at chambers had changed the venue from another county to Surrey; and, whether the Government is prepared to take steps to prevent the serious consequences to suitors arising from the course taken by the judge?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he sent the Question of the hon. Member to the Lord Chief Baron, who was senior Judge at the Surrey Assizes. The learned Chief Baron, in reply, said the learned Judges who had held Assizes in Surrey since the new distribution of circuits throughout England had found it necessary to try no causes in Surrey other than those in which the cause of action arose in the county, or in which the parties and their witnesses were resident in the county. The Lord Chief

Justice and Lord Coleridge had adopted this principle, and the main reason was that a great number of causes—sometime 150 or 200—were brought to the Assizes, the parties to which were strangers to the county, and often came from distant parts of the country, and even from Scotland; consequently, the real business of the county was greatly delayed. He (Mr. Assheton Cross) presumed that his proper course would be to send the letter to the Lord Chancellor, in order that the letter might be brought under his notice.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, he should on that day week renew his Question, and ask, Whether Her Majesty's Government intended to take any steps in order to prevent Her Majesty's Judges placing themselves above the law?

## ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869—TIMBERSCOMBE SCHOOL SCHEME.

### QUESTION.

Mr. COURTNEY asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether it was not provided by the forty-eighth section of the Timberscombe School Scheme, approved by the Queen in Council on the 12th August 1876, that

> "no boy or girl shall, by reason of any exemption from attending prayer or religious worship, or from any lesson or series of lessons on a religious subject, be deprived of any advantage or emolument under the Foundation to which he or she would otherwise have been entitled;"

whether he is aware that, under the seventh clause of a Scheme of competitive examinations for Exhibitions drawn up by the Governors of the said School, it is provided that the examination shall include "Group IV. of the diocesan system in religious subjects," *i. e.* the creeds and catechisms of the Church of England; and, if he proposes to take any steps to protect children not attending religious instruction from the loss of advantage they suffer in the examinations for Exhibitions?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, my attention has been directed to this case, and after looking at the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, and the Timberscombe School Scheme, I find that the only persons having jurisdiction in the case are the Charity Commissioners, whose decision is final; and they are not of opinion that the regulations for the examination violate the School Scheme. I should add that this school is a Church of England foundation, and by Section 19 of the Endowed Schools Act is specially excepted from preceding clauses relating to religious instruction.

## MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACTS—LEGISLATION.—QUESTION.

Mr. STEVENSON asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether he can hold out any prospect on the part of the Government of introducing next Session a Bill for the amendment of the Acts relating to municipal corporations, as he has been unable this Session to carry out his intention of doing so, which he announced on the 10th of August last year, in which Bill he hoped to include provisions for the readjustment of wards and councillors in boroughs, with a view of correcting anomalies in the representation arising from changes in the population and rateable value of existing wards?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker): Sir, when on the 10th of August last year I made some observations to which the hon. Member refers, but which he does not in his Question quite accurately describe, I had been informed that a Bill to amend the Municipal Corporations Acts would be introduced by the Government this Session, and I expressed an opinion that the provisions relating to the adjustment of wards, which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick (Mr. Arthur Pell) was then pressing, would find a more appropriate place in such Bill than in the one which was then under my charge. The Government measure I alluded to has been introduced by my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury, and, I believe, is now in Committee. I had no other Bill in contemplation when I spoke.

## CRIMINAL LAW—VACCINATION PROSECUTIONS—PRISON DISCIPLINE.

### QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he has had his attention called to the treatment of Thomas Bertram, who was sentenced at Sunderland, on the 14th June, to fourteen days' imprisonment for the non-vaccination of his child,

> "who was sent to Durham Gaol handcuffed with ordinary criminals, and whilst there his daily diet consisted of two pints of gruel and one pound of bread; that he was denied the use of a mattress on which to sleep, and that his cell door was kept continually locked with the exception of three quarters of an hour twice a-day while out for exercise;"

and, if he intends making any alterations in the existing prison regulations?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that this question did not rest with the Secretary of State. The whole thing turned upon the warrant of commitment. He was in hopes that by the passing of the Summary Jurisdiction Bill a great part of the evil referred to might have been prevented; but, unfortunately, it had not been possible to get that measure passed this Session. He hoped to re-introduce that measure at the very earliest period of next Session, in order that a great part of the inconvenience alluded to might be obviated. He thought that the unregulated use of handcuffs was a matter deeply to be regretted, and he called the attention of the mayor to this matter, and he (the mayor) stated that he would bring the matter before the bench. He (Mr. Assheton Cross) had expressed his opinion as strongly as he could against the indiscreet use of handcuffs.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION — TREATY OF BERLIN—THE TURKISH INDEMNITY.—QUESTION.

MR. LAING asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether there is anything in the Treaty of Berlin, or in the engagements taken by Russia at the Congress, by which the indemnity to be paid by Turkey to Russia is postponed to other debts of the Turkish Government which had no special hypothecations, contrary to the general rule that the debts of a State have no priority, inter se, apart from special hypothecations?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, there is nothing in the Treaty of Berlin that bears upon this matter; but in the 11th Protocol it will be found that there were some communications that passed between the Plenipotentiaries. I will especially call the hon. Gentleman's attention to what passed between Count Corti and Count Schouvaloff. Count Corti quotes the words of Count Schouvaloff declaring that if the indemnity of 300,000,000 of roubles be affirmed by a vote of the Congress, this sum would enjoy no preferential claims over the loans guaranteed by France and England. His Excellency remarks that he thinks there are other loans not guaranteed, and he thinks he may believe that the Russian declaration extends to all the other loans of Turkey. Count Schouvaloff says that he has not examined this difficulty; but he states generally that Russia proposes to respect the legality of every anterior loan. Prince Gortschakoff remarks that the war indemnity would not affect the interests of the creditors of the Porte. I do not pretend to put an interpretation upon nice questions of international law; but these are points which are material to the Question of my hon. Friend.

## ARMY — THE AUXILIARY FORCES — YEOMANRY ADJUTANTS.—QUESTION.

MR. STARKIE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Adjutants of Yeomanry, appointed under the old regulations, are to be granted the same steps in promotion of a Majority as the Adjutants of Militia appointed under the old regulations, and holding their appointments permanently, the same as Adjutants of Yeomanry?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, that the question was at present under the consideration of the Committee appointed to consider the matter, and he should prefer waiting until the Report of that Committee was received before he made any statement on the subject.

## POOR LAW (IRELAND)—UNION WORKHOUSES.—QUESTION.

MR. MACARTNEY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Report of the Commission appointed last year to inquire as to the advisability of the amalgamation of union workhouses in Ireland will be presented to the House before the Prorogation of Parliament?

MR. J. LOWTHER, in reply, said, that the Report would not be presented to Parliament this Session, because it was not expected that the Commission would have concluded its labours before September.

## PUBLIC BUSINESS—THE MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—QUESTIONS.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, at this advanced period of the Session, it is the intention of the Government to proceed with a measure involving so many important interests as the Medical Act Amendment Bill?

MR. A. MILLS asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed this Session with the Medical Act Amendment Bill, now standing for Second Reading on the 5th day of August, against which stage six Notices have been placed on the Order Book, together with three pages of Amendments in the event of the House going into Committee on the Bill?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, in consequence of the opposition by certain Members to this Bill, its chances of becoming law this year daily diminish. My Amendments were put upon the Notice Paper to make clear to the opponents of the Bill the course we intended to take, in the hope that their opposition would be then removed; and until I know the effect of my Amendments, I am unable to give a definite answer as to the fate of the Bill this Session.

## NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD." QUESTION.

MR. M. BROOKS asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If his attention has been called to the losses of drift nets and other tackle suffered by owners of fishing craft in the Bay of Dublin owing to the standing rigging and wreck of H.M.S. "Vanguard;" and, if he will inform the House of the measures taken for the removal of the said wreck?

MR. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that he was not aware that fishermen had lost their nets owing to the wreck of the *Vanguard*, and if they had done so he was afraid it must be due to some want of care on their own part. He was sorry to say that it was not in the power of the Admiralty to take any steps in the matter until the 31st of October. The contractor had undertaken to raise the ship by that date, and until he fulfilled or abandoned his undertaking, it would not be possible for the Admiralty to interfere with the ship.

## SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1859—THE CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT. — QUESTION.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the answer given by him to a question on June 27th, that in the scheme for the reorganisation of the Customs Department the ordinary terms of retirement under the Superannuation Act of 1859 will be offered, applies to the outdoor as well as the indoor department of the Customs?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in reply, said, that his answer of the 27th of June applied both to the out-door and the in-door Departmentsof the Customs.

## ARMY—DISMISSAL OF THE RESERVES. QUESTION.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in the probable event of the Reserve men being shortly sent to their homes, the Government, having in view such effect on the labour market, would consider the propriety of not dismissing them all suddenly or simultaneously?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, the difficulty referred to by the hon. Baronet had been very carefully considered by the War Department, and they had decided to discharge the men some time before the expiration of their engagements, so that their discharge would be spread over a period of something like a fortnight. Perhaps he might be allowed to add that, in consequence of communications which he had caused to be made to the Inspector General of Fortifications, instructions were given to ascertain if the Government contractors would find, as far as possible, work for the men on the operations in which they were engaged. In some cases this had been done, and notification had been given to the men that they might find employment.

## COAL MINES—THE HAYDOCK EXPLOSION.—QUESTION.

MR. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the Report of the Inquiry into the cause of the Haydock Explosion is likely to be laid upon the Table of the House; and, whether it will be circulated among Members?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that the Report referred to had not yet been received; but that as soon as it was it would be laid upon the Table in due course.

Mr. MACDONALD gave Notice, that on going into Committee of Supply on an early day he should call attention to the subject, and should move a Resolution.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS hoped that the hon. Member would not move a Resolution on the subject until he had seen the Report of the gentleman who was specially sent to investigate the question.

## ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—MILITIA COLONELS—QUESTION.

Mr. HAYTER asked the Secretary of State for War, with reference to his reply on the 25th of July, that in the Militia the regulations as to the retirement of officers at 60 years of age, unless specially recommended for five years' extension, were strictly enforced, what course he proposes to pursue with regard to the officers commanding the Bedford and 2nd Stafford Militia who have attained the ages of 77 and 70 respectively; and, whether he is of opinion that sufficient information as to the ages of Militia officers and their consequent retirement to ensure a proper flow of promotion, is at present at the disposal of the War Office?

Colonel STANLEY, in reply, said, perhaps the hon. Member would allow him to answer his Question generally and not particularly in reference to the cases of certain officers who were Members of that House. The rule which he had adopted in all cases was the one which he understood, from consultation with the Commander-in-Chief and the Inspector General of the Auxiliary Forces, was to be generally acted upon—namely, that when an officer attained the age of 60 he should, as a rule, retire from the active command of a regiment, his commission then being an honorary one; but that, in certain exceptional circumstances, he should be permitted to retain his command for another five years.

## TREATY OF BERLIN—BULGARIA.

### QUESTION.

Mr. OTWAY: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question of which I have given him private Notice, with reference to a discrepancy in the French and English versions of the Treaty of Berlin. I wish to know, Whether the elaboration of the organic law of Bulgaria is to precede the election of a Prince, according to the French version, or whether the Prince is to be elected before the organic law is elaborated, as is stated in the English version?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, the French version of the Treaty is correct—that is, the organic law precedes the election of a Prince. I would take this opportunity of expressing my regret to the House that I find that there are a good number of inaccuracies in the translation of the Treaty, and I can only say that these inaccuracies are to be excused by the fact that we were most anxious that not one moment should be lost in presenting the Paper to the House. Beyond causing inconvenience to hon. Members, those inaccuracies are of no importance, and they will be rectified before the ratification of the Treaty.

## PUBLIC BUSINESS—THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he had asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer two or three times when the Supplementary Estimates would be laid upon the Table, and when he would make his statement in relation to them? He should be obliged if the right hon. Gentleman would give the House that information now.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The Supplementary Estimates will be laid upon the Table this evening, and I hope to be able to take them on Monday next, provided the course of Public Business will enable me to do so.

---

*Ordered*, That the Orders of the Day subsequent to the Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) Bill be postponed until after the Notice of Motion of the Marquess of Hartington relating to Eastern Affairs.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

---

### DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE (ESTABLISHMENT) BILL—[Bill 277.]

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. MACDONALD said, it had been his intention to divide the House on the question; but he had no wish to stand between the House and the debate on Eastern affairs, which was then about to come on. He would not, therefore, carry out his original intention; but he must say he entered his strongest protest against the measure.

Mr. BURT fully approved of the course taken by the hon. Member for Stafford. He also would like to make a few remarks upon the subject; but he thought he should best consult the convenience of the House by reserving them until the third reading of the Bill.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

## *MOTIONS.*

---

### EASTERN AFFAIRS.—RESOLUTION.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON, in rising to move the following Resolutions:—

"That, whilst this House has learned with satisfaction that the troubles which have arisen in the East of Europe have been terminated by the Treaty of Berlin without a further recourse to arms, and rejoices in the extension of the liberty and self-government of some of the populations of European Turkey, this House regrets:—

"That it has not been found practicable to deal in a satisfactory manner with the claims of the Kingdom of Greece, and of the Greek subjects of the Porte:

"That by the assumption under the Anglo-Turkish Convention of a sole guarantee of the integrity of the remaining territories of Turkey in Asia, the Military liabilities of this Country have been unnecessarily extended:

"That the undefined engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the better administration of those provinces have imposed heavy responsibilities on the State, whilst no sufficient means have been indicated for securing their fulfilment:

"And that such engagements have been entered into, and responsibilities incurred, without the previous knowledge of Parliament;"

said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the Papers which have been recently laid before us on the subject of Eastern affairs, to the Convention concluded between the Governments of England and Turkey, to the Treaty which has been concluded at Berlin and the despatches which accompanied it, and to the Protocols of the Congress which has lately closed. I am afraid that in doing so, I may have to occupy somewhat longer time than I am in the habit of doing, and I fear that even then it will be in my power but very imperfectly to lay before the House a sketch of those considerations which I think ought to be taken into view by the House, before we vote on the Resolution that I am about to propose. But, in these circumstances, I think I shall best consult my duty and the convenience of the House, by refraining altogether from any unnecessary preliminary observations, and by directing attention as briefly as I can to the main points which I ask the House to consider. The Resolutions which I am about to move, it will be observed, do not, in any way, attack the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin; but, at the same time, I think the House ought to take this opportunity of considering what are the provisions of the settlement of Berlin, in what respect it alters previous engagements, and in what position it leaves the Turkish Empire and affairs in the East. The Government appear to be desirous of inviting us to consider the Treaty of Berlin in comparison with the Treaty of San Stefano, and to limit our consideration of it to that view. I think that a very inadequate idea of what is accomplished by the Treaty of Berlin would be arrived at in any such manner. The Treaty of San Stefano was avowedly a preliminary Treaty; it was always admitted by Russia that its main provisions—at all events, those provisions which affected other European Powers, should be subject to revision by Europe; and it did not profess to be, on the part of the Russian Government, a final settlement of affairs in the East. I think that a more just idea of what has been effected by the Congress of Berlin would be obtained if we compared, for a moment, the state of things which existed at the close of the Crimean War with that which now exists in Turkey. The principles of the Treaty of Paris, by which the Crimean War was terminated, were, in the main, these—That the integrity of the Dominions of Turkey, as then established, was guaranteed, and the independence of the Sultan, on the principle that he should be complete master within his own Dominions, was there asserted. Well, before the late War broke out, before active operations commenced, a communication was made by the Russian Government to Her Majesty's Government, in June, 1877, informing them what were the demands of Russia in case peace could be concluded without having recourse to actual hostilities. No doubt, those demands made very considerable inroads on the two principles which I have referred to as being the basis of the Settlement of 1856. Still, I think it would be desirable to recall to the House what those demands of Russia, in June of last year, were, and to see how very far short they fall of what has been accomplished by the Congress of Berlin. At that time, Russia demanded that Bulgaria, up to the Balkans, should be an autonomous Vassal Province. As to Bulgaria South of the Balkans, it was proposed to secure to it, as well as to other Christian Provinces of Turkey, the best possible guarantees for a regular Administration; Bosnia and Herzegovina were to be provided with institutions compatible with their internal state and good administration; and Austria was to have a preponderating voice in their future organization. As to the independence of Roumania, that was to be settled by European agreement; as to Montenegro and Servia, nothing was said about their independence, but an increase of their territory was to be determined on by a common agreement; and as to the annexation of territory on the part of Russia itself, nothing was asked for except that part of Bessarabia which was ceded in 1856, and some portion of the territory at Batoum. These were the terms asked for by Russia in June, 1877, and the House will remember in what manner they were described by Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, to whom they were referred. Sir Austen Layard declared that they were terms virtually amounting to the destruction of the Turkish Empire, and he proceeded to argue in what way they would have that effect. I do not know—we have never known—what was precisely the view taken by Her Majesty's Government themselves of those terms; but they never expressed their approval of them, nor took steps to urge them upon Turkey to save her from the horrors and disasters of the war which has lately been concluded. Let the House compare those terms of June, 1877, with those of the Settlement agreed to by the Congress of Berlin. Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro have all acquired complete independence; Bulgaria, North of the Balkans, has acquired a larger and more complete degree of independence than that which was stipulated for in June, 1877. The Bulgarians, North of the Balkans, are, in fact, on the high road to complete independence, and following in the footsteps which have been trodden by Roumania and Servia. In South Bulgaria, or, as the Congress preferred to describe it, in Eastern Roumelia, an administrative autonomy has been established. It is true that it is described in the Treaty as remaining under the direct political and military authority of the Sultan. But under what condition is the Sultan to exercise that direct political and military authority? There is to be a Christian Governor, who is to be appointed with the assent and after consultation with the Powers of Europe, and he is to be irremovable for a period of five years. That is to say, the Mahomedan Sultan is bound to appoint, to rule over this Province, which remains under his direct authority, a Governor of a different religion, and he is bound to do that only after consultation with, and with the assent of the Powers of Europe. A Constitution is to be prepared for Eastern Roumelia, not by the Sultan and his Advisers, but by a European Commission, and it is to receive the assent of the Powers. The Sultan is, it is true, to be permitted to defend the frontier of that Province; but even that Prerogative is only to be exercised under certain restrictions. Irregular troops may not be used, even in the defence of the frontier; and as to the internal administration of the Province, he is not permitted to introduce any regular troops for the preservation of order; he is not to be the judge when order in the Province is or is not disturbed—internal order is to be preserved by a native *gendarmerie* or militia; and it is the Governor General appointed by the Powers of Europe who is to be the judge when the necessity arises for summoning troops for the preservation of internal or external security. Such is the nature, political and military, of the authority which has been reserved to the Sultan by the Treaty of Berlin. What is his position as regards independence with respect to the other Provinces of Turkey? By the 23rd Article of the Treaty, the Porte undertakes to apply scrupulously in the Island of Crete the organic law of 1868. Similar laws are to be introduced into the other parts of the Empire; special Commissions, in which the native element is to be largely represented, are to draw out the details of the new laws, and the Sublime Porte, before promulgating those laws, is to submit them to, and take the advice of, a European Commission instituted for the organization of Eastern Roumelia. Such is the amount of independence preserved to the Sultan by the Treaty of Berlin for the remainder of his Empire. I have now to refer for a moment to the case of Greece and the Greek Provinces of Turkey; and I wish to state, at the outset, that though I have thought it necessary to refer to them in the Resolutions, I do not propose to formulate any serious charge against Her Majesty's Government in this respect. Any responsibility that has been incurred—and I think it is a very great one—has been incurred by all the other Powers that met in Congress; but, nevertheless, Her Majesty's Government did, in my opinion, incur with regard to Greece a special responsibility not shared by the other Powers. Throughout these troubles, Her Majesty's Government have been in constant communication with the Greek Government, and assurances and promises in considerable numbers have been made to the Greek Government with a view of inducing them to abstain from adding to the difficulties of the Porte. I freely admit that the promises of the Government were not of a very distinct or definite character; but I think that their general effect, if I am not misrepresenting them, was that the Greek Government was informed that they would lose nothing by waiting, and that Her Majesty's Government would use its best endeavours, when the time for the final settlement arrived, to gain for the Greeks in Turkey all the advantages and reforms that would fall to the other Christian subjects of the Porte. That being the nature of the promises made by Her Majesty's Government, and the nature of the inducement held out to the Greeks to abstain from taking part in the war, let us now proceed to consider what the results are. Lord Salisbury, in the Congress, asked for and obtained the admission of a Greek Delegate; but what were, respectively, the attitudes of the Governments of the European Powers to the Greeks in the Congress? Who proved to be the friend of friends at the Congress? Prince Gortschakoff declared beforehand that he was anxious for the Greek cause, and that the Representatives of Russia were not exclusively concerned with the Slavs, but regarded also all the Christian subjects of the Porte; and when the question came on, he said that he would identify himself with any measures adopted in favour of the Greeks, and would even demand for the Greek Provinces of Turkey an autonomy similar to that claimed for the Slavs, the object of his Government being to draw those races closer together. That being the view taken of the Greek claims by the Russian Plenipotentiaries in the Congress, what do we find is the attitude of the British Representatives? At a later period of the deliberations of the Congress, France brought forward proposals in favour of the Kingdom of Greece which were, no doubt, the result of a preliminary arrangement between the Powers. I cannot say that those proposals, moderate in the extreme though they were, received any warm support from Lord Beaconsfield. The Greeks were informed that they had totally misapprehended the objects of the Congress; they were told—and, after the assurances they had received, with cold comfort—that no one could doubt the future of Greece, and that nations that had a future could, like individuals similarly placed, afford to wait. But as to the proposals themselves, Lord Beaconsfield declared that he looked upon them as open to objections, which, however, his Excellency would withdraw in the interests of unanimity. That is the amount of support which the Greeks received in the Congress from the British Plenipotentiaries, who had before put themselves forward as the champions of their admission and of their claims. Well, Sir, we are told that in point of territory Greece will obtain a great deal. But the Congress does not insist, as it does in other cases, upon any extension of Greek territory, but merely recommends it; and it rests to a very considerable extent upon the goodwill and disposition of the Government of Turkey whether or not Greece will ever obtain that extension of territory. But, Sir, Greece in that matter acted not merely in her own interests as a nation; but she was, to some extent, and was recognized to be, the champion of the Greek subjects of Turkey; and the course she desired to take, but which she was persuaded not to take, was calculated not only to advance her own interests, but also those of her compatriots in Turkey. The Government of Her Majesty promised to use their best endeavours to give them the same advantages as those gained for other races; but what is the result? The Slavs are protected by Russia, and acted just as we advised Greece not to act, and they are now either absolutely free or else in a very advanced position towards acquiring absolute independence; the Greek Provinces, on the other hand, obtain nothing but the extension to them of the Cretan Constitution, which has not preserved their freedom nor prevented the occurrence of continued struggles against the authority of Turkey. Lord Beaconsfield, in his speech on Saturday last, said there was a Party not in this country alone—which I take to mean that there is one also in this country—which, for factious purposes, egged on the Greeks to take a violent course. I think Lord Beaconsfield is somewhat difficult to satisfy. When his policy is not directly challenged in the House in which he sits, he complains that it is met only by question and innuendo; when, on the other hand, it is challenged in this House, and when I, acting on behalf of a good many hon. Members on this side of the House, put forward some one of our objections to it, then we are told that we are acting for factious purposes. But I deny the charge altogether that in this country there is any Party that for factious purposes is endeavouring to egg on Greece. Everyone must be aware that after the end of the war—after the termination of the labours of the Congress, it would be perfect madness for Greece to attempt to pursue a violent course. What I regret is that past proceedings will have taught the Greeks a lesson which they will not soon forget, and that on the next occasion of difficulty in Turkey, they will rather be disposed to follow the example, which has been proved to be successful, of the Slav subjects of the Ottoman Empire, than to follow the advice which has been given them by Her Majesty's Government. In future they will be disposed to follow Servia, Roumania, and Bulgaria, who, with the assistance of Russia, have obtained some tangible advantages, instead of listening to the Government that soothes them during the time of possible action with smooth words and promises—words and promises which, when the time of performance arrived, seem to have been so greatly and so unfortunately misapprehended. There is one point of view from which I am perfectly ready to concede that the Congress has done good service to Europe, and also to the cause of Greece. I cannot look upon the Treaty of San Stefano or of Berlin as a final solution of the Eastern Question, though the Treaty of San Stefano was, perhaps, more complete than that of Berlin. I give no opinion whether it is a better solution or not; but the Treaty of San Stefano pointed to a complete solution, which would been entirely and solely in the interests of one race, and that the Slav race. I think that the Great Bulgaria, which was planned in the Treaty of San Stefano, would have left open to Greece an extension in the direction of Epirus and Thessaly; but would, no doubt, have closed to Greece all prospect of extension in the direction of Salonica, Roumelia, and Constantinople. Well, Sir, I believe, as I have said, that the Treaty of Berlin will not prove a final settlement. I believe that the future of the inhabitants of what remains of the Dominions of Turkey will ultimately be determined by internal and natural causes, rather than by causes which are external and artificial; and I rejoice that a temporary solution, temporary though it be, has been arrived at, which will leave scope for those natural causes to work, and which will not replace the military domination of Turkey by the military domination of Russia or the Slav over unwilling races. In the main, Sir, the provisions of the

Treaty of Berlin are not repugnant to the views which have frequently been expressed by hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House. We have always looked at the Treaty of Paris as an experiment. It was based on the idea that the institutions of Turkey might be reformed, and that with the chances there given her, she might ultimately take her place among the nations of Europe. We have come to the conclusion, sooner than hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the experiment has failed, and that some policy must be substituted for that which was the dominant policy in 1856. We believed that the only substitute for that policy lay in the gradual development of the Christian races of the Porte. You may disguise it if you choose, you may use what phrases you please about the independence and power and direct authority which are left to Turkey; but, disguise it as you will, that is the principle which is at the bottom of the Treaty of Berlin. So far as the Treaty of Berlin is a complete settlement, it is in the direction of extending self-government to the races which were lately subject; so far as it is incomplete it points to a complete settlement in the same direction; and it is because we believe that it is a step, and a very long step, in the direction of the policy which we have from the very beginning of these troubles advocated upon this side of the House, that we do not repudiate, but rather welcome, the Treaty which has been concluded. I observe that my hon. and learned Friend the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) has given Notice of an Amendment, which is about to receive the support of the great majority of hon. Gentlemen opposite, expressing great satisfaction with all that has been done or attempted to be done by Her Majesty's Government. I suppose we may take that to mean an approval of what has been done by the Congress of Berlin. If that be so, and if the Amendment is to be assented to by hon. Members opposite—what greater justification could we desire for the course which we have taken from the very beginning? If you approve what has been done at Berlin, you approve what has been done by the war. If you approve the independence of Bosnia, Servia, and Roumania, and the self-government of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, then you must approve those results which have been brought about by the war. You yourselves tried at the Conference at Constantinople what could be effected by peaceable means. Those means failed, and all that has been accomplished has been brought about by the war; and the course we have taken throughout has been, by every means in our power, to induce the Government and the country to refrain from going to war for the purpose of resisting the enterprize which had been taken in hand by Russia. If, then, you are about to vote approval of all the results of the war, how can we desire any better justification of the course we have taken? But, Sir, it is impossible to look only at results, and to shut our eyes altogether to the course which has been pursued by Her Majesty's Government, and the mode in which those results have been arrived at. The character of English statesmanship and of English diplomacy must always be a subject of no common interest to this House. I am not going now into a subject which has been discussed at considerable length in "another place," as to the good faith and accuracy of statements which were made in both Houses of Parliament. I have no doubt it was extremely inconvenient to Her Majesty's Government, when the secret Agreement, which they entered into with Russia, was inadvertently disclosed. I think that after the Agreement had been disclosed, it would have been as well had a full and complete account of it, and all that led to it, been laid before Parliament. All I can say is that if it was the intention of the Government to give that frank, clear, and complete account of the Agreement, and of the circumstances which led to it, they have been somewhat unfortunate in the replies they have given and in the impression they produced. But, Sir, I do not want to go into that controversy, and I venture to express a hope that we may proceed to this debate without reopening it. But it is important to consider whether the course pursued by the Government, not towards us, not towards Parliament, but towards Europe, has been a consistent one—whether it has been a course consistent with the declarations that they made to Europe, or consistent with the obligations they owed to Europe? We have, since the conclusion of the war, been incessant in our expression of disapproval as to the secrecy with which the Treaty of San Stefano was entered into. We have declared, over and over again, that we should recognize no agreement as binding which affected European or British interests which had not been submitted to Europe, and had not received the approval of Europe. We concluded that the Treaty of San Stefano should be submitted at the Congress as a whole; and I observe that in the despatch of July 13, Lord Salisbury says that the demand had been fully recognized. But Lord Salisbury did not think it necessary to state that before that contention was fully recognized and admitted by Russia, we had entered into a secret Agreement with Russia, by which the main provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano—not certain unimportant stipulations which did not affect European or British interests, but its most important stipulations—were agreed upon between England and Russia, who had all through been considered as the chief opponents in the matter; and that, therefore, practically, they were removed from the consideration of the Congress of Berlin. Sir, that was not the only secret Agreement which Her Majesty's Government entered into before the Congress was held. There was also a Convention with Turkey, which up to that time was also a secret Convention. And now I wish to ask Her Majesty's Government how, in their view, that Convention, which was never submitted to the Congress, and had never received the approval of Europe, was consistent with the declarations they made to Europe? That Convention binds Turkey to do two things. First, it gives to us certain rights of intervention which were, in our opinion, necessary to secure better government in Asiatic Turkey, and next it allows our occupation of the Island of Cyprus. Well, in what respect did the first concession differ from the contention put forward by Russia before the Crimean War as to a Protectorate between the Porte and its subjects, and which we resisted by force of arms, and which it was one of the main objects of the Treaty of Paris to induce Russia to abandon? How is it admissible for us to assume the special right of interference between the Porte and its subjects apart from the rest of Europe, when we prevented the carrying into effect of a similar assumption on the part of Russia? As to the occupation of Cyprus, it may be said that it is no breach of our obligations under the Treaty of 1856, because it has been done with the consent of Turkey, and the question of the extent of territory to be occupied has nothing to do with the matter. But let me put this case. Supposing that before the outbreak of war, either by means of threats or promises, Russia had induced Turkey to permit her to occupy Bulgaria, or any part of Bulgaria which she might designate. If such an agreement had been entered into, would Her Majesty's Government have admitted that the contracting Powers were justified in such a course under the provisions of the Treaty of 1856? If the Government are not prepared to admit such a right as I have suggested, I fail to see how they can reconcile with their international obligations an Agreement entered into behind the back of Europe for the occupation of Cyprus. As to the policy of the occupation itself, I do not intend to trouble the House at any length. If Her Majesty's Government can show that the occupation has been accomplished in an internationally legal manner; that it is an advantage to this country in any respect; that it is necessary for the protection of the Suez Canal; or that England requires another naval station in the Eastern part of the Mediterranean, I shall not be disposed to make any objection to the step which Her Majesty's Government have taken. But I cannot forget that we are in possession of no such information, either in the form of Papers or of statements made in "another place;" and that nothing has been said to show that the occupation of Cyprus will increase our military or naval power, or assist us in any degree in meeting the engagements into which we have entered. I will assume, for a moment, that the occupation of Cyprus is necessary to enable us to fulfil the Guarantees into which we have entered for the protection of the Asiatic Dominions of the Sultan; but surely it can never be intended to embark troops at Cyprus, and then to land them on the coast of Asia Minor, across which country they would have to be transported, although, at present, no roads or provision for the passage of an Army exist. If we are to undertake the defence of Asiatic Turkey, it would be much more easy to make Constantinople, or one of the ports of the Black Sea, a base of operations than the Island of Cyprus. It is, therefore, impossible to see how the military occupation of Cyprus will add to our naval power. I come now to the Convention which has been concluded between the Government of Her Majesty and the Porte. The first question I have to put is as to the necessity for that Convention. If a necessity exists, it is in some degree, at all events, one which the Government has created for itself—or, at any rate, one which the Government had made no effort whatever to avert. The necessity which is alleged is that of preventing the advance of Russia in Asia Minor, and the acquisition of certain territory there; and I have pointed out that up to June of last year the Russian demand did not include the annexation of any part of Asia Minor. [Mr. BOURKE: Except Batoum.] Exactly so, but we have heard from a very high authority in "another place" that Batoum is a port of very little importance; and, if my memory does not deceive me, the despatch of Lord Salisbury placed the alleged necessity for the action taken by the Government, not upon the cession of Batoum, but on the cession of Kars, Ardahan, and the adjoining frontier of Asia Minor. The original terms demanded by Russia did not include any of these points of Asiatic Turkey; and if the Government had been aware that a Russian advance in that direction would be so fatal to the interests of this country, it does seem to me extraordinary that they should not have made some effort to press upon the Government of Turkey the acceptance of terms which did not involve these conditions, when they must have known that a Russian advance in Asia would have been the inevitable result of a war. I am not in a position to deny the accuracy of the statements which have been made by Lord Salisbury as to the possible consequences of a Russian advance in Asia Minor. It is probably true that a weak Government there would grow gradually weaker, and that such weakness would probably end in disorganization, and Russian annexation of the Provinces? I cannot say that I have any such positive knowledge on the subject as Lord Salisbury appears to possess. He seems to know as a fact that the increasing weakness of Turkey can only lead to the Asiatic Dominions falling into the hands of Russia. That may be so; but, at the same time, I must say that it does not appear to me so self-evident as it does to the mind of Lord Salisbury. The Provinces are inhabited chiefly by Mahomedan races who would strongly resist the destruction of the Mahomedan power or annexation to Russia, and even if Russia succeeded in annexing them they would, in my opinion, not only prove a source of very little strength to her, but would, on the contrary, turn out to be a very troublesome acquisition of territory. Assuming, however, that Lord Salisbury is right, I think the House ought to be asked to consider—and they have not yet been asked so to do—what is the nature of the British interests involved in Asia Minor. As far as I can see, our interests in India are not in any way affected by the question of Asia Minor. It is possible that at some future day there may be a railway through the Euphrates Valley; but as to that we have an authority in this House. Not long ago a Committee, presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, sat to consider how far the construction of this railway would be inimical to our interests. That Committee reported in the mildest terms imaginable, and they said that, although the railway might be of considerable importance to the Indian Government, it was by no means an object of paramount necessity. And even if this railway were made, and it was made use of by Russia what would Russia find when she reached the other end of it? She would find the British Navy. I should like to know how, even supposing Russia had hostile intentions, she could, when brought face to face with the British iron-clad Navy at the Persian Gulf, carry out those intentions through Asia Minor. But we are told on high authority that in the event of a Russian attack upon India, the line is not through Asia Minor, but lies through Persia. I believe that is an assertion no one will deny. Persia is as much within the grasp of Russia as Asia Minor. Persia is as misgoverned a country as Asia Minor, and it seems to me if you are bound to assume the Protectorate of Turkey, you are bound to guarantee the protection of Persia. A large use has been made of the word prestige, and I fully admit its importance, particularly as far as Eastern countries are concerned; but when we speak of impressing the Natives of India with our power, a reservation should be made as a condition precedent that the power should be used for objects which all the world approves. I do not think that, in order to maintain our prestige among the Natives of India, we should make an exhibition of our power in connection with objects which we ourselves should not deem it necessary to go to war about. Depend upon it that the Native Princes are too clever to be misled by such a course of proceeding on our part. They understand us well enough when we make a display of force to secure objects of Imperial necessity; but their minds would not be influenced in the smallest degree if we were to lower our standard of statesmanship to the level of their ideas, and if we were to use our power for objects we ourselves did not consider worth contending for, but which an Asiatic Potentate might go to war to obtain. But I want to know when it was first discovered that vital British interests were connected with Armenia and Asia Minor? Certainly, the discovery was a very recent one. It had not been made in May of last year, when the celebrated charter of policy was promulgated by Lord Salisbury. Neither had it been made a little later, when that noble Lord addressed the Merchant Taylors, when he absolutely ridiculed the idea of any vital British interests being involved in Armenia and Asia Minor. Certainly, it had not been made in June, when the Russian terms were made known to the Government. It had also not been made when, on a later occasion, Colonel Wellesley had his interview with the Emperor of Russia, and when the Czar stated that he should require to annex some parts of Armenia, and when Her Majesty's Government expressed their satisfaction that the demands of Russia were so modest. Neither had the discovery been made in November last, when Her Majesty's Government told Russia that a further advance of her Armies in the direction of Constantinople would be resisted by us by force of arms; while, at the same moment, they were looking on unconcernedly at the capture of Kars by the Russian Forces. Well, we are told by the Prime Minister that our responsibilities have not been increased by this Convention with Turkey; but that they have, on the contrary, been diminished by it. The noble Lord said—

> "Suppose now, for example, the settlement of Europe had not included the Convention of Constantinople and the occupation of the Isle of Cyprus; suppose it had been limited to the mere Treaty of Berlin; what, under all probable circumstances, might then have occurred? In 10, 15, it might be in 20 years, the power and resources of Russia having revived, some quarrel would again have occurred, Bulgarian or otherwise, and in all probability the Armies of Russia would have been assailing the Ottoman Dominions both in Europe and Asia, and enveloping and enclosing the city of Constantinople and its all-powerful position. Well, what would be the probable conduct, under these circumstances, of the Government of this country, whoever the Ministers might be — whatever Party might be in power? I fear there might be hesitation for a time—a want of decision—a want of firmness; but no one doubts that ultimately England would have said—'This will never do; we must prevent the conquest of Asia Minor; we must interfere in this matter and arrest the course of Russia.' No one, I am sure, in this country who impartially considers this question can for a moment doubt what under any circumstances would have been the course of this country."

Why, I wish to ask, are we to assume that, when the next occasion arises, the Government then in Office will do exactly the reverse of that which has been done by Her Majesty's Government? No doubt Lord Beaconsfield is a very good judge of what is likely to take place in the future Cabinet; because he was, probably, relying on his memory when he said that there might be hesitation for a time, a want of decision, and a want of firmness. No doubt, the noble Lord was speaking from experience; but I cannot see why the future Government should do precisely what the present Government have not done. Lord Beaconsfield goes on to say that this Convention will remove all doubt in the matter. That does not appear to me to be so certain. This is not the first Guarantee that we have entered into with respect to Turkey. The terms of the Guarantee of 1856 and of the Tripartite Treaty were distinct enough, and could not have been more binding upon the high contracting parties than they were; nevertheless, they did not remove all doubt from the mind of Russia, who, notwithstanding them, had proceeded to make war upon Turkey, in which she was so far justified that none of the parties who were bound by the Guarantee had stepped forward in defence of the latter. The fact is that guarantees of this sort cannot possibly bind future generations. The foreign policy of future generations must be decided by themselves according to the circumstances of their own time and according to what is expedient at the time. In his opinion, it was idle for any Government to say that by entering into any guarantees now they would prevent Russian aggression some 20 years hence. It is true that on some occasions the Prime Minister does assume to himself extraordinary power. He says that it is time to say to Russia—"Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther." I wonder when the Prime Minister used these words, he considered where the quotation originated. These words are taken from a passage in the Bible, in which were described the attributes of the Almighty. There is a legend in English history of the courtiers of a certain British Monarch who desired to flatter him with the possession of Omnipotence. The British Canute was not to be deceived by the counsels of those courtiers; but proved to them, by practical experiment, that they were assigning to him powers beyond those he possessed or could possess. But I am not surprised at the Prime Minister using language which would attribute to himself not only Omnipotence, but Omniscience, seeing that he professes to be able to tell us what will be done by the Government of this country some 20 years hence in the event of the Eastern Question arising again at that time. I contend that it rests upon Her Majesty's Government to show to Parliament and to the country wherein lies the imperative necessity and compulsion for us to enter into these engagements. I think that no adequate necessity has been shown by Her Majesty's Government for our entering into them, and that no corresponding advantage has been secured to us in return for our having surrendered our freedom of action. There can, however, be no doubt that we have largely extended our liabilities. It is to defend Turkey in Asia Minor, not when we please, but when Russia pleases. Not to take our own time, not to be our own judges of the interests which are involved; but to defend the territorial integrity of Turkey in Asia whenever and for whatever cause Russia may attack it. Are you perfectly certain that Russia, which has hitherto not been generally considered wanting in astuteness, will always select the time for attack which precisely suits our own convenience, or do you think it possible that Great Britain may be involved in difficulties or wars with other nations and that she may not always be ready at the call of Russia to undertake this military liability you have imposed upon her? I know it is now extremely unpopular to talk about our insular position, although there was, I believe, a time when we were extremely proud of that position. To the strength which we derived from it we owe, in my opinion, the greater part of our power. But, although we have not been content—and I do not complain of it—to confine our Dominions within the Seas which surround these Islands, though we have extended them to every part of the globe, we have hitherto been very fortunate in the way in which those extensions have been made. We have been fortunate in not possessing an extended military frontier. The frontier between the United States and Canada is, I believe, the only extensive military frontier which we have had to defend, and hon. Gentlemen may remember the anxiety which was felt a few years ago when our relations with America were not so good as they are now. In India we have an Empire of vast extent, surrounded on two sides by the sea; while, on the third side, we have been singularly favoured by the nature of our frontier. There we have a chain of the highest mountains in the world, and on both sides of those mountains you find warlike and independent Tribes, who, if they resent encroachment from our side, equally resent it from any other quarter. Indeed, the position which we occupy in India is one which is as secure as it is possible to have. But what is it that we have done by this undertaking of the Government? We have advanced the time for the conflict, if conflict there is to be, between us and Russia, perhaps by 100 years, and we have advanced the frontier open to her attack, to our disadvantage, at least 1,000 miles. We have left behind us a frontier such as I have described in India, with which every military authority has hitherto been satisfied, and we have planted ourselves close to the frontier of our sole enemy, close to his resources, and 1,000 miles away from our own. We have left behind us, in India, our Navy and the Navy of India, the resources, the wealth, the railroads of India, the Native troops we have trained, and the population from whom they are recruited—we have given up, I say, all these military advantages, and placed ourselves close to the resources of our enemy, trusting only to the resources of the misgoverned and semi-civilized Turkish Provinces in Asia Minor. If that be not a policy rightly described—as it was described the other day—as an insane policy, I want to know what epithet is to be applied to it? This reminds me of—and this is the last reference I need make to—the speech of the Prime Minister on Saturday. I do not complain of his retort to that description of his policy which was given by my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich; it was, I think, a fair Parliamentary retort. But when the noble Lord thought it worthy of himself to go on to describe my right hon. Friend as

> "a sophistical rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity, and gifted with an egotistical imagination which can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign an opponent and glorify himself;"

when the noble Lord went on to describe my right hon. Friend in that way, I think he was offering somewhat of an insult to the Sovereign of whom my right hon. Friend was for no inconsiderable time the chief Adviser; to the Privy Council, of which my right hon. Friend is still a Member; to this House, which he has led; to the people of this country, whose confidence at one time my right hon. Friend possessed, and the confidence of a large portion of whom he still commands. Sir, I regret that personalities of that description should enter into our discussions, whether inside or outside this House. But, passing by that, I go on to consider the political responsibilities which the Government have undertaken by the policy which they have adopted. Some persons entertain a doubt whether the military engagements into which we have entered with Turkey depend or not on her performance of her promises. But, whether they be or be not unconditional engagements, there can be no doubt about the responsibilities which we have incurred under the engagements which Turkey has made to us. Those responsibilities extend very far, indeed, beyond Asia and the Asian frontier, to the whole external and internal policy of that country. I think it quite clear that when the contingency arises, and when the Asiatic Dominions of Turkey are attacked by Russia, it will not be an isolated attack, but part of a general attack on the Turkish Empire; and the defence of the Asiatic frontier will be, to all intents and purposes, a general defence of Turkey in a war with Russia. Is it possible that Her Majesty's Government can bind themselves to be the Ally of Turkey in any such war, altogether irrespective of the cause for which such a war is being waged? It is inconceivable that Turkey is to be made the judge of her action in bring about a war under such conditions; but, unless we intend to regulate the foreign policy of Turkey when it has relation to Russia, how is it possible we can tell whether the cause of such a war is one we can fight for? It is necessary, therefore, that we should assume some control over the foreign policy of Turkey with regard to Russia. Let the House look at the responsibilities which we have now incurred in Asia, and the consequences to which they may tend. We are assured by Lord Salisbury that our aid is conditional on reforms being introduced in the government of the Turkish Provinces, and that we have the promise of the introduction of those reforms. But are we to rely on the promises which have been made to us by the Porte? Previous experience serves to show us what those promises are worth. Have we taken power to introduce ourselves, or to insist upon Turkey introducing, the necessary reforms into her Asiatic Dominions? If so, then, as negotiations are not now going on, the House ought to be informed what those powers are. All that we have heard is that the Sovereign rights of the Sultan are to be respected; but, then, the problem to be solved is this—how to respect the Sovereign rights of the Sultan, and at the same time not to rely simply on the promises of the Sultan. What machinery are you going to employ to ensure reforms being introduced into Asiatic Turkey? I suppose we shall be told that the problem has been solved by Great Britain in India; but I am surprised that India should be referred to as an analogous case, for the very name of India negatives the idea of the independent Prerogative of the Sultan. We may be told of protected Indian Princes whose governments we have undertaken to and succeeded in reforming, and who retain a shadow of independence. That case has been repeated over and over again. In the first place, we protect a Native Prince; in the second place, we find fault with him; and, in the next place, we correct him for his bad government; and, finally, we disestablish him altogether. Perhaps the Sovereign rights of the Sultan are a mere phrase? Perhaps it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to assume a real authority, and to administer, in the name of the Sultan, the Provinces of Asiatic Turkey by our own officers? Has the House considered, even for one moment, the enormous difficulty that will attend such an enterprise? India, no doubt, will again be referred to, and it will be said we have succeeded there in that task. But how different are the circumstances in the two cases! In India we are the paramount Power; there is no military force that can compete or compare with ours. When we resolve that something shall be done in India, we have the unquestioned military power to enforce our will; and there we are exposed to no interference from any other European Power. No other Power either desires or has a right to interfere with or to question our position in India. With the Protectorate you are about to undertake in Asia Minor the case is far different. There not only every European Power has a right to be present, but under the 61st Article of the Treaty which you have concluded you have given to every European Power that has signed it a right to inquire into, to investigate and supervise the reforms that are to be introduced by the Porte for the better government of the country. Then, again, what are you going to do in the event of insurrection? You are to guarantee Turkey against Russian aggression. But is it merely aggression from without that threatens the Turkish Dominions? And does not such aggression generally begin with insurrection from within? Have you undertaken, or do you intend to guarantee the Porte in Asia against the consequences of its own misgovernment if that misgovernment, is continued, and to use the armed force of England in putting down internal revolt? Surely engagements so embarrassing were never entered into with so little consideration? If there had really been any serious consideration of their policy, Her Majesty's Government might have pointed out to the Sultan that there was but one chance left for the continuance of his power either in Europe or in Asia, and that was by the better government of his subjects. They might have offered their assistance for that purpose. They might have said—"We want no more words, but some evidence, however little, that we are to have deeds." They might have given him what assistance he needed to initiate those reforms; and when they had something tangible to bring before us, when they had some reforms made, some improvements effected, in the condition of those Asiatic Provinces, then I could have understood Her Majesty's Government coming to Parliament and saying—"The work of reformation has begun; the Sultan is availing himself of our assistance; the well-being of these Provinces has been secured and will be further secured; and now we ask you to aid in protecting this work against foreign aggression." In such a policy as that there would have been something solid and clear; but there would have been nothing showy, and nothing to justify congratulatory regrets. Her Majesty's Government have given us great professions—immense professions—and I ask them what shadow or tittle of action, or performance, there is to correspond with these professions? We are told that we shrink from the responsibility; that we, and such politicians as we are, would not have been the men to adopt that policy. But to that, my reply is that the Indian Empire has been managed by men on very different principles. They advanced their Dominions gradually and steadily, and they said very little about it. You make very large professions; and I want you to tell Parliament what ounce or tittle of performance there has been for all these professions? Sir, I may be asked what is the object I have in bringing forward this Resolution? and in asking the opinion of the House upon them. From a Party point of view, I have no doubt it would have been easier to have remained quiet, to have bowed our heads to the breeze of popularity which is now carrying forward the vessel of the Government, and to have waited for the time—in my opinion, the inevitable time— of re-action, and to have reaped our own advantage from the disappointment and discontent which follow the exaggerated hopes of an untrue confidence. It would have been easier, perhaps, in a Party point of view, and more politic, if we had adopted that course. But that is not the view which we take of the duty we owe to the country. We have thought that it was more patriotic to endeavour to point out to this House and the country the nature and the magnitude of the liabilities and responsibilities which you are undertaking, and the dangers which we believe are involved. We have thought it better, if those dangers and liabilities are to be incurred, that they should be incurred with a full knowledge of their character. And we wished, further, to prepare the way, if possible, when the time for reflection should come—as come, I believe, it inevitably will—so as to enable the country, while there is time, to retreat from this false, and, as we think, ill-advised, course with honour, and to retire from a position which we believe that neither its interest nor its duty demands that it should assume.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, whilst this House has learned with satisfaction that the troubles which have arisen in the East of Europe have been terminated by the Treaty of Berlin without a further recourse to arms, and rejoices in the extension of the liberty and self-government of some of the populations of European Turkey, this House regrets:—

"That it has not been found practicable to deal in a satisfactory manner with the claims of the Kingdom of Greece, and of the Greek subjects of the Porte:

"That by the assumption under the Anglo-Turkish Convention of a sole guarantee of the integrity of the remaining territories of Turkey in Asia, the Military liabilities of this Country have been unnecessarily extended:

"That the undefined engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the better administration of those Provinces have imposed heavy responsibilities on the State, whilst no sufficient means have been indicated for securing their fulfilment:

"And that such engagements have been entered into, and responsibilities incurred, without the previous knowledge of Parliament."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

**MR. PLUNKET,** in rising to move to leave out from the first word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words—

"An humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learnt with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire,"

said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the Amendment of which I have given Notice, I have first of all to say a word in expression of my sense of the courtesy with which the hon. Member for Stoke (Dr. Kenealy) has given way to me on this occasion, and not imposed on me the necessity of moving an Amendment to the same effect. I think that the House will agree that, however much any of us on this side of the House, at all events, are in accord with the views expressed in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Stoke, we must all agree that as his Amendment seemed only to touch one part of the Motion brought before us, and did not appear, as I understand it, to deal with the Anglo-Turkish Convention, it was more convenient that the sense of the House should be taken on the Amendment which I have framed. Because, Sir, I regard the proceedings of this evening, at all events the Amendment of which I have given Notice, should it be adopted by the House, as doing something towards recording the approval of the country of the conduct of their Representatives here in the House of Commons, and of the acts of the Government, which are really now completed, and as also indicating—as the result of this debate will indicate—the determination of the country to support the Ministers in proceeding with and carrying out that other old, and I think wise, policy which they have now entered upon. Of course, Sir, I am well aware that this Amendment, if carried, will be in the nature of a Vote of Confidence in Her Majesty's Government, and as a loyal supporter of that Government I shall rejoice on that account; but I think it of much higher importance in a national sense, because I believe that the great majority—as I am sure there will be—as the result of this debate, will show to Europe and to the world that after all the controversies, and after all the contentions that have raged in this House upon this subject, we are again I hope thoroughly, as regards our foreign affairs, a united people. The noble Lord who has just sat down, towards the close of his speech, referred to the breeze of popularity which he said was now passing over the land, and he regarded that as only of a passing and temporary character. I cannot agree at all in that view of the extraordinary enthusiasm and unanimity with which the conduct of the Premier and the announcement of the future policy of the country, as regards Turkey, has been received in this country. Nor, indeed, need we surprised when we consider what a wonderful change has passed over the mind of these people within the last few weeks. It is not so long ago since we were all in a state of extreme anxiety and great attention; this peaceable, commercial people had been required to prepare itself for the possibility of a war—a war which, if it began at all, was sure to prove a great and probably a long-continued struggle. We had seen the wonderful resources of this country, which, during times of peace, she had carefully hoarded up, rapidly and easily developed; but while the country, I am sure, would view with admiration and with pride the rapid development of those great resources, should it have become necessary to employ them, when Fleets could have been sent forth by England such as no other country could pretend to equip—whilst we saw not only our own Army rapidly mobilized and in a short time made ready for active service—while we saw with pride the Native troops of India rallying to the Standard of the Queen, while we received from all quarters of the country promises of assistance should we require it, at the same time the feeling of the country was one of extreme and painful apprehension. There was a feeling that when we were preparing with all our energies for war, the horrors which at that time seemed to be impending over the country predominated in the national mind. But, Sir, all that now has passed away. The soldiers who were called out—the Reserve Forces—are no longer necessary on sea or land, and the ordinary course of peaceful life at home has been happily resumed. I do not think that anyone could wonder at the breeze of popularity which is now, as it is said, passing over this land, and over those statesmen who have maintained the dignity of this country in the counsels of Europe, and who have brought back to her from that great Assembly of the statesmen of Europe, "peace, and peace with honour." But, Sir, the noble Lord who has just sat down has taken the Prime Minister somewhat severely to task for a sentence uttered by him at a banquet on last Saturday evening. Now, I really think myself the noble Lord treated that in a somewhat too serious manner. I was under the impression that it was not delivered in a vindictive or in a serious mood. It was received much more with laughter than with any serious feeling. But I must say one word more. The noble Lord has spoken gallantly and loyally for his Chief, and I may say one word on behalf of the Prime Minister in speaking those words. Does the noble Lord think that the Prime Minister had received no provocation? Does he not remember how, not in jest at all, but in sober and solemn earnestness, that Statesman has been denounced now for these three years; how in patience he has endured all those taunts and all those insults, and, I must say, in the most pleasant and good-humoured way? He referred to his great rival at a banquet on Saturday, and I do not think that great blame can be attached to him. Why, I recollect the time when we were told that the Ministry, of which Lord Beaconsfield was the Chief, could hardly be excused; the right hon. Gentleman guarded himself from accusing them of "purposed complicity with guilt." The expression occurs in a famous pamphlet; and not only that, but we were told that the Government of that day had more disgraced the name of England than any Government for years; and we were assured that nothing good would come of their Administration, until they had been taught as "lisping babes." Why, Sir, is all that nothing? I am referring to expressions by the right hon. Gentleman himself in serious earnestness. If you add to those the calumnies of orators and writers on Lord Beaconsfield, my astonishment is not so much that at last he must have said something, or that he should have said something rather more playful than serious, but that he should so long have succeeded in maintaining his patience. I cannot, of course, ask the indulgence of the House for any length of time; and, therefore, I shall at once address myself to the question raised by the Resolution of the noble Lord, and the Amendment that I move. Now, Sir, as to the Treaty of Berlin. The noble Lord contrasted the terms of the Treaty of Berlin with the terms of the Despatch of last June, and also with the principles that were founded on the Treaty of 1856. Now, Sir, I think that is not the fairest or the best way, perhaps, of treating this question. I did not understand the noble Lord that he was led to imply that we should have coerced Turkey to adopt it—I thought the noble Lord himself was opposed to the policy of coercion—or that we should have sooner checked the Russians when they made their advance with the encouragement of the opponents of the Government. I do not see with what object these comparisons have been made; but when the noble Lord went on to say that he has always been against the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and the Conservatives of the opposite opinion, he must, I think, have forgotten what occurred before the Conference of Constantinople. In the Session of 1876 the noble Lord himself warned the Government not to depart from the traditional policy of Palmerston, and similar advice was given by Lord Granville. The integrity of the Ottoman Empire has also been the whole foundation of the Conference of Constantinople. So much, however, has occurred since, that I do not see that one can gain much by contrasting the terms of the Berlin Treaty with those earlier documents, and therefore it is much better that we should contrast them with those of the Treaty of San Stefano. I will not follow the noble Lord in his analysis of the Treaty of Berlin; but as one of the questions raised by the Resolution concerns that Treaty—the question, namely, of the Greeks—I am compelled to make one or two remarks upon it. The noble Lord said he did not attach much blame to the Government for what had been done with respect to Greece, for that after the representations which had been made on the subject he found that the other Plenipotentiaries took the same view of the case; but he went on to say that some hopes had been held out to Greece by Her Majesty's Government which had misled her. I have selected passage after passage from the Blue Books, which prove incontestably that that has not been the case. On the contrary, Greece has been specially warned that Her Majesty's Government could not pledge itself to procure for her any territorial additions; but it did pledge itself to obtain for the Greek cause, as far as possible, a hearing in the Congress, and to obtain for the Greek Provinces of Turkey whatever was granted to the other Christian Provinces of the Porte. There is not one word in any of those despatches to show that the Government did not in every respect adhere to their promises; on the contrary, when we compare the action of the Government with that of the French, we will see that the speech of the Prime Minister contained very friendly advice to the Greeks, and that, as a matter of fact, the proposals of the Plenipotentiaries were just those agreed upon between the Greek Minister and Lord Salisbury and Lord Beaconsfield, who never did anything to diminish the force of the representations made on behalf of the Greeks. If anything, they were more in favour of the Greeks than the other Plenipotentiaries; because when the question arose of the demands of Greece, and whether her Representatives were to be present at all discussions touching the various Greek Provinces, they proposed that they should be present, while the French Plenipotentiaries would have excluded them. The results obtained for Greece were very considerable indeed; and though she may not acquire any vast increase of territory, she is a gainer by the Congress, and has a great future before her. One great boon obtained for the Greek Provinces is this—that the duties as regards the supervision of the new arrangements instituted in the Greek Provinces are relegated to a European Commission, and not to a Russian Commission. The real wishes of Greece are stated in a Blue Book of December, 1876, which contains a Minute of a conversation between Lord Derby and M. Gennadius, the Greek Chargé d'Affaires, who told him that the Greek nation could not but regard with apprehension the attempt to extend the Slav Provinces at the expense of the Greeks, for the Greeks formed the most important element in that part of European Turkey, and were a particularly thriving community. It went on to say that, as a body, the

Greeks would prefer Turkish rule to the domination of the Slav races. I need not say that the hopes of the Greeks will not be likely to be realized under the supreme control of Russia. In my opinion, next to the strengthening of the power of the Sultan—to whom has been intrusted again the great city of Constantinople and the guardianship of the Straits—the next most important result of the labours of the Congress was the substitution in the disturbed Provinces of European for Russian authority and influence. It is an entirely unfair and an unjust accusation to say that any promise made by Her Majesty's Government to the Greek Kingdom or the Greek Provinces has been in any way violated; or to say that France or any other country exhibited towards the Greeks any greater favour than was shown them by England. Indeed, I had forgotten Prince Gortchakoff for the moment. He did not care if the Greek Provinces were made altogether independent; but that never occurred to him when making the Treaty of San Stefano. Under that Treaty the Greek Provinces would have been subject to Russian predominance altogether. I now come to the only part of the Treaty of Berlin with which the noble Lord appears to find serious fault—I mean the Anglo-Turkish Convention. I was rather struck by the curious series of arguments used on that subject by the noble Lord. They reminded me of a phrase sometimes seen in our charts—"dangerous winds from opposite quarters." Russia, said the noble Lord, would not assail Asia Minor, because she had no desire to come into conflict with Mahomedans. Well, that is a startling statement, considering what Russia has already done in Asia; and then the noble Lord said—"You incur a fearful responsibility." But where is the responsibility as regards the Turkish Provinces in Asia if Russia is not going to attack them? But, said the noble Lord—"You forget the Tripartite Treaty; is it not stronger than any you can make?" Well, I have heard that argument used before. I put it to the House, is it true that a Treaty—which it is the business of three different Powers to carry out, where responsibility is divided, and where there must be great difficulty and delay in bringing it to pass—is at all as binding or as valuable as the Convention which has been entered into by England and Turkey; a Convention by which England, for the purpose of carrying out her guarantee, accepts an important naval station, and undertakes to assist, from day to day, as far as she may be required, or invited to do so, the reforms which the Sultan agrees to adopt? It is obvious that no Russian statesman or soldier could for a moment believe that, under such circumstances, the English Government would recede from the important obligation which they have now incurred. It is a wise policy to defend Asia Minor against future aggression on the part of Russia, and one from which England will not recede. Then the noble Lord, having stated that the Russian Government would not think of attacking a Mahomedan country, proceeded to argue that she might do so with safety so far as this country is concerned. Is it likely that, if the Convention had not been entered into, Asia Minor would have been attacked? If you realize the condition of Turkey in Asia—a country inhabited by divided races, and races belonging to different creeds—if you realize the disintegration of Turkish Government in Asia Minor from the events of the late war, and if you realize all the fortresses which defended the territory of Turkey, and which have passed into the hands of Russia, do you not think that that is a prize which would present an irresistible attraction to the ambition of Russian statesmen and Russian soldiers? With regard to danger being apprehended in the event of the Russians getting down to the Isthmus of Suez, that might come to pass if they became the conquerors of Asia Minor; but would not their first advance on the Southern shore of the Black Sea bring them directly and speedily to the very confines of Constantinople? If it is intended to give a fair trial to the policy which has been undertaken of still intrusting to the Sultan the guardianship of Constantinople and the Straits, it is absolutely necessary that he should be safeguarded in his Asiatic Possessions as well as in his European Provinces. Then, said the noble Lord, we have undertaken grave responsibility as regards reforms in Turkey. No doubt we have undertaken considerable responsibility; but it is a responsibility we were bound to undertake. If we are to protect the Sultan in his Asiatic Dominions, is it not the first and necessary condition for successfully protecting him that reforms should be carried out in earnest? But it will be said there is no use in depending on the promises of Turkey. Well, I do not suppose there is any Member of the Liberal Party who will regret to see reforms effected in the Government of Turkey. What they say, then, is that there is no use in leaving the carrying of them out in the hands of the Sultan of Turkey. He requires aid, and that aid England has undertaken to give him. If the guarantee is to be carried out at all, what have we to do? We have to make an attempt to reform the Turkish Government in Asia Minor, and to redeem from their present miserable condition the subjects of the Sultan. That is not only a duty which we may fairly say we owe almost to humanity, but it is obviously a policy which, if successfully carried out, must be of immense advantage to this country and to the world. Is it not well known that there are enormous resources lying waste in Asiatic Turkey—immense fields of enterprise which have long been lying fallow, and that there is great wealth there to be developed? The people of that country are an industrious people—an honest people; and if their Government could be reformed, there is no reason why the country should not become as prosperous as it has been in times past. Therefore, I contend that this undertaking on the part of Her Majesty's Government to assist in the reform of Turkey is not only a wise, but a generous policy; and one which I am very confident the people of this country will fully approve. But it is said—"Why do you not declare the way you are going to carry it out?" Surely that is not a thing that can be done in a day. The British Government have undertaken to do their best to assist the Sultan in carrying out these reforms, and the Sultan has undertaken to carry them out under the advice of the British Government; but it necessarily will be a matter of time. Hon. Members opposite think it can be done off-hand—done by a stroke of the pen—but no reasonable expectation of any such thing can be formed. It will be necessary to make investigations, and to concert measures in order to secure real practical reforms; but I venture to think that if in other respects the policy of Her Majesty's Government as regards Asia Minor is accepted by the English people, they will not be turned away from carrying it out by those phantasies of responsibility. That, at all events, has not been the history of England. The noble Lord has pointed out that in India we have accepted responsibilities under different circumstances. That is true; but that is no reason why we should not incur these particular responsibilities for the purpose of regenerating the country, developing its commerce, and securing the good government of its people. To shrink from it would not be in accordance with the history of the great achievements of the English people, and which has made us what we are. In former times the English people in these Islands had for centuries treasured up the spirit of freedom, until it became a part of their character, and gave strength and vigour to it. Because they have thus formed a character the most daring and the most capable of sustaining effort, when opportunities have been given to the whole world to visit untried fields, the English have always been the first to colonize and the greatest to conquer. If we conquered, we did not take the vanquished people into slavery; we conquered in order to push forward the cause of freedom. We do not purpose to go as colonists or conquerors to Turkey, but as ancient and faithful allies and friends; and by our advice, example, and experience to endeavour to lead them out of the unhappy condition into which they have fallen; and, as far as possible, to confer upon them the blessings which were intended by nature to rest upon the favoured countries now under Turkish rule. I beg to move the Amendment of which I have given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the first word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learnt with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire,"—(*Mr. Plunket,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, before I refer to the speech which has just fallen from my hon. and learned Friend, I wish to notice one omission in the admirable speech of the noble Lord. The noble Lord, unintentionally, forgot to support, by speech, the last paragraph of his Resolutions, which is certainly not the weakest point in our attack on the proposals which the Government have placed before the country. I mean, of course, the paragraph in which we express the deep regret we feel that the Government policy has been adopted without the knowledge or the sanction of this House. At a moment when a new departure has been taken in the foreign policy of England, and a Convention signed, which friends and enemies unite in admitting to be of the utmost gravity, no attention has been called to those proposals by the Government in the House of Commons, and it has been left to the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition to raise the matter by his Resolutions. When we are asked to support what I suppose will be termed a grand policy, I cannot refrain from saying that I think that it would have been far more deserving of the epithet if it had been a policy approved by Parliament after it had been laid before Parliament as a whole. It is not in these days that Governments can make Conventions, that will bind free peoples to engage in bloody wars, without the previous consent of Parliament. It is one thing to make Treaties on lines which have been foreseen, and on principles which Parliament has been permitted to discuss; but it is a very different thing to take a new departure and to deal in a clandestine manner with matters which have never been before either Parliament or the country. The clandestine character of the conditional Convention will be the chief of the reasons which are likely to give it a short life. The people will not forget the manner, if they forget the matter, of this Convention. I turn now to the consideration of the speech of my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Plunket). My hon. and learned Friend is one of the favourite orators of this House; but, if he will allow me to say so, I do not think that his speech to-night was equal to the occasion: and I cannot but believe that it must be the badness of his case which must account for the defective character of his speech. It was not really a defence of the policy of the Government. My hon. and learned Friend did, indeed, ask the House to approve their policy; but instead of explaining it to the House, or defending it as best he could, he indulged in *tu quoque* observations, and, if I may be allowed the phrase, in "chaff." It is quite true, as my hon. and learned Friend said, that the noble Lord began his speech by expressing satisfaction, not only at the conclusion of peace, but, on the whole, at the nature of the peace which has been arrived at. The majority of the arrangements which have been made in the Treaty of Berlin are satisfactory to both sides. The noble Lord did not refer to the retrocession of Bessarabia, and there is not a man in the House who is favourable to that retrocession, or who would not desire to have seen it avoided. But, with the exception of the case of Greece, it may be taken for certain that the general character of the arrangements was inevitable. It is interesting to observe how extremely like the Treaty is to the suggestions made by the Russian Government in June of last year. It goes a good bit further, but it goes upon the same lines; and it is clear that Russia has gained considerably more by the temporary settlement which has been arrived at than, at this time last year, she expected to obtain. On the whole, the arrangements of the Treaty of Berlin are arrangements which, from the time of the Conference of Constantinople, might have been foreseen. What has been done could not have been avoided when once it had been decided not to prevent the war; but those who, like our Ambassador at Constantinople, foresaw such terrible calamities as he described in changes much milder than those which they themselves have now carried into effect, must surely ask themselves whether the Liberals who supported the policy of the Berlin Memorandum were really, as they were described to be, the enemies, not only of Turkey, but of England herself? The second head of the three main heads of the Motion of the noble Lord is that which refers to Greece. Before I come to the consideration of what has been done, or of what has been left undone in regard to Greece, let me first apply myself to remove a false impression which undoubtedly exists among many in the country, if not among many in this House. It is, that Greece is merely an ambitious Power, like Piedmont before 1859, desirous of obtaining, at the expense of her neighbour, territory, chiefly on the sentimental ground that it is inhabited by her race. Those who have not carefully followed this question for themselves are not aware of the frightful cruelties which have been perpetrated by the Turks close to the Greek frontier, in the Provinces of Thessaly and Epirus. Read the account which history gives of the massacres and destruction wrought by the Turks in Greece in our fathers' time, and you will find the true picture of the state of things prevailing in Thessaly and Epirus now. I should almost think that the Turkish Pashas, knowing that they will be compelled to hand over the frontier Provinces to Greece, have determined to hand them over in the condition of a desert, with every homestead burnt, and the green fig-trees, that will not burn, cut down. I pointed out in the House, some months ago, that the Porte had emptied its gaols, and let the convicts loose upon the Greek Provinces, to rob and murder all the people. Up to that moment, in spite of immense temptations, the Greek Government had preserved neutrality; and when at last they resolved upon action—which was forced upon them by the sufferings of their race, and by the outcry of their population—we checked their action by the promises that we made. One of those promises, which was made over and over again, was, that we would "use our utmost endeavours," and again, "do all in our power," to prevent the deeds of lawless violence which were being committed by the Turkish troops in Thessaly and Epirus, and in Crete. I have yet to learn that we did much in this sense except talk, through the pleasant mouth of Mr. Layard, to the Turkish Vizier; and I now assert that those deeds of lawless violence are continuing unchecked at the very moment at which I speak. As far as words went, however, nothing could be more satisfactory than the treatment about two months ago by the Government of the case of Greece. The instructions, addressed to the English Plenipotentiaries by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, are strong and clear upon this point; and as it so happened that the two principal Representatives of England were themselves present at the sitting of the Cabinet, at which the instructions to themselves were drawn up, it must be presumed that the language used had their sanction, although that made use of in Lord Salisbury's despatch of the same day to Lord Odo Russell was far from being equally emphatic. At the first meeting of the Congress Lord Salisbury gave notice of a resolution for the admission of Greece. At the second meeting he brought it forward. At the third meeting he moved it—the debate at the second meeting having been adjourned; and on this occasion England took, or appeared to take, the wider and more liberal view. My hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Plunket) affirmed that England did more for Greece than did France herself—a statement which will provoke the laughter of the Plenipotentiaries. It may be distinctly affirmed, indeed, that at the third sitting of the Congress England showed herself far more liberal to Greece than did France; and yet it is France, and not England, who has left the Congress with the thanks of Greece, for reasons which I presently will show. At the ninth sitting of the Congress Greece stated her case, and asked for Crete, Thessaly, and Epirus. There is only this to be said in regard to her demand for Crete—that the very reasons which were given by the English Plenipotentiaries in support of the demand, introduced by, and actually proposed by, them, to the Congress—that Austria should occupy and administer without limit of time the Provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina—apply in the case of Crete. Crete has over and over again been the scene of revolutions, and the government of Crete by Turkey is a permanent menace to European peace. At the 13th sitting of the Congress the Greek case was considered. When the case of Greece was brought before the Congress, it was not upon a proposal of England, but on a proposal of France;

and not even on a proposal of France, on behalf of France and England, as was the case with some other proposals submitted to the Congress. The proposal was of a very moderate nature—in fact, far too moderate to give any lasting chance of peace, which could only be secured by giving to Greece her mountain frontier of the Olympus line. To the obvious arguments on behalf of Greece, put forward by France and Italy, the Turkish Plenipotentiary replied—"The sea which surrounds Greece on all sides affords her the means of unlimited development." As the Turkish Plenipotentiary, however, refused to give up the possession of any Island in the seas which surround her, it is rather difficult to know what his suggestion meant, unless that Greece should drown herself. Lord Beaconsfield then spoke, and blamed Greece for not having listened to the advice of England—a statement which was contrary to all history; for I think I can prove that, on the contrary, she listened to it too much for her own good. The resolution of France was then agreed to. So much for the position of affairs as it appears to stand upon a consideration of the Protocols. So much, in short, for the public history; but what has been the private history of these transactions? At the beginning of the Congress Greece found, on the part of England, encouragement and fair words, and had the hope of at least some small prospect of reaping the reward for her abstention from action, or rather, as I would call it, the reward for the action she took, for putting down insurrection on the frontier, at the request of England. Then she had to face the postponement of her case; next, after a long delay, her Delegates were heard; and when they left, Prince Bismarck, in a marked manner, addressed the English Delegates, and asked them what they had to say in regard to the Greek demand? A dead silence followed, and then Lord Salisbury whispered that before any decision was taken, the Roumanians ought also to be heard. Towards Roumania, be it remembered, England had taken no engagement; and she seemed to consider that her formal engagements towards Greece had been redeemed when Mr. Delyanni had been allowed to talk for half-an-hour — an act of kindness extended to Roumania, to whom no English promise had been given. This was the redemption of the English pledge! Greece had had every right to understand from all the declarations which Lord Salisbury had made, that her Representative would have been admitted to be present at the sitting of the Congress at which the Cretan Question was discussed. The Protocols distinctly show that the Article of the Treaty of San Stefano which relates to Crete was considered, and the corresponding Article of the Treaty of Berlin was passed, without any intimation to the Greek Delegate as to when the question would be raised; and it is plain, indeed, that his presence at the discussion, had he known of it, would not have been allowed. The fact that the Cretans are in successful revolt against the very organic law of 1868, which is mentioned by the Article, and that they hold, at this moment, the whole Island as much as the Russians possess Bulgaria, had no weight with the English Plenipotentiaries. In what I have said down to this point, I am speaking of facts which can be proved. I will now speak upon matters which can neither be proved or disproved, but which I have upon the highest authority. I am informed that M. Waddington was privately charged by his Colleagues with the duty of studying the Greek proposals, and formulating a resolution to be submitted to the Congress; that he declared himself favourable to the annexation of the whole of Thessaly and Epirus to Greece; that this proposal was supported by Italy and by Austria, but fell to the ground, in the face of the absolute opposition of the English Plenipotentiaries.

Mr. BOURKE: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Baronet; but will he be good enough to point out in what part of the Protocols he finds the proposal to cede the whole of Thessaly and Epirus to Greece?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: I said nothing about the Protocols. That which I have stated has appeared in those German newspapers which are best informed on foreign affairs; but I did not get my information from the newspapers. I am sure that what I have said will not be contradicted by those who know the facts. M. Waddington then fell back on the territorial limits, which are those mentioned in the Protocol, but proposed a definite and settled annexation. This met with decided opposition from the English Plenipotentiaries, who held that public opinion in England did not allow them to sanction a further dismemberment of Turkey, beyond the lopping off of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which they had themselves proposed. On the very morning of the sitting which was to decide the case of Greece, M. Waddington had an anxious but fruitless interview with Lord Beaconsfield at 11, and pointed out in how hard a position he was placed, by those who had asked him to formulate a resolution on the subject of the Greek demands, and who then opposed his minimized proposal, which was, in fact, their own. M. Waddington's proposal was supported, at another interview, by Count Andrassy. The outcome of the opposition of the English Delegates was the proposal of the resolution in such a form that it finds no place in the Treaty; and to a resolution which Lord Beaconsfield, on Saturday night last, declared to be his own, Lord Beaconsfield, in his place in Congress, actually objected. The result of the transactions which I have described is that England has lost the sympathy of the only rising Power in the East which can be set against the Sclavonic friends of Russia. The right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) made a speech at Cheltenham the other day, in which he said that the Government had secured a permanent and lasting settlement of the Eastern Question. Now, I venture to assert that no settlement can be permanent or lasting that fails to give satisfaction to the legitimate claims of Greece. The settlement come to is but a truce; and into the future complications and the future wars which must arise, you will venture in this melancholy fashion—that by guaranteeing Turkey and betraying Greece, we have set ourselves on the side of what is dead, or, at least, decayed and dying, and against that race which is young and full of life. I am speaking myself in the character of one of those who have been deceived; because I rejoiced at Lord Derby's downfall, and at the accession to Office of Lord Salisbury; and I spoke, shortly afterwards, in this House, in support of Lord Salisbury's Circular, and of its policy of running the Greeks against the Slavs. I have spoken strongly of the breaking of the pledges that have been undertaken towards Greece. Now, what were those pledges? On the 23rd of February M. Delyanni addressed our Government at great length on the subject of the representation of Greece at the Congress; and he put his claim for that representation on the ground that the Greek Government were the natural representatives of the Greek population of the Turkish Empire. What was the answer of our Government? Did they contest the justice of this view? Not a bit of it. They only replied, on the 9th of March, that they had considered the appeal—that they thought Greece ought to be represented; and they expressed their opinion on the same day to the whole of the Great Powers, for which they received the warm thanks of Greece. Surely this justifies me in the statement that, at that time, the Government had in view no limited, but an absolute, representation of Greece at the Congress? Not only is a so-called settlement of the Eastern Question—which leaves in the possession of the Turks that most Greek part of Greece, the Island of Crete—no settlement at all; but it must be remembered that there is at least grave doubt whether, by the arrangements of the Treaty of Berlin, we have made dispositions with regard to Constantinople itself which will last our time. Fresh importance is given to the Hellenic Question by the division of Bulgaria. Bulgaria, south of the Balkans, is, by race, largely Greek. If this new Province of East Roumelia is to form a barrier, in the future, against the advance of Russia, it can only be by one of two means—either by a pure military Austrian Protectorate, or by the fostering of the Greek element among the people. The former plan offers no prospect of permanence, and it is to the latter, if we are to succeed, that it would be necessary for us to resort. I am aware that there is in this country, and in this House, a certain prejudice against the Greeks. I cannot but think that those who know their ancient history will see in the modern Greeks the virtues as well as the vices of their ancestors. So close is the resemblance, that if it be true, as ethnologists believe, that there is a large Albanian and a large Sclavonic element among the Greek people of our day, we have to fall back upon the supposition, even more flattering to the modern Greeks than the theory that their race is pure—namely, that they are of so conquering and predominating a blood as that they impose upon inferior races, not only their religion and their tongue, but also their love of freedom and their national character. It should be remembered that the Greek people has never been given a fair chance. The Hellenic Kingdom, formed under the protection of the Powers, contains within its present boundaries a quarter only of the countries and of the people who took part in the war of independence against the Turks; and by restraining Greece within those narrow limits, we believe that you not only make it impossible that she should become a Power able to hold her own, but also that you are not, in so doing, supporting the Turkish Power so much as you are labouring for the ultimate triumph of the Pan-Sclavonic idea. I now come to the third part of the Resolution of the noble Lord, which is that in which he emphatically condemns the vagueness of the obligations that we have entered into as regards Asia. My hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Plunket) over and over again referred to the great popularity of the Convention. He said that the country from one end to the other had testified its unanimous delight at this arrangement. I do not know what opportunities my hon. and learned Friend may have for learning the opinion of the country. I, perhaps, have equal chances with him, and I venture to assert the very opposite. I think the country has been filled with wonder and amaze, and has shown its wonder and amaze by silence. Some years ago I wrote in favour of the scheme for the construction, in the interest of our rule in India, of a railroad from Constantinople to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf, with a branch from it to the Gulf of Scandaroon. This line I recommended as an alternative route, and that at a time when the position occupied by France in Egypt made it clear that England could not, at that moment, play in Egypt the dominant part; and I ventured then to prophecy that the glories of Cyprus could be revived, and that it had a second history before it. Since that time the position of affairs, with regard to Egypt, has greatly changed, and our position in that quarter is far more strong. But, even now, I am favourable to the construction of the Bagdad line, and to that amount of intervention in Asiatic Turkey which is necessary to secure it; and I should contemplate a military occupation of Cyprus and Scandaroon in time of war, in order to provide for the security of our line. Now, the question that I ask myself is, whether we have bought the right to have troops at Cyprus in time of peace at too high a price? I have no hesitation in adhering to the view that almost any direct engagement, however grave, would have been better than the enormous, because utterly vague, responsibility that we have undertaken. I am not opposed, in short, to a grand policy; but I am completely opposed to a policy which is not only grand but also reckless. And with regard to the grand policy itself, I cannot but think that it would be all the grander for being—not the policy of two Ministers, or the policy of a Cabinet of 12, but the policy freely resolved upon by a free Parliament and a consulted people. To my mind, the whole effect of the new policy has been destroyed by the clandestine character of the conditional Convention. I had expected to have heard from my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Plunket), who asked us to vote our confidence in the Government, what was to be the future of Asia Minor. I hoped in vain. Not a word fell from him as to the nature of the arrangements to be made. We are placed in a certain difficulty when we try to argue this question in much detail; because, if we speak of our new responsibilities as great, we are instantly assured that they mean nothing. Now, if they mean nothing, I should be still more ashamed of my country's conduct in the matter than is the case at present. Surely, England cannot put her name to such a deed, with the intention of not carrying out her share. But whatever may be the intention of the Government, I cannot but believe that it will be found in practice that our responsibilities are very great. The inventors of this policy with regard to Asia Minor are the men who, in the fullest degree, believe in the habitual resort of Russia to intrigue. Now, by the 61st Article of the Treaty of Berlin, the Porte engages to carry out certain reforms in Armenia, and to guarantee the security of the Armenians against the Kurds; and the Powers are to superintend the execution of those promises by the Porte. When we say the Powers are to superintend, we mean that Russia, as well as the other Powers, is to superintend. Russia, more than other Powers; for what interest can Germany, and Austria, and France, have in the Armenian Question? That is to say, that in Armenia Russia will have her Consuls reporting to her Ambassador at Constantinople every murder and every robbery that takes place. Russia will be urging the British Government to prevent atrocious acts, which undoubtedly will continue to disfigure the government of Provinces, as to which we have assumed, by our clandestine conditional Convention, peculiar responsibility. No Minister will be able to get up here and say that the conduct of the Turks in Armenia is no business of ours. It will be impossible to do so in the face of that Convention. It seems, then, to me, that with England interfering under her Convention, and driven, as she soon will be, by Parliamentary pressure, to appoint Residents in Armenia, and with Russian Consuls, under the clause of the Treaty of Berlin, watching the English Residents, you will have a state of things which inevitably, sooner or later, must lead to war. What kind of war? An inland war, in a country which we cannot reach. If we wanted war, and thought that war with Russia for the possession of Armenia inevitably must come, it would have been better to have faced it frankly, and called upon England to retain Batoum for the Turks. My belief upon the matter is, that we shall be held by Europe to have agreed to secure good government in Armenia; that we have no power to prevent the raids upon the Armenians by the Kurds; and that we shall be held in future morally responsible by Europe for those crimes. I do not, therefore, think, whatever may be the intention of the Ministers, that our responsibilities under the Convention can be looked upon as light; but, on the contrary, I believe that we have displaced the centre of gravity of the British Empire towards the East, and entered upon a course which, if persevered in, must lead to England becoming a sort of rich Dependency upon the Indian Imperial Crown.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE observed, that during the last two years the important questions which had arisen, and upon which the destinies of the nation, the interests of the people, and the question of peace or war had depended, had been made throughout Party questions by the Liberal Opposition. He should have thought that on great occasions—and especially on the present occasion, when peace had been restored and war avoided—Party animosities would have disappeared; there would have been a unanimous feeling of congratulation upon that which had been accomplished, or, at least, of recognition of the efforts of the Government, and of the manner in which they had been carried out. He could not imagine, looking to the terms of the Resolution proposed by the noble Lord opposite, that their author had read the Protocols before framing those Resolutions. In the very first Protocol it was shown that Lord Salisbury brought the question of Greece before the Congress; it was repeatedly brought forward; and it almost seemed at first as if the existence of the Congress depended upon the solution of the Greek Question. Many years ago he (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) had charge of the interests of Greece in that House, and he had never lost his sympathy with that classic country; but when he considered what the condition of Greece was, and what were her demands in the present instance, he could not conceive for one moment that those demands could have been granted. During the Greek War of Independence, in 1827, the question arose of annexing Thessaly, Epirus, and Crete to Greece, and if that annexation had been made, King Leopold would have accepted the Throne of that country. It was, he thought, very much to be regretted that that was not the solution of the Greek Question, for it would have been a solution of the great Eastern Question also. Russian intrigues, however, caused the opportunity to be lost; and it would have been impossible for the Congress of Berlin further to partition Turkey by adding to the Kingdom of Greece Thessaly and Epirus. It might, however, be supposed, from the speeches of some hon. Members, and the articles in some portions of the Press, that the Congress had done nothing for Greece. He maintained that a great deal had been done for Greece. The Congress had unanimously recommended to Turkey to grant another frontier to Greece, and there was no doubt that the Turkish Government would carry out that recommendation. If that proposal were carried into effect she would gain no less than 5,500 square miles, while the addition to Servia was only 3,800, to Montenegro 1,300, and to Russia in Europe 2,500 square miles, by the retrocession of Bessarabia, although, of course, 10,000 square miles had been added to the last-mentioned country in Asia Minor. It was impossible in these circumstances fairly to contend that Greece had been ill-treated; and he might further point out that the territory which she would acquire would include those mountain passes which were the resort of the brigands who had hitherto infested the Greek frontier, and thus brigandage could be put down. In the whole of the arrangements which had been made, the Government had taken a wise and judicious course; they had obtained for the Christian Provinces great assurances of better government; the disaffected Provinces, which had hitherto been a source of danger to Turkey, had been placed in a more satisfactory position; and, Turkey thus strengthened, and concentrated, would now be enabled to make a very material advance. The Government had been charged with not carrying out their principles. Now, at the time when the war broke out, Constantinople, Gallipoli, and the Dardanelles had been described as English interests; it was certain, however, that, if so, they had been maintained. He did not know what would have happened if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had been in Office; or, rather, it was tolerably clear that in that case the Russians would have been at Gallipoli and Constantinople, and we should have had to declare war in vindication of our honour. The Government had avoided that misfortune, and had gained for the country not only the certainty of peace for many years, but a knowledge of its own strength and of the unity of feeling between England and her Dependencies. There was another point on which he wished to touch. It had often been said that we had incurred a great responsibility; but with respect to Asia Minor, there was no better way of protecting the Christians than by showing to the inhabitants of the mainland the advantages of English rule and the merits of Western civilization. Of course, there were great responsibilities and difficulties; but when objection was taken to the occupation of the Island of Cyprus, he was bound to point out that Turkey had always been under a kind of tutelage, and that we had always in a manner had a control over her. Consequently, all we had to do was to carry out our plan, and to get the best possible men for the Consulships in Asia Minor. As for Russia, he neither trusted nor mistrusted her; but he had never believed the debates of last year, in which all good qualities had been claimed for her, and an absolute absence of ambition and cruelty. He had always taken a more just view of her national character; and now, judging from the whole tone of the remarks of Count Schouvaloff and Prince Gortchakoff, he felt confident of the maintenance for a long time of the peace of Europe. He believed, then, that we ran no risk from our policy in Asia Minor. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, who last year had felt so strongly on the question, had on a previous occasion thought very differently, and had said, in the year 1856—

> "But there was another danger—the danger of the encroachment upon, and the absorption of, Turkey by Russia, which would bring upon Europe evils not less formidable than those which already existed. Such a danger to the peace, liberties, and privileges of all Europe we were called upon absolutely to resist by all the means in our power."—[3 *Hansard*, cxlii. 96.]

Turning to another point, he would remark that Lord Salisbury had been much blamed for the secrecy which had been kept with respect to Cyprus; but he could show that the Congress had had a very fair hint of what was about to be done—

> "Without laying stress on a proposition which seems to him evident, Lord Salisbury asks the Russian Plenipotentiaries whether the considerations which the Representatives of England had brought forward in their private interviews with their Excellencies have affected their determination to retain the fortresses of Kars and Ardahan; in the event of Russia thinking herself bound to persevere in this belief, Lord Salisbury declares that he would reserve for England the right to secure her interest and her influence on the populations by whatever means she might consider fitting."

He believed that that extract was only one of many that might be cited in explanation of the policy of the Government; and if the Protocols were circulated throughout the Kingdom, that policy would be generally approved by all parties. The future, he was confident, was peaceful; and it was satisfactory to think that Prince Bismarck had been able thus to speak at the close of the Congress—

> "Gentlemen,—At the moment of separating I do not hesitate to affirm that the Congress has deserved well of Europe. If it has been found impossible to realize all the aspirations of public opinion, history will nevertheless do justice to our intentions and to our work, and the Plenipotentiaries will have the consciousness of having, as far as was possible, given and secured to Europe the great benefit of peace, which was so gravely menaced. This result cannot be diminished by any criticism which the spirit of Party may be able to publish. I have the firm hope that the European understanding will, with the help of God, be lasting."

He trusted that a division would be taken on the question before the House; and that hon. Members would show that, although they were unwilling to wound, they would not be afraid to strike—that they would have the courage to stand by their opinions—and that the House would, by a large majority, prove that England had achieved a measure which was not only honourable to the country, but satisfactory to Europe.

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY said, though the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) had never appeared in the character of a recognized novelist, he ought henceforth to be looked upon as a great master of romance. The hon. Member had certainly attributed the Liberal Party views about Russia that they never entertained. When the hon. Member accused the Opposition side of the House of being actuated by Party motives, he would only point out that the hon. Member was such a Party man himself that he made not only his speeches and votes, but also his confidence or mistrust, his likes and dislikes, depend upon Party exigencies of the moment. For instance, he was astonished to find that the hon. Member had now entire confidence in Russia. He would not refer to the many speeches the hon. Member had addressed to the House against Russia; but he might refer to one on May 26th, 1877, in which he went to considerable length in describing the aggressive character of Russia, and said that whenever Russia and England were contiguous, great armaments must spring up from that contiguity, and the British forces doubled. Another point which proved that the hon. Member was a great master of fiction was his account of 1830 and the affairs of Greece. He had stated that the narrowing of the boundaries of Greece in 1830 were entirely owing to Russian intrigues. Why, it was beyond all controversy that it was solely owing to the Turkish fears and Turkish proclivities of a Conservative Government under the Duke of Wellington. Both the French and the Russian Governments, parties to the Treaty of London, were perfectly willing to give Greece wider boundaries; Crete and Samos were thrust back under Turkish rule, when they both desired and expected union with Greece, by the action of a Tory Government. There was, therefore, special reason why England should have come forward at this Congress and strongly advocated the claims of Greece and Crete. But look at these Protocols! It might be said that it would have been absurd for England to have advanced propositions that had no chance of being accepted. It seemed, however, to him that even if England found she would be in a minority, which he much doubted, it was due to the Greek feeling in this country, due to her own dealings with Greece, that England should have got endorsed in a Protocol her desire to offer a larger extension of the Greek boundaries than the Congress had thought fit to give. Undoubtedly, the English Government had held out hopes to Greece; and they must remember that the question of peace in the South-East of Europe would never be settled until the Greek Question was settled. This led him to the question of the Treaty of Berlin. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had explained very fairly the Liberal view of that Treaty. The Treaty, as it stood, leaving its omissions out of consideration, was not a Treaty which the Liberal Party could in any way attack, either justifiably or with pleasure; because, although there were points that must be deplored —such as the cession of territory to Russia in Asia and Roumania—these were points that they foresaw and warned the country of as inevitable when once the war had begun; but as to the other points of the Treaty, these were, in the main, points which they must all rejoice at. Undoubtedly, the Treaty of Berlin had effected an enormous change in the Turkish Question. Undoubtedly, it had given a blow to the old fetish that we had held for years—namely, the "independence and integrity" of the Turkish power in Europe. Undoubtedly, it gave distinct recognition to what they had contended for—that the Christian populations of Turkey were the sources to which to look for the future governing classes. Undoubtedly, it had given such a start to the progress of events in that direction, as soon to leave us no more cause for anxiety as to how that Question, so far as Europe was concerned, might be solved. For do not let hon. Members imagine that by the Treaty of Berlin they had set up a state of things in the East that was going to last 15 or 20 years, or even 10 years. The Plenipotentiaries at Berlin thought they had made a great achievement by calling one of the new Provinces Eastern Roumelia instead of Southern Bulgaria; yet neither that dividing name nor the mountain ridge would prevent Bulgaria South of the Balkans from being united, sooner or later, with Bulgaria, North of the Balkans. Then the proviso that the Greeks should have no extension of boundary beyond certain limits, at a time when the Greek was attempting to free his fellow-religionists, and men of the same race from murder, rapine, and tyranny, would not, he was convinced, check the Greek aspirations for freedom. The lesson that it must be by their own swords and their own hands that they must obtain their deliverance, would not be lost upon them. Let him here remark that he repudiated entirely the statement made by the Prime Minister the other day that there were persons in this country who, for factious purposes, were inciting the Greeks to revolt. That was on a par with the conduct of our Ambassador at Constantinople in respect of his statements relating to the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone.) All that those who were thus condemned were doing was to recognize existing facts, and to discuss them as such—dealing with things as they are, and not as it might be desired that they should be. It seemed to him that, during the last few years, we had had new exemplifications of how history repeated itself. The same course of events that took place in 1829, under the policy started by Canning, but more than half dropped by his successors, had been repeated now. After a war extremely bloody, the Russian Government, on both occasions, virtually obtained all that she desired. Mr. Canning's policy was identical with what had been lately advocated as the "policy of coercion," and, if pursued, might have prevented the fatal Treaty of Adrianople. In that House two or three years ago, when he ventured to advocate a policy of coercion as the only way in which war could be prevented, he was held up to ridicule as a man who advocated a bloody war. He ventured to say if that policy of coercion had been adopted there would have been no war; Russia would not now be in the position she is; and the Turkish Power in Europe would have been maintained for another quarter of a century. With reference to that, he must contradict the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin University (Mr. Plunket), when he said that the Leader of the Opposition had condemned a policy of coercion. He had not had time to consult the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) since the speech made by the hon. and learned Member; but his memory served him as to no such condemnation having been pronounced; and he well remembered that the noble Marquess had said that if the Berlin Memorandum had been accepted by Her Majesty's Government, very different results would have been obtained. What was the Berlin Memorandum but coercion before war—coercion to enforce a reasonable demand? It was, of course, galling to men who, for the last two years, had been called Russophiles, and similar names, to feel that Russian views had been advanced not by them, but by the so-called friends of Turkey. They had now, however, to look at what the Government were going to do in the future. If Her Majesty's Government would accept the friendly advice that was given to them, they would adopt a more solid and more temperate line of statesmanship. While, however, the country was considering these questions, a Convention burst upon them, which he was, at all events, justified in saying was unparalleled in British history, which had been undertaken without the slightest notice to the people of what was called a free country, or the rest of Europe. The only precedent was one relating to Portugal in the middle of last century. But in that case the only liability we entered into with Portugal—a country with a large seaboard—was, that should war break out, we would send 12,000 men to serve under the Portuguese Government, and would keep the Force recruited up to that number. There our liability began, and there our liability ceased. But the liability under this Treaty, if it was real—that was the question—he wanted to know, was it real?—was enormous, and our responsibilities were dangerously increased. Either this Anglo-Turkish Convention was a reality, or it was not a reality. If it were a reality, had the Government taken the trouble to examine its full meaning, and to convey any idea of it to others? If it was not a reality, what on earth was the use of making such a Convention? The first result would be that the Turk would say—"The British Government has undertaken my defence, and I shall trouble myself no further about the matter." If, six years hence, Turkey should call upon the British Government to defend her frontiers, how many Turkish soldiers did they expect to find there? Did they suppose the Turkish Pashas were not going to spend their money in kiosks and seraglios, when they could get a British Army to fall back upon to defend them? If they had to go to war in five years' time, and expected to find a powerful Army ready to take the field, they would find them utterly inefficient. The only lever that could be used effectually on the Turks up to this time was the fear of Russia. If this Convention took away that lever, what had they got to set up? How were they to act directly upon them? They were told that they must send their best men under their own officers, that they must put pressure upon them, and that they must annex Turkey. Now, really, was the word "insane" too strong a word to use when a British Minister undertook, by one stroke of the pen, to manage Asia Minor? That case had been put so well by the noble Lord who moved the Resolution that it would be presumptuous if he detained the House by enlarging upon the point. Since the conquest of the Caucasus and the acquisition of Kars, Russia had got positions of unparalleled strength. We were moving our Indian frontier to the very strongest point of the Russian military system. That was a point he hoped the House would not forget. By this Treaty they had given Turkey the right to call upon them to come forward and execute their bond, and resist any attack that might be made by Russia. Turkey was not a Party to the Tripartite Treaty of 1856 between England, France, and Austria, and was, therefore, luckily held incompetent to call upon us for its fulfilment; but in this case she was not only a signatory, but the only signatory besides ourselves. By this Anglo-Turkish Convention they had completely parted with freedom of action, and had handed over the national honour of England to Turkey. ["No, no!"] Turkey had now the power to ask Great Britain at any moment, however inconvenient, to do that which she could not refuse to do without the loss of national honour. Who knew what might happen under those conditions? There might be an irruption of Kurds. Then would come an advance on the part of Russia to pursue these marauders. The Russians might perhaps take some part of their territory to keep them in order. Then Turkey would call upon Great Britain at once to help her in resisting this incursion, and there would be war between England and Russia. If he were the Russian Government he should withdraw his Ambassador from Constantinople, and should treat directly with the British Foreign Office, because all diplomacy rested on force in the background. If a third party came in to take charge and to guarantee, it was to that party you must address yourselves. If they were going with a light heart to take this unknown and terrible responsibility, they had better make the whole transaction complete by undertaking the regulation of Persia, because Persia was infinitely more valuable to Russia than Asia Minor as a route to India. Persia was completely in the hands of Russia, and she need not require to disturb Asia Minor so long as Persia was so completely in her power. So long as the British Government shut the back door in Armenia, but paid no regard to the front door in Persia, they were not acting in a rational manner. But he regarded the whole thing as an unreality, and to be got out of as soon as convenient. The policy of the Government for the last three years had been a policy of unreality. He did not deny that they had had enormous difficulties to contend with; but he would tell Her Majesty's Government that the greatest difficulties they had to contend with were difficulties of their own creation. [An hon. MEMBER: No.] The hon. Member who said "no," should wait to hear what he meant. Their chief difficulty arose from their having tried to "halloa" with the music halls, while all the time compelled, and perhaps inclined, to hunt with rational men. Well, the Government, by their self-imposed difficulty of "jingoism," were driven into a secret agreement with Russia. It need not have been a secret Convention if they had not had a Party behind them whom they were fearful to offend by any conciliatory arrangement with Russia. He did not blame the Agreement, but he blamed the secrecy of it, and he said that that Anglo-Turkish Convention was part of the same necessity—a necessity imposed upon the Government by a certain portion of their supporters—that they should not come back from Berlin without something in their pockets to satisfy them. He did not think that sort of thing was beneficial to the country. It was far too like the conduct of a gambler who had lost all his ready money and then staked his inheritance. They were, in fact, pledging those who came after them by that Anglo-Turkish Convention, without running much risk themselves, because it stood to reason that after a convulsion of this sort all the parties were weary, and they were sure of a certain period of exhaustion. They were, for their own Party purposes, leading the Turk into a feeling of false security, and making him believe that he was going to have that assistance from England which would avail him at the last moment. He believed that Turkey in Asia had a good future before it if it only took the good advice of the English nation; but that it might have had without the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The possession of the Island of Cyprus was in one view a matter of congratulation; for he did not hesitate to say that, as an Englishman and a patriot, he was always glad to see, if it could be done with justice, honour, and legality, the maritime bounds of the Empire extended. What he did not want to see was the extension of our territory over Continents where our maritime supremacy would be of no avail, and by the holding of which they would undoubtedly change the complexion of their military and civil burdens. He wished to say one word as to the last part of the Resolution of the noble Lord. He knew that there had been times in the history of this country when it had been most respected, when the Foreign Office sought in Parliamentary discussions their surest aid in the conduct of their transactions with Foreign Powers. But since the last two or three years Her Majesty's Government seemed to take an exactly opposite course. They seemed to keep Parliament in the background; they disliked debates, while they courted divisions and they abominated questions. What they seemed to like to do was this—Having settled their policy, they came down to the House of Commons and said—"The thing is done;" and even then some of their Party would use very harsh language, talking about a "factious opposition" when the Party opposite did what it undoubtedly was the duty of an Opposition to do—namely, asked that a certain amount of information should be given to them. He did hope that such a line of conduct had only been adopted to meet the temporary exigencies of an anomalous occasion, and that it would not be carried out to the extent of depriving Parliament of a voice in matters to which such great liabilities were attached. The Parliament of this country was, after all, the representation of the nation, and he did not think that the history of the past would show that when treated with confidence it did not rally round Her Majesty's Ministers, especially in relation to foreign affairs. He did not hesitate to say that the feeling that had been growing up in the country of late had been one of the results of the action in foreign affairs of the last two or three years. It was felt that an enormous expense had been incurred by the country; but without the country that Parliamentary control over foreign affairs had been gradually diminishing; and that the time was approaching when, if that state of things was to continue, the Liberal Party would have to make it one of their cries that the Prerogative of the Crown, as exercised by Her Majesty's Ministers, had increased, was increasing, and must be diminished.

Mr. R. E. PLUNKETT said, he did not attach much importance to the noble Lord's Resolutions, because he did not believe that in any popularly-elected Assembly in this country, at the present moment, it would be possible to pass a Vote of Censure upon the Government. Indeed, he believed that if the Opposition had acted upon their first impulse, they would have brought forward a Resolution to express "regret that it had not been found possible to dispute, in a satisfactory manner, the claims which the Government had established upon the gratitude of the nation." But although, from one point of view, one was tempted to treat the Resolutions somewhat lightly, there was another point of view from which they had a serious bearing. The question at issue was not merely as to the conduct of the Government, or as to our immediate action in Asia Minor. It seemed to him that the Congress of Berlin had inaugurated a new state of things in Europe, and that what the present debate would decide was the part which this country was henceforth to play in the European system. There were two views which might be taken of our position. One was that we should shake off all Imperial responsibilities and confine ourselves to trade, protracting a miserable existence as long as our coal and iron lasted, and ending finally in smoke and nothingness. The other ideal for this country was that she was a great nation with a high destiny to fulfil, and that her interests were not confined to the narrow limits of these Islands. England was a little nation in Elizabeth's time, and she then defied the greatest Power of Europe. They had humbled the pride of the greatest Monarch France had ever possessed, and were they to shrink before the force of a single Power? Why should they be afraid of holding one side of the frontier, when Russia was not afraid of holding the other? With regard to the Persian Gulf, if an ironclad Navy were to be kept there, he did not see that the scheme of the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) was less hazardous, and certainly not more practicable, than that of keeping Cyprus. With regard to the treatment of Greece, he was reminded of certain benevolent people described by Dickens, who, when they see a fight going on, invariably, in the goodness of their heart, tell the smaller boy to go in and win. If the smaller boy went in and fought, they knew what would happen to him, and no benevolent gentleman would step in to help him. We had said to Greece that she could not establish her cause by fighting, and that she must not fight. There was now open to her, without resorting to arms, a better prospect than she could possibly have secured if she had expended all her little force. The noble Lord's logic was complete. He said—"You approve of the Treaty of Berlin, therefore you approve of the war." It would be a pity to spoil such an argument by handling it, therefore he left it as it was. Then it was said that the Convention with Turkey was an infraction of the Treaty of 1856; but if that was so, why was not the Treaty of 1856 quoted to show where the variance came in? For the simple reason that there was not an article in it which could, by any possibility, be held to exclude that Convention. The object of the Convention was clear. It was accepted on all sides that the misrule of Turkey would never cease until there was some Power standing by her side and ready to exercise pressure upon her. They had tried remonstrances and appeals from a distance, and Heaven knew what; but they had seen no result for all their efforts. They had brought pressure to bear on Turkey in Europe, but in Asia they had a population which could not look to Europe. It was with this population which England had concerned herself. In giving a military guarantee to Turkey against Russian aggression in Armenia, England acted for her own interests; but it was to her honour that she had undertaken to protect the people against Turkish misrule, and they must be on the spot to do it; and were they now to shrink back, afraid to undertake the responsibility of the situation? They had been told a great deal about the liabilities we were undertaking. He held them very lightly, for if Russia was going to attack us, we would now be able to meet her on ground with which we were acquainted, instead of having to send out a hasty Expedition to unknown territory. Two hon. Members had told them they were giving up their insular frontier, which had been our safety hitherto. Where had those Gentlemen been the last 200 years?

Since the end of the 17th century they had not had an insular frontier. The frontier of Canada stretched for 4,000 miles along the border of a country ten times as powerful as Russia, and they had a considerable land frontier in India. During the Eastern debates they had heard a great deal of what was to happen when Turkey split up; but they had not heard anything of what was to happen when Russia split up. Yet in a country like Russia, where the populations differed so much in character, and were only held together by the loose bonds of a common savagery, there was sure to be a re-distribution of power as civilization increased. Long before their power was threatened, they might see an entire re-distribution of the power of Russia. As to the "undefined engagements" into which they had entered, he thought misconceptions had arisen from a misreading of the first Article of the Convention. Our engagement was not to effect reforms, but to defend Armenia by force of arms; and there was nothing undefined about that. He could not see what was left of these extraordinary Resolutions, but supposed the Leader of the Opposition felt bound to make a formal protest against a policy which had been pursued until it was a notable success. Perhaps, what was intended to be the sting of those extraordinary Resolutions was the Constitutional objection that these engagements had been entered into without the previous knowledge of Parliament. It was impossible, however, that our Plenipotentiaries could consult the Legislature with respect to the various questions which were raised at the Congress. Either their mission was to be a mere sham, or it was absolutely necessary that they should be allowed to act upon their judgment; and he could not but think that this charge of not consulting Parliament was introduced to furnish a decent tag-end to what the noble Lord must have himself considered a most inconclusive set of Resolutions.

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Sir, the subject which is brought before us by the Resolution of my noble Friend divides itself into four parts—The effect of the recent negotiations on the Turkish Empire in Europe, their effect on the Turkish Empire in Asia, their effect on the British Empire, and their effect on the world at large. On each of these parts I should like, with the permission of the House, to say a very few words. First, then, as to the results they have produced on the Turkish Empire in Europe. No one, I should hope, will grudge to Montenegro the gift of independence and the small accession that has been made to her scanty territory. Some writers and speakers, to whom the existence and history of that gallant little clan seems to have come suddenly as a sort of special revelation during the struggles which have so lately closed, have doubtless made too much of its merits; but after much has been subtracted, much that is creditable and deserving of sympathy still remains. Then as to Servia. Servia has made no great figure in the whole business, and before the foolish war into which she entered, her politicians indulged in preposterous dreams; but we cannot regret that she, too, has obtained some sentimental and some material advantages, though far less than she would have obtained if good sense had prevailed two years ago in the Councils of Belgrade. Nor is there anything in the aggrandizement of Roumania which is otherwise than satisfactory. The pity of it is that she was not made independent 10 years ago. The wiser friends of the Porte urged that. Its less wise and far-seeing friends resisted it, and we now see the result. If Roumania had been in that position in 1877, how much would the difficulties of Russia in the way of attacking Turkey have been increased? Neither can I much regret the retrocession of the too famous piece of Bessarabia. Of course, I know that that district, being inhabited by a Roumanian population, is much more similar in character to Moldavia and Wallachia than is the Dobrudscha, or the other territory which she obtains South of the Danube; but those who go a-hunting with the lion must submit to the lion's terms; and who shall say that, looking to the future, it may not be well for the peace of the Provinces, which are not essentially warlike, that they should not be encouraged to cherish ambitious hopes of being the nucleus of a great Roumanian Kingdom, which might extend from the Bug in the East, a long way towards the Theiss in the West. With, however, the names of Montenegro, Servia, and Roumania, the list of the districts which have received very substantial benefit from the Treaty of Berlin comes to an end. We have now to look at its failures. When we broke the concert of Europe in 1876, by declining to adhere to the Berlin Memorandum, it was our bounden duty to be prepared shortly afterwards with some scheme which we might submit to Europe. Such a scheme must have been based upon one of two policies—either on the old policy of 1856, the traditional English policy, as modified by the Andrassy Note to which we acceded—or on a bold attempt to reach the root of the evil and cure the heart disease under which the Turkish Empire was suffering. That heart disease was the incapable, and more than incapable, character of the Central Power at Constantinople. No half-measures were any longer reasonable. By its acceptance of the Andrassy reforms, the Porte had gone as far in concession as an independent Power could go. If that concession did not meet the exigencies of the case, then there was nothing for it but to acknowledge that the Porte was no longer sustainable as an independent Power, to knit once more the concert of Europe, and with Europe to put something better in its place. We did not do this. We entered with the unhappy Constantinople Conference on the region of half-measures, and we see to what they have brought us. What is the result? We have become parties to the creation of an autonomous tributary Bulgaria, from which those very districts, which our people first learned to call Bulgaria, are studiously excluded. That autonomous Bulgaria will have two great objects in life—first, to get rid of paying tribute, and secondly, to add to itself all the Bulgarian-speaking districts South of the Balkans. Whereas, for 10 years previous to the ineffectual rising which was stamped out so savagely by the Bulgarian massacres, you had Bucharest as the centre of Russo-Bulgarian intrigue in Turkey, you will now have Tirnova or Sofia for the centre of that intrigue. Her Majesty's Advisers make much of having restored to Turkey a defensible frontier in the Balkans; but how idle it is to talk of Turkey having any longer a defensible frontier in Europe. Her garrisons in the Balkans will be a mere source of expense, and a ready means of fixing a quarrel upon her, whenever it may suit her Slav neighbours to re-commence a contest. Then, again, as to the organization of Eastern Roumelia. If its organization is made predominantly Christian, that may be a very good thing; but it is vain to talk of its being any longer a real portion of Turkey, which is Mahomedan or nothing. It is a Province being got ready to be taken from Turkey, as Roumania was three years ago, and got ready by a very clumsy process. Then as to Bosnia and Herzegovina. I am quite willing that they should go to Austria, if it is to the advantage of Austria that she should have them; but it is well known that their annexation is looked upon with the greatest distrust by many of the wisest and most patriotic men in the Empire. They fear that the introduction of those Provinces into the Empire may be the beginning of the end, may break up the arrangements of 1866 between the Domains of the Hungarian Crown and the States West of the Leitha. That is a turn of affairs that could not be looked upon with perfect calmness, even by those who remember the terrible days of 1848-9, when it was said of one aged General—"In his camp was Austria." Of course, it is conceivable that the experiment may succeed; but if it does not, which is but too likely, Her Majesty's Government, by contributing to it, will have had the poor satisfaction of, while they left the Eastern Question unsettled, opening a far more serious Central European Question. Then, again, as to the Greeks. What has been done, or proposed to be done, has stimulated their appetite, and further excited their ambition without giving their wise aspirations any reasonable satisfaction. Nay, so far as anything has been done, they have been led upon a wrong road. They have been incited to think rather of advancing in the direction of Macedonia and Thrace, than of making themselves strong on the coasts and on the Islands. Greece is not like Antaeus. Her forces are re-vivified, not by touching the earth, but by touching the water. If, from some fantastic notion of using her as a barrier against the advance of Panslavism, we encourage her to think that she has a great future on the mainland, we do her a cruel wrong. We engage her in the same struggle in which Denmark, in an evil hour, engaged with her great Neighbour. I, for one, heartily hated the Treaty of San Stefano; but what Her Majesty's Government has brought us from Berlin is the Treaty of San Stefano disguised, not the Treaty of San Stefano altered. The essential feature of the Treaty of San Stefano was the breaking up of Turkey in Europe, without putting anything that could live with its own life in the place of that effete organization, and without settling the question of Constantinople, which remains a standing menace to the peace of Europe. That, however, would be a perfectly accurate description of the Berlin Treaty. There are differences between the two; but the differences are made merely to gull simples. They are razors good to sell—bad to cut. Of two things, one—either we should have held to the policy of 1856, and tried to keep the sick man on his legs till his natural heirs could have got their full rights in the Balkan Peninsula, or we should have taken our part in putting in his place a Western Prince, as the Duke of Wellington long ago advised. We took neither course, and our sons, who will see the question of Constantinople opened again, will hardly thank us. And now I pass to the effect of the recent negotiation upon Turkey in Asia. Well, as to Cyprus, of course what has happened is an excellent thing for Cyprus. There is no doubt about that, and the Anglo-Turkish Convention will be a beginning of great good to Asia Minor, and many other broad lands, if the British people really mean to take a serious view of its responsibilities, not merely to-day or to-morrow, but for the next half-century. But, when we come to ask what is the effect of the recent negotiations upon the British Empire, a very different answer must be given. The Anglo-Turkish Convention either means nothing, or it means something. If it means nothing, it is altogether an imposture. If it means something, it is well nigh an impossibility. I will not say anything as to the first supposition, the supposition that the Convention was meant to be like one of those quarterly articles by a theologian famous in his day, as to which Mr. Lockhart once said when someone remonstrated with him about them—"Yes, I know it. They tell nothing, they mean nothing, they are nothing—but they go down like bottled velvet!" I will take it for granted that it means something. In that case, I say it is well nigh an impossibility. Never has this nation, in all its long history, taken such a burden upon its shoulders with its eyes open. India, says someone. But did we take India on our shoulders with our eyes open? Assuredly not. We slipped into our Indian responsibilities by a series of accidents—happy accidents—perhaps yes—perhaps no. That is the secret of the future; but accidents undoubtedly. This, however, is no accident—it is a stroke of high policy. How? What do we gain by it? It is replied that we secure our route to India. Our route to India, I rejoin, is not threatened; and if it were, is in no way secured by our engagement with Turkey. Our hold of India is no more endangered by Russia having Batoum, Kars, and Ardahan, than it is endangered by her having Modlin or Cronstadt. All the five possessions are to India supremely immaterial. If Russia were ever to invade India, her route would be from the South-eastern corner of the Caspian, *viâ* Astrabad and Meshed, to Herat. There are other possible routes, though really none worth considering at present; but an invasion of India by Russia is, as I have often had occasion to show, so entirely out of the question, under any circumstances that can occur in our times, that we may cease to think of it. But if, instead of being a far-off danger, it were a near and present one, it would not be even remotely affected by Batoum, Kars, and Ardahan having changed hands. If Russia, neglecting the only possible line, along which even a man who united the genius of Napoleon with resources such as Russia could only obtain by mortgaging her future for 100 years, might conceivably lead her hosts to attack us in India, were to advance from Armenia to the Persian Gulf, she would only be preparing for herself a defeat even more disastrous than that with which she would meet if she, having taken Herat, advanced down the Bolan. But, it is said, we secure the Suez Canal. Look at the map—what have Batoum, Kars, and Ardahan to do with the Suez Canal? No, Sir, by the unlucky Convention we do not secure the Suez Canal; we take away our thoughts from the country of the Suez Canal, from Egypt, which is of great importance to us, to fix it on a dream and a delusion—to chase some phantom of a railway down the Euphrates, which it would be a most pleasant and desirable thing to have, but which should never be allowed to take off our thoughts from the infinitely more important Egyptian transit. Why do I say infinitely more important? Because Egypt is the only country over which the English flag does not wave where we can, at any moment, be immensely strong both by land and by sea. Far better, if it is intended to spend money in improving our communication with India, to spend it in quickening and improving the service, *viâ* Egypt, than in getting, at infinitely greater cost, a line which can never be of the same importance to an essentially Naval Power. By all means encourage railways being made in Asia Minor or Syria, running towards the Persian Gulf—the more strings to our bow the better; but do not let us throw away national money upon objects which, however good, are only in a very secondary sense national. But I shall be told—away with these merely selfish considerations; think of the blessings we shall confer on one of the most interesting and unhappy regions of the earth. I do not wish to forget them; but it is a question of relative duties. Is everything in so satisfactory a state at home that we can afford to go world-bettering at the expense of our own people? We can do nothing worth doing in Asiatic Turkey without incurring great expense. That means that we shall impose new, and not take off old, taxes in Great Britain. We shall stint our development at home to restore prosperity to the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Are our own gigantic Colonies and India, trifling in size and in future compared to these, but still so enormous, not a sufficiently wide field for our energies? Must we wander so far out of our way in search of sure excitement and uncertain markets? Then, again, just see what we are doing. We are afraid of Russia in India, and so we, in the first place, give Russia a good reason for wishing to trouble us in India by thwarting her in the Balkans, and then we take up position in Armenia, which enables her to bring her strongest against our weakest part. When I learnt fencing, I used to be told that I should bring the forte of my blade against the foible of my adversary's. I rather think my Lord Salisbury took lessons from the same master; but, if so, he has forgotten his cunning, for he does just the opposite. What demon can have tempted any not wholly-mad Briton to give his country a long land frontier? But that is exactly what this Treaty does, since it makes us defend Asiatic Turkey—a country 20 times as large as Scotland—just as if it were Scotland. All I have said is on the supposition that the Turkish authorities in Asiatic Turkey will meet us in good faith, and allow us virtually to govern Turkey; but is not that an extravagant supposition? Why should they? Is it not more likely that they will intrigue against us, and thwart us, and even, if the worst comes to the worst, throw themselves into the arms of Russia? I have long thought that it would be a perfect God-send to all these countries to be governed by Anglo-Indians; but, in order to give the Anglo-Indian fair play, you must change your central authority at Constantinople. English gentlemen acting under the sort of people who have long ruled there would be in a most painful position. And observe, one false step involves another. If it is right to take charge of Turkey in Asia because Russia has got Batoum, Kars, and Ardahan, it is much more right to take charge of Persia. Her Majesty's Ministers have already, in spite of our protests, practically annexed Khelat. A very little encouragement would send them to Cabul, and then we should have everything on our shoulders, from the Mishmee Hills, which look down on the eastern corner of Assam, to the cypresses of Scutari. I confess that, to my mind, such a prospect is more dazzling than re-assuring; and will anyone say that it is a whit more improbable than what we see before our eyes in this Anglo-Turkish Convention? I come now to the influence of these negotiations upon the world at large; and this is certainly not their most agreeable aspect. Before they began, Her Majesty's Government had gained a great deal of credit on the Continent amongst those who, hating Russia and desiring to thwart her, were unwilling themselves to "bell the cat." But when it was found that, far from "belling the cat," Her Majesty's Ministers had made a private arrangement behind the back of Europe to go shares with the dreaded animal, that cheap and noisy popularity, acquired by the readiness to waste British blood and money upon non-British objects rapidly declined. How does Europe stand affected to us at this moment? Russia, of course, hates us cordially, and bides her time. Austria is pleased or acquiescent. Germany thinks we are what we always were—clever traders on high principles, with a weather-eye open to commercial results. France thinks that *perfide Albion* is, as ever, *perfide Albion;* and Italy, the country where, for a long time back, there has been more popular sympathy for England than in any other European land, is thoroughly disgusted, and says that the pens with which the Berlin Treaty was signed were taken from the wings of four vultures, one Turkey, and two geese. The wise policy for this country being in every possible way to minimize its military obligations and territorial interests wherever the British flag does not now wave, while we keep up the very best possible Diplomatic and Consular Service, so as to be at once able and willing to assist other nations, as a well-informed, powerful, and disinterested friend to all of them, we have, thanks to Her Majesty's Ministers, taken a precisely opposite line, forfeited the good opinion of our honesty, which some held, confirmed the bad opinion which others held, while we involved ourselves in new and perplexing duties. We have descended from the grand and unique position which history has been more and more giving us, of being in Europe, yet not wholly of Europe; but rather a great Asiatic and Oceanic Power, to make ourselves largely dependent upon the intrigues of Constantinople, one of the most corrupt of European cities. The negotiations of this summer will be what those of 1864 would have been if Lord Salisbury had then prevailed—the very parting of the ways, the beginning of Imperial decline —if we cannot within the next few years overturn them, burying, let us trust, in their ruins, those who had most hand in building them up. Before I sit down, I should like to say just one word on the Constitutional question to which the Motion of the noble Lord refers at its close. No one doubts, I suppose, that the Crown has full power to conclude Treaties without consulting Parliament; but that is a doctrine which wise Ministers will not push to its logical extremity. Our Constitution is good for nothing, if it is permitted to Ministers, without the consent of Parliament, not merely to conclude an ordinary or even extraordinary Treaty without Parliament being consulted, but to utterly revolutionize the whole policy of the Empire. That is what this Convention does, if it does anything at all, and is not a mere deliberate deceit practised on Turkey, on England, and on Europe. The Constitution says, no doubt, that the nation is, in this respect, at the absolute disposition of the Crown, which is another phrase for the Ministers of the day; but the Ministers of the day should remember that complimentary and courteous expressions must not be interpreted all too literally. When a Spaniard or an Italian tells you that his house and all it contains are at your disposition, you may safely understand that he means to be very civil and hospitable; but you must not understand him to mean that he actually transfers his property to you. If you do, it may fare with you as it did with the late Prince Metternich. That statesman being in Rome and in the house of Torlonia, expressed great admiration for an extremely valuable picture which belonged to his host. Torlonia, with the courteous instincts of his country, immediately begged him to consider it as his. Metternich, acting with as little discretion as the present Cabinet, took him at his word, and Torlonia revenged himself by telling the story to the day of his death, with the epilogue, *Et le coquin l'a pris.* I am afraid the word which he used was rather stronger than *coquin*, and very like it. Well, Sir, the Constitution being an impersonal creature, will not be able to tell the story to the disadvantage of those who have treated it so badly; but the Constitutional historian will do that for it, and we may be very sure that when he tells the story of the too literal interpretation which has been put upon its provisions, he will end it with an epilogue at least as severe, if not quite so bitterly expressed, as the *Et le coquin l'a pris* of the plundered Italian. Ministers who try to strain the Prerogative should remember that the violence of the 16th of May was followed by the humiliation of the 14th of December, even if their studies in French history do not go further back, and bring with them more formidable recollections.

MR. BOURKE said, he was not surprised to hear the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken say that he expected to see the Government buried under this Treaty, of which he was disposed to take so unfavourable a view. That, no doubt, was the wish of the hon. Gentleman. But he (Mr. Bourke) could not agree in one or two of the remarks which the hon. Member made, especially when he complained of the position this country held in relation to, and in the estimation of foreign Powers. For his own part, he believed there never was a time when we had more friendly relations with all the Powers of Europe than the present; while with regard to the effect which the hon. Gentleman said the Anglo-Turkish Treaty would have upon them, he was convinced that there never was an episode in the history of Europe where England had shown so much influence as she had done in that which closed in the Congress of Berlin. The noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) at the close of his speech made some statements which called for observation on his part. The noble Lord and his Friends who acted with him, thought the most patriotic course for them to take was to bring this question boldly before the House, and state their objections to the policy of Her Majesty's Government. The Government entirely concurred in that sentiment. They had no objection whatever to the course taken by the noble Lord on this occasion; and the only complaint they had to make was that his criticisms had been small and captious, and had not battled with the grave questions involved in the policy before the House. The noble Lord's remarks, in fact, were not calculated to place before the country the grave issues which it would have to decide. There were one or two remarks of the noble Lord which, although of a general character and applying only to the details of the question, he should like to brush away before he came to the great subject under consideration. He hoped the hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Grant Duff) would not suppose that he was treating him with disrespect when he passed by, also, some of the observations he had made, recurring to others as they arose. The noble Lord said—"If you approve of the Berlin Treaty, you must approve of what was done by the war;" and the hon. Member who had just sat down had stated that he could not understand the object of it. But why did we join in the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket), in approving of the course which Her Majesty's Government had taken? We did so because we undid, by the Berlin Treaty, a great deal of what was done by the war. Therefore, the House must look at the matter in a light exactly the reverse of that placed upon it by the noble Lord. He also said, in his opening remarks, that he thought it more desirable to compare the Treaty of Berlin with the terms of June than the Treaty of San Stefano. These terms of June might be disposed of in a very few words. It had often been said that the Government ought to have insisted on the Porte accepting the terms of June. Well, we were most anxious that the terms of June should be accepted by Turkey, and they still had no doubt that Turkey would have acted very wisely in accepting them. What did Her Majesty's Government do? The course adopted was well known to the House, because it was recorded in a Parliamentary Paper. Her Majesty's Government wrote a despatch to Mr. Layard, and asked him whether there would be any use in bringing the terms of June to the notice of the Porte? It would be in the recollection of the House that at that time the Turkish Army was making a gallant defence on the Danube against the whole power of Russia. It would also be remembered that, according to all the reports we received, we had every reason to think that Turkey was firmly determined to carry on the struggle to the last, and had not unreasonable grounds for hoping that even she, with her small forces, would be able to make terms of peace which would be more likely to be to her advantage than anything we could shadow out in the terms of June. Then the Government heard from Mr. Layard that it would be perfectly hopeless to mention the terms of June to the Porte. Mr. Layard did sound the authorities, and came to the conclusion that we should be losing our influence for good hereafter if we asked the Porte to consent to anything like the terms of June. With regard to the noble Lord's comparison between the terms of June and the Treaty of Berlin, he had this remark to make. The terms of June were not before the Congress of Berlin; and, therefore, the question the House had to decide was the difference between the Treaty of San Stefano and the Treaty of Berlin, which were the two great documents on which the Congress had to decide. It would be disrespectful to the House if he were not to give hon. Members credit for knowing the main features of those great events which had occurred in Europe during the last three years, and the general causes which led to the Congress. Therefore, he would not delay the House a minute by dwelling on those great events. It was admitted that the terms of the Treaties of Paris and the Treaty of London could not be modified without the general consent of Europe. It was also seen by every person who gave the subject his calm attention that, as Russia had waged a victorious war against Turkey, she had obtained advantages and rights which nobody could deny. When the Treaty of San Stefano appeared, that document astonished and alarmed the world. But it was not until after it had been studied for some time that its true significance was perceived either in this country or in Europe. When, however, the real meaning of that Treaty was discovered, a diplomatic struggle ensued between Russia and Europe, the question being how far Europe would modify that Treaty, which had been made between Russia and Turkey. Lord Salisbury's Circular of the 1st of April appealed to the public law of Europe and to the Declaration of 1871. In that Circular it was pointed out that, under the Treaty of San Stefano, a great State would be constituted from the Ægean to the Danube, in the formation of which Russia would have a preponderating influence, and over the future of which she must exercise complete dominion. Moreover, in the future, all the races would be subject to one nationality which hitherto had shown no power of self-government. It was also felt that the power of the Sultan would be reduced to absolute subjection. Europe generally concurred with that Circular of Lord Salisbury's. For a considerable time it was doubtful whether the Congress would meet or not. Some Governments, particularly that of Germany, concurred with the British Government that the Congress would be worse than useless unless the divergent ideas and opinions which existed, not only between England and Russia, but between other Powers and Russia, were smoothed away by preliminary negotiations before the Congress met. It was well known that irreconcilable opinions existed between the Governments of England and Russia, and it was this circumstance that led to that interchange of ideas between the two Governments out of which arose the much-abused secret understanding come to by Count Schouvaloff and Lord Salisbury. He might take that opportunity of reminding the House of the great efforts that Count Schouvaloff made to bring about an understanding—of his journey to St. Petersburg, and of the great influence which he not only possessed with his own Court, but of the influence which he was able to be bring upon every other Court in Europe. He, for one, was glad to take this opportunity, if it would not be considered a liberty, of saying that he believed this country and Europe were very much indebted to Count Schouvaloff for his wise counsels at the beginning of these troubles, and, above all, in the negotiations which preceded the Congress. But the great and cardinal point was that the Treaty was submitted to Europe. What was the object England had in view in going to the Congress? The object they had in view was to build up and not to destroy. They recognized the fact that, bad as the government of Turkey had been, there were elements of good in the country, and that there was much industry, integrity, and valour among the Mussulman population—who, he might be allowed to say in passing, had never been permitted to take a share in the government—that there were elements still in Turkey by which territorial and administrative arrangements could be made in accordance with the interests of the majority of the population, the wishes of the Sultan, and with future tranquillity. The arrangements with respect to Bulgaria were only arrived at after protracted discussion, much of which turned upon the question of the frontier. It was important that a defensive frontier should be given to the Porte, and it would be observed in the Treaty what the frontier was now to be. It was to be laid out by Commissioners, and it was to be not only a geographical, but a really defensible frontier. With regard to Montenegro, the changes effected in the Treaty of San Stefano would, he believed, be hailed with general satisfaction. Herzegovina and Bosnia naturally fell under Austrian administration. It was desirable for Austria that her frontiers should no longer be disturbed, and that consideration more than anything else induced the Congress to confide to her the administration of the two Provinces mentioned. In connection with Roumania, the retrocession of Bessarabia had been made the subject of complaint against Her Majesty's Government; but although Roumania had at the commencement of the war allied herself with Russia, and therefore had not *primâ facie* any great claim upon our consideration, both Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury urged her claim to be heard, and it was through their instrumentality that the question of Bessarabia was brought before the Congress. The position of Roumania in the matter might be thought one of hardship; but no Power was prepared to make the question of Bessarabia a vital one to the success of the Congress. He did not suppose anyone would contend that it was the duty of England to go to war for every act of injustice committed by one State upon another. Looking generally to the work of the Congress, it could not be denied that great dangers which would have been produced by the Treaty of San Stefano had been averted by the modifications brought about by the Treaty of Berlin. The preponderating influence of Russia was not now to be apprehended, and other influences had been introduced into the countries on her borders. The policy adopted by Great Britain in the Congress with regard to Greece had been attacked that night by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke); but he thought that the objections which they urged were without foundation. From the first, they endeavoured to impress upon Greece that if she wished to succeed in her aims, she would not do so by insurrection; that by insurrection, indeed, she would perpetuate rather than remove the evils of which she complained. Not only did they do that, but they urged Turkey to behave in a generous spirit towards Greece, so as not to tempt her to any acts of violence, in proof of which it was only necessary to refer to the despatches which had already been published in the Blue Books. In October last, Lord Derby requested Mr. Wyndham to inform the Greek Government that the wisest policy for them to pursue would be to maintain an attitude of strict and impartial neutrality. At the same time, they urged upon the Porte the necessity of preserving a good understanding with Greece. Not only had Her Majesty's Government given that advice to Greece, but they had also urged Turkey to act in a generous manner towards that Kingdom. The Greek troops crossed the frontier into Thessaly; but, owing to the representations of the British Government, the Porte refrained from attacking them. Then, with regard to what took place at the Congress, Her Majesty's Government undertook to represent to the Congress the claims which Greece had to be heard; but, at the same time, they told the Greeks most distinctly that all questions of territorial acquisition must be settled by the Congress, and that they could give no opinion themselves, nor prejudge what the opinion of the Congress might be. Both the noble Lord and the hon. Baronet had spoken as if Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury were indifferent to the claims of Greece; but he thought the Protocols showed that it was very doubtful whether Greece would have been heard at all had it not been for Lord Salisbury. With regard to the indemnity, it was agreed by all the Powers that it was not to be converted into a pretence for further territorial annexations, neither would it affect the interests of the creditors of the Porte. The Treaty of San Stefano, which provided for a cession of territory in lieu of the indemnity, had been considerably modified by the Treaty of Berlin. Bayazid, which, as they all knew, was an important place on the road to Persia, had been restored to Turkey. Batoum had been represented as a place of very great importance, a statement which had been challenged; but, whether it was of great importance or not, the disposition of it made by the Treaty of San Stefano had been changed, and it was made a free port. He could not help thinking that by this change the great danger of the place becoming a naval arsenal for Russia, and so being turned into a serious menace of the freedom of the Black Sea, was avoided. In view of the fact that England was not prepared to go to war for the sake of Batoum and the territory around it, he thought the conclusion which had been arrived at on the subject was perfectly satisfactory. Then, with regard to the Asiatic Protectorate, if Europe was not prepared to assist England in the prevention of the undue aggression of Russia in Asia, Europe could not be jealous of England for taking the course which she thought most desirable to arrest these encroachments in Asia Minor. Lord Salisbury had distinctly told the Russian Plenipotentiaries that, if Kars and Ardahan were taken by Russia, then England must take the measures which she thought best for preserving her interests in the East. When Russia declared war against Turkey, it must have been perfectly clear to any intelligent observer that the responsibility of England would vastly increase. It was quite clear that under Russian influence, a new state of affairs would arise in the East. Notwithstanding this, England agreed to remain neutral, and it was not until the Turkish capital itself was threatened that England took those measures of precaution which she thought absolutely necessary. The Treaty of San Stefano showed the dangerous condition of Asia Minor, and the menace which was offered to the Turkish Provinces there. Her Majesty's Government were convinced that if some great effort were not made to restore good government in Asia Minor, those Provinces of Turkey must inevitably become Dependencies of Russia. If Russia were to acquire a populous territory in Armenia, she would obtain a large recruiting field and a district from which she might get large supplies, and thus she might apply unlimited pressure upon Persia. He did not say whether a railway would or would not be made in the Euphrates Valley; but there were plenty of districts in Asia Minor where railways, if made, would be of great value and importance in opening up the country. The question was asked, what were their interests in Asia Minor? and it was said that Asia Minor did not touch India. But the same argument might be applied to Egypt and other places. Again, it was said that Asia Minor was not the way to India. But Persia was the way to India, and he had shown that Persia must inevitably fall to Russia if Russia once got possession of Asia Minor; so that it came to this—that whether the Anglo-Turkish Convention existed or not, if Russia attacked and conquered Asia Minor, the consequences to English interests would be serious; and he believed that no British Government could long exist which did not use the resources of the country to avert such a result. From that point of view, therefore, their responsibility was not increased by the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The noble Lord himself said they should tell Turkey once more that she had a chance of reform, that she must reform her Asiatic Provinces, and that if she showed an anxiety to reform—if she carried out their advice in that respect, they might then proceed to offer her protection. Well, that was substantially what that Convention did, with the important amendment that they would help Turkey to reform. But, if the noble Lord's plan were adopted—if, when Turkey had reformed, they were then to say they would protect her, what became of the argument of those who asserted that Asia Minor was of no importance to England? If that country was left alone, it was vain to hope for any amelioration of its condition. The old intrigues and collisions would continue, and the unhappy population would only remain in the miserable state in which they had been for many years; and, in all probability, they would before long see the same scenes enacted in Asia Minor as were lately witnessed in the Balkan Provinces. One of the first conditions for averting such a state of things was that the country should be at peace, that intrigues should cease, and that Russia should be convinced that further conquests in Asia Minor were incompatible with the local reforms which it was the admitted duty of England to encourage in an especial manner. A great deal had been said about the military liabilities they were incurring; but that phrase, however adroitly used, would not frighten the English nation. High authorities assured him that the best military measures they could adopt were the opening up of the country, making roads, providing security for life, and giving the people an interest in their own prosperity. If that were done, the people would be ready and willing to devote themselves to their own protection. In that way he believed the best foundation they could have would be laid for giving strength in a military point to Asia Minor, and also for attaining other valuable ends in connection with its good government. He could not believe that those objects were beyond the resources of Turkey, if she was well advised and assisted morally. It was said that they had pledged themselves to advance 1,000 miles closer to the military resources of Russia. Of course, in one point of view, they had gone 1,000 miles closer to her; but it was entirely an error to suppose that Russia had her great sources of strength in Asia Minor. Russia's object was to obtain possession of the populous country of Asia Minor, in order to avoid the necessity of transporting her troops South of the Caucasus—of a country, in short, which would admirably serve as a recruiting ground. If Russia were not really an aggressive Power, she would not be hurt by their acquisitions, and would desire no advantages in Asia Minor. If that was the case, well and good; but if not, and she had designs on the country, it could be only for one object, and that the ulterior onject of further conquest. She had already plenty of territory North of Asia Minor, but no means of recruiting her Army South of the Caucasus—which he considered necessary in view of further conquests. Surely, on such a question, they were a united people? Russia, under the Treaty of Berlin, had taken upon herself great responsibilities as to the improvement of the populations under her care. Austria, too, had undertaken enormous responsibilities; and it was not for them, the only country greatly interested in Asia Minor, to be alone afraid of the duties attaching to their position. It would be observed that they had not guaranteed Turkish territory as had been done in 1856; their guarantee of Asia Minor was conditional on the reform of that country, and if the condition was not complied with the guarantee ceased. The inducements to the Sultan to introduce reforms were very great, because their promise depended on that point, and he would not otherwise be protected from Russian attack; if, on the other hand, he introduced no reforms, he would be left to his fate, and England would be obliged to re-consider her position with regard to the territories of Asia Minor. No doubt, in the first case, it would become the duty of England to assist the Sultan in the work of reform, to help him in levying taxes, in police, and in the administration of justice; and, above all, in caking care that men of tried integrity were put at the head of affairs, and should not be subject to arbitrary removal, but should hold office for a certain term of years, without being liable to dismissal by a decree from Constantinople. Now, it might be asked what was the nature of the reforms that would be recommended to the Sultan? but he could imagine nothing more impolitic than that he should stand there and state what the reforms suggested would be, nor would any course be more certain to prevent their accomplishment. Probably, too, the changes they should propose would be canvassed and criticized both in the House and out of it, and so the Sultan would be led to doubt the soundness of the advice tendered by Her Majesty's Government. With regard to Asia Minor, they would all feel that any improvement must be very gradual, and that if they did their duty there could be no doubt whatever of success. The dangers were not very considerable, and he had already indicated those against which it was necessary to provide. He did not know that he need say much about Cyprus; but he wished to say a word or two on what had been called by hon. Members opposite the Constitutional question. It had been called a secret Treaty, while, in fact, it had never been intended to be secret, but to be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it was ratified. In that respect they had exactly followed the precedent of 1856, for the Treaty of 1856 had not been laid on the Table till some days after its ratification. Nothing would have been less judicious than a discussion in the House on a Treaty that required secrecy for its success. Why, the first thing that would have happened, if it had been known that such a Treaty was about to be signed at Constantinople, would have been to try to prevent the Sultan from agreeing to it. The whole question of signing or not signing had depended upon a few men at Constantinople, who might easily have been pursuaded to induce the Sultan to withhold the ratification of the Treaty, and thus the object in view would have been frustrated. As to the Anglo-Russian Agreement, it was one of those agreements which were very common. Hon. Members must know that, when a great international arrangement was about to take place, negotiations often went on for months before, and agreements were come to preliminary to that arrangement, which were sometimes put in writing and sometimes not. But it was absolutely necessary to come to some agreement before the Congress met, because the divergences between the two Powers were so great that, otherwise, in all probability, war would have been the result. With the arrangement which the Government had made the country was, he believed, satisfied. If peace really reigned in Asia, large fields of future industry would be open which would otherwise have been closed to British commerce. By the arrangements made in Asia Minor, they had not added to the responsibilities of this country in the least; but by taking time by the forelock, by telling Russia what they really did intend, they would avoid those difficulties which would certainly have come on the country if they had simply allowed things to take their course. It would require determination on the part of any English Government to carry out the policy which had been inaugurated; but if they exhibited the same character which had distinguished Englishmen in all generations, they need not fear the verdict which history would pass either on the Berlin Treaty or the Anglo-Turkish Convention.

Mr. HUSSEY VIVIAN had no desire to call in question the statement, made on the Ministerial side, that England had always exercised an important influence in the affairs of the world; but he denied the truth of the customary assertion on the other side of the House that the influence of this country had been diminished during Liberal Administrations. He did not believe that the influence of a great country like this was increased by constant boastful references to its power. The question at present before the House was not to be limited to a comparison of the Treaty of San Stefano and the Treaty of Berlin. In order properly to appreciate the policy of Her Majesty's Government, the House must take into consideration the declarations of the Head of the Cabinet when these difficulties began; and it was a most remarkable thing that the policy he at first enunciated had been entirely reversed. It was the policy of the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) that had triumphed; the policy of the Prime Minister had certainly not been secured by the Treaty of Berlin. At one of those meetings at which it is customary for Ministers to state their policy to the country, the noble Lord at the head of the Government had said that he had been labouring for 12 months to maintain the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire. As far as he (Mr. Hussey Vivian) was aware, this statement had never been retracted. But was that a statement of the policy which had been affirmed at Berlin? Why, neither the integrity nor the independence of Turkey had been maintained. Under the Treaty of Berlin Turkey lost large possessions, and the famous Convention of the 4th June tore away the last rag of the independence of the Turkish Empire. The evidence of this was contained in the speech just delivered on behalf of the Government. From that speech it appeared that we were about to interfere with the most intimate relations between the Sultan of Turkey and his subjects in Asia Minor. It was extraordinary to note how Her Majesty's Government had contrived to persuade the country that their diplomatic defeat was a victory. That they should have been able to do so passed his comprehension. No doubt, there was great cause for rejoicing that peace had been secured; and there was no man in the country who must not, to a certain extent, be thankful that Her Majesty's Government had conducted these negotiations in such a manner as to bring them to a peaceful issue. The Opposition would certainly have taken a different course. First of all, they would never have allowed the peace to be broken. If, at the time of the Berlin Memorandum, the Government had joined the other Powers of Europe in plainly telling the Sultan of Turkey that we would not allow his misgovernment to continue, no European war would have broken out. He believed that the Berlin Memorandum was placed before the country in such a way that our Government could not with honour have concurred in it. But there was nothing to prevent the Government making such a counter-proposal as the other three Powers would have assented to. If our Government had plainly said to Turkey —"We cannot allow your misgovernment to continue," Turkey must have given way. There would then have been no war. He could not, therefore, give the Government the credit of having secured the peace of Europe. The same might be said of the Congress. He (Mr. Hussey Vivian) had compared and collated the terms of Russia as expressed by the Treaty of San Stefano with the terms of the Treaty of Peace concluded at Berlin, and the differences between them were extremely slight; there was, in fact, an extraordinary similarity between the two documents. In his opinion, Her Majesty's Government were deeply responsible for not instructing Mr. Layard to lay before the Porte the distinct terms which Russia was prepared to accept on the 8th of June, 1877; and which, if they had been submitted to by the Porte, would have been far better than those she had since been forced to accept. If they came to consider the arrangements made by the Treaty of Berlin, it would appear that many points remained unsettled. The internal peace of East Roumelia was to be preserved by a native *gendarmerie*, or local militia; but he desired to know of what materials it was to be composed? Were the officers to be appointed by the Sultan to be Christians, or were they to be sent by the Sultan from portions of his Dominions other than Roumelia? The wording on these points was not at all clear, while upon these questions the most material issues arose. Again, what would be the position of Turkey 10 years hence, possibly with another war with Russia on her hands, and having this militia, which would certainly be hostile in feeling, in her rear? What would become of the Balkan passes in such a state of things as that? As to the Commission, he looked with the greatest hope to the Russian portion of it; for the Russians throughout had struggled to secure the liberties of Christians, while the Plenipotentiaries who represented England had striven to maintain, as far as possible, the *status quo*. With regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina, those States had been handed over to the military control of Austria. The English people ought at no time to allow such a tyranny to be imposed upon any nation. This he felt from his own experience, having travelled in Italy, when that country was in a similar condition. Knowing what Austrian military rule meant, he could not believe that the freedom of Bosnia and Herzegovina would be thus secured. The fact was that the question of the freedom of those oppressed nationalities had never been present in the minds of our Plenipotentiaries, who, possibly, had to contend with the jealousy of Austria; but who were, nevertheless, bound to use their best endeavours to secure for them as many as possible of the blessings of that freedom which we enjoyed. The Bosnians and Servians were people of the same race, of the same language, and, largely, of the same religion, although he was aware that many of the former were Mahomedans. Under such conditions, there would have been no difficulty whatever in handing over to Servia a large portion of the Principalities; but, as he had said before, there was Austrian jealousy to conciliate, and our Plenipotentiaries had yielded to it at the cost of Bosnian freedom. Now, with regard to the retrocession of Bessarabia, he thought that no one could feel that the conduct of Russia had been in any respect satisfactory; at the same time, he was bound to admit that he thought the Government had acted wisely in not going the length of declaring war against Russia on that ground. What was the outcome of all this, but that Russia had triumphed on every point, and had obtained the original terms laid down by her? Surely, that was no cause for congratulation on the part of Her Majesty's Government, who had opposed her? Again, the question of the indemnity had been treated at the Congress in the most superficial manner. So long as that immense claim continued to hang like the sword of Damocles over the head of Turkey, so long would she continue under one of the most severe conditions imposed by the Treaty of San Stefano. It really seemed that no serious effort had been made at the Congress to deal with that question, which would continually menace her independence. It appeared to him that it ought to have been disposed of in some way; but it was, practically, passed over, after a very short discussion. It was true that the Russian Plenipotentiaries had given assurances that the claim would not rank before the prior claims of other creditors of Turkey; but the indemnity would still hang over her. On the whole, he thought he had shown that it was not the Government policy, but that of their opponents, which had triumphed at Berlin. Then as to the famous Convention. They now knew that it was made at the same moment as the Agreement with Russia. Could that Convention have been entered into for the purpose of covering the retreat of Her Majesty's Government after their diplomatic defeat? He very much suspected that such was the object which they had in making that Convention. He was reminded that Her Majesty's Government were somewhat in the habit of referring to *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, and would venture to draw their attention to a little matter of natural history, which appeared to him to have a considerable similitude to their action in the matter of the Convention. *The Encyclopædia* said that—

> "The cuttle-fish contained in a certain distinct vessel a fluid as black as ink, which it shed for the purpose of concealing itself when pursued by its enemies."

He had a strong suspicion that the Government had used the art of the cuttle-fish in covering their retreat. It was also possible that the Convention might have been a portion of the grand idea for the regeneration of the glorious East, which had occupied so much of the mind of the most prominent Member of Her Majesty's Government. He believed the result of it would be to involve the country in great difficulties, because it would bring us face to face with Russia—a result that when we complained of her advance in Asia we had always been anxious to avoid. If Russia ever invaded Asia Minor, it would be at a time when this country was involved in some great difficulty. It had been admitted by the hon. Member who had just spoken (Mr. Bourke) that we must exercise a large influence upon the internal government of Asia Minor. He said that we must advise and assist the Porte in the levying of taxes, police functions, and the appointment of officers who were to be permanently occupied in the administration of justice. By undertaking to mix ourselves up in the local details of a country like Asia Minor, we had incurred enormous responsibilities. How were these engagements to be carried out? Was it to be supposed that the Turks, who had struggled against annexation by Russia, would allow us to take possession of their country in such a manner? And yet it must come to this if we thrust ourselves into the internal management of their affairs. He presumed it would be admitted that there must be a Resident in every important town of Asia Minor; but those Residents would be backed up by no force as in India, where they had the support of the Army. It appeared to him, moreover, that an interminable struggle would go on between the Residents and the Consuls of the various other Powers, which would produce difficulties that before long would involve the country in actual war either with Turkey or Russia. It had not been made clear to his mind why we had undertaken these serious responsibilities. Lord Salisbury, in his despatch of the 30th May, 1878, to our Ambassador at Constantinople, had described the Turkish Dynasty as one that rested more upon active power than upon the sympathies of nationality; and he went on to say that the defeat which its Army had sustained would produce a belief in its decadence and speedy change; that the only way to prevent this was an engagement on the part of a Power strong enough to fulfil it—that in future it would be defended by force of arms. The decadence of Turkey formed no reason why we should undertake such enormous responsibilities as were involved in the undertaking to put matters right in Asia Minor. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) had said we must undertake some responsibilities, because other countries had taken responsibilities upon themselves. But he denied that Austria, who had simply to march her Army, which was quite ready, and to take possession of two Provinces, had incurred any responsibility whatever. He had also used words which had certainly somewhat alarmed him, when he said that "there were imminent dangers in Asia Minor." When an hon. Gentleman holding the position of his hon. Friend made a statement of that kind, they had a right to expect that he should tell them what those imminent dangers were. The necessity of guarding the Euphrates Valley, which had been dwelt upon to a very slight extent, was not now urged as a necessity for undertaking the grave responsibility which we had assumed. It was not mentioned in Lord Salisbury's despatch, and the Government did not seem to treat that matter as one of very great weight. Great weight had, however, been attached in "another place" to the influence which our action in Asia Minor might have upon the Mahomedan mind; and a noble Lord, well acquainted with India, lost no time in pointing out that though we had poured out our blood and treasure in maintaining the Dominions of the Porte during the Crimean War, we had no sooner done so than the Indian Mutiny broke out. He repeated that we had incurred a great responsibility, and that, too, without the sanction or knowledge of Parliament. Parliament, by a tendency of the Government to make these great strokes of policy without its consent, had become little else than a Registry Office. He would only add, that as long as he had strength to raise his voice, it should be raised in that House against such engagements as this being contracted without Parliament being in any way consulted.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Viscount Sandon.*)

MR. GREENE wished to make an appeal to both sides of the House. The debate had been the dullest he ever remembered. The House had always been indulgent to him, and he wanted to get away to attend to his business. He thought that the debate should terminate the next night, as there had been the greatest possible difficulty in carrying it on. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) had made a very able speech; but all who had followed him had spoken in the same terms. He thought the noble Marquess would be doing an act of kindness in causing the debate to finish next evening.

MR. GOSCHEN said, the Government had not assisted to bring about the end desired by the hon. Member for Bury St. Edmunds (Mr. Greene). At 12 o'clock, a Cabinet Minister had proposed to adjourn the debate, and then there was the remarkable fact that during the whole course of the debate no Cabinet Minister had condescended to address the House. They had had in the course of the proceedings many departures from ordinary precedents; but they had now come to this—that on the first night of one of the most important debates that could occupy the attention of the House, no Cabinet Minister had risen to defend the policy of the Government. He could not express surprise at this, for it was in accordance with the course pursued by Ministers through the whole of the negotiations.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The remarks of the right hon. Gentleman are very amiable, no doubt; but, considering that we were challenged by the Leader of the Opposition to a most solemn debate upon the most important action of the year, or, indeed, of many years, it is rather remarkable that there should be so small an attendance, and that so very slight an interest should have been manifested during a great part of the evening. I cannot, of course, account for that; but, although my noble Friend was perfectly ready, and had intended to address the House, yet it seemed that there was a certain slackness, and that it would be a better economy of time—for, at this period of year, we must economize our time—not to proceed with the debate, but to take it up to-morrow with perhaps a little more spirit, and, in the meantime, to get some through some of the Orders. When it is said that no Cabinet Minister has spoken, it must be remembered that the Under Secretary, who represents the Foreign Department in this House, has spoken with great ability, and his speech was a complete answer to the observations addressed to the House on the part of the Opposition early in the evening. I thought that his speech deserved an answer from the front Opposition Bench. It is, of course, impossible for us to control the course of debate so as to render it agreeable to everyone, and I know how difficult it is to arrange a debate of this character in a way that will give a due and fair place to everyone who is naturally desirous of speaking. I should be glad if we could continue it a little longer; but I am afraid the House has fallen into luxurious habits in this respect,

Fin'

and we do not often carry on a debate after 12 o'clock. Although I am not sanguine enough to imagine that the debate will be concluded to-morrow, I hope it may terminate on Thursday next.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, it was explained at the beginning of the evening that the Endowed Schools (Scotland) Bill would be brought on at a reasonable hour. The object of adjourning at present was, he believed, to enable that measure to be proceeded with. It was understood, however, that the Bill would not be brought forward except at a time when the Scotch Members could fully discuss it. He thought the debate should be continued.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS would reserve his answer, until he made a statement further on.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON could hardly hope that the debate would be closed until the end of the week; indeed, he was not sure that it would terminate then, unless there was a disposition on the part of hon. Members to facilitate that result by somewhat curtailing their remarks and confining them to one or two points. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had referred to the fact that the speech of the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was not answered by any Member on the front Opposition Bench. Two of his right hon. Friends were extremely anxious to have an opportunity of replying to that speech; but it did not tend to bring a debate to a conclusion if too much time, especially in the earlier part of the debate, were occupied by Members on the front Benches. There was a reasonable feeling that fair opportunities ought to be given to speakers in other parts of the House.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) rose to reply to the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he was unable to agree with the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) as to the desirability of postponing the Scotch Endowed Schools Bill.

Mr. RAMSAY said, the Endowed Schools Bill for Scotland had been read a second time in April last, and he put it to the House whether it was reasonable, when they were promised a full discussion of the question to proceed with it at that hour of the night? The right hon. Gentleman must recognize that there had been undue delay in bringing forward the Bill. He was of opinion that the business should be taken on another occasion.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL wished to know with what object it was proposed to adjourn the debate, whether for the purpose of proceeding with the Scotch Bill, or the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS replied, that he intended to proceed with the Scotch Bill.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE was also of opinion that the House should be made aware of the statement of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Assheton Cross) as soon as possible.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

---

### ENDOWED SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS (SCOTLAND) BILL—[*Lords.*]

(*The Lord Advocate.*)

[BILL 157.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he trusted hon. Members would allow them to go into Committee on this Bill. It was intended to give all the trustees of these institutions a chance of reforming themselves; and, if the Bill were postponed to another year, the opinions of the Government would remain the same. The Government proposed that the trustees should have power conferred upon them for a limited time to promote schemes of reform. These schemes would be referred to a Commission, and the names of the Commissioners would be given to the House before the Bill passed. It was quite evident that those who took the extreme view that there should be some summary measure, would gain their object earlier by supporting the Bill. The schemes proposed by the trustees would be referred to the Government for approval. This would be the last chance which the trustees would have of reforming themselves. The Government undertook, by the Bill, not to vary the schemes in any vital point. Under those circumstances, the trustees would have a free course of action. They must, however, bear in mind that their schemes must be *bonâ fide*, and such as would meet with the approval of the Commission and the Government. After the schemes had been proposed and approved, there would follow an Executive Bill to carry them out; and, if this were not sent in and approved of, then the Government would do for the trustees what they would or could not do for themselves. He trusted the House would agree to the Bill, which, if it did not go so far as some hon. Members wished, was still a long step in the direction recommended by the Commission which had already reported upon the question; and, if the Bill was not passed this Session, it would be brought in again next year.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE wished to understand clearly that the Bill should not pass without the names of the Commissioners being given, and when they should have an opportunity of discussing the Bill. [Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: On the third reading.] He hoped they would not be asked to pass the Bill through an important stage at a period of the evening when it was impossible to discuss it fully. After the inquiries instituted by the Commission of which he had been Chairman, it was very disheartening that they should have to begin with this legislation. The trustees of many of the institutions to be dealt with were guided by very narrow instincts — narrower, in fact than the trusts. For instance, Heriot's Hospital had always been spoken of as if it belonged to Edinburgh; but the fact was, it was a double endowment, first for the benefit of Edinburgh, secondly for the benefit of the whole world, through the University—as would be seen from an examination of the codicils to George Heriot's will. Hitherto the endowments had been administered wholly in the interest of Edinburgh. He did not think that that was the way in which this matter should be carried out. But if it were to go on, it must be upon condition that there should be a strong assurance to the people of Scotland that the Government was in earnest, and that the time for the duration of this measure was only a year, and that after that year the Government would be prepared to act in the spirit of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken. He could see no reason why they should not act in that manner at once, and why the Bill should not be upon the same principle as that upon which legislation for England had proceeded. There was no reason that he could see for any difference between the two countries in that matter. He did not, however, wish to oppose the Motion for going into into Committee on the Bill; but it must be on the clear understanding that, before another stage was reached, the Government would give the names of the Commissioners proposed to be appointed.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL was very much disposed to support the proposals of Her Majesty's Government, provided they could be carried out fully and fairly, and that nothing was done which should have the effect of leading the trustees of the Endowed Schools and Hospitals into a trap. He did not take so gloomy a view of the position of trustees as was taken by the hon. Baronet. In the burgh he represented there was an important educational trust; and while there was in it, like others of the kind, great room for reform, those who represented that trust were themselves sincerely anxious to reform it, and only sought facilities to enable them to do this. As the Bill originally stood, where the trustees agreed to a scheme of reform, the Commissioners, whose names had not yet been given, and afterwards, the Government, might alter it. It was said by the Government that such schemes were not to be altered in any material degree. But he was apprehensive that there was not sufficient safeguard to satisfy trustees that something would not be imposed upon them for which they had not bargained. If it were clearly understood that nothing should be done against the will of the trustees, and that the Government should only retain the power of rejecting a proposal, he could see no objection to the measure. Not only did he think that it was necessary that the Amendment of the Lord Advocate should be adopted; but he was of opinion that it should be made perfectly clear, so that the trustees should not find their schemes altered in any material degree. It was, further, of the utmost importance that the names of the Commissioners should be made known to Parliament as soon as possible, for the whole working of the Bill would rest with the Commissioners to be appointed. His chief apprehension was that those gentlemen who might be appointed might be inclined to carry out the principle which had already been carried too far in England—namely, the diversion of endowments intended for the poor to the benefit of those who were not poor. He was very anxious that a change of that kind should not take place. In his own burgh a foundation had been established at a not very recent period, which was made as exclusively and absolutety for poor people as possible. He should be sorry to see that and similar foundations diverted by Commissioners from their original objects.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY did not think that much of real reform was to be expected from the Bill. It was all very well to propose that reforms should be carried out in the abstract on liberal principles; but that might mean anything or nothing. In his opinion, the reforms should all proceed upon this principle—that the benefits be conferred, not as a matter of favour, but as a reward of merit; that was the principle which should run through all these foundations. Times had very much changed, and it was now found, from experience, that where foundations were applied as a matter of favour the privileges conferred did more harm than good. This Bill was most important, and ought to be discussed at a time when it could be reported in Scotland. He did not think that a proper discussion of it could take place at that hour in the morning. Speaking from experience of the last Act of a similar character, he should not be disappointed if this Bill was dropped. Under the last Act only two schemes were proposed, and one only was passed. That was some indication as to what might be expected to be done under the present Bill. In his opinion, trustees would not be likely to agree to schemes of real reform. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would find some other evening for the discussion, when the Scotch Members would have an opportunity of taking part in it. He begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. LEITH seconded the Motion. He said that there was a promise that Scotch Business should receive more attention, and yet this Bill was now brought forward at a time when it was impossible for it to have full discussion; and while, at the same time, it was admitted that the Bill was one of very great consequence and would affect a very large amount of property in Scotland. In the constituency which he had the honour to represent, there was a large amount of property depending upon this Bill; and he did protest, in the cause of his constituency, against so important a measure being brought on at past 12 o'clock at night. He would also call attention to the way in which Ministers had dealt with Irish Business in contradistinction to Scotch Business. The reason for that difference of treatment was that Scotch Members were not banded together for the purpose of obstructing the measures which the Government might bring forward; but were always ready to assist the Government in the progress of beneficial legislation for England, Scotland, or Ireland. Therefore, he thought it was not right that the Government should treat Scotch Business in the way they did, and give the preference to Irish measures over those relating to Scotland. With reference to what had been stated by the Secretary of State for the Home Department with regard to the Commissioners, he thought that the names of the Gentlemen proposed to be appointed should be given to the House before it went into Committee. It was of great importance that those names should be known, and he thought that a distinct pledge should be given by the Government that the names should be made known at an early stage of the Bill. He was in favour of the Bill, and on behalf of his constituents would offer every facility in his power for its passing. But there were certain conditions which in fairness they had a right to ask, and one was that they should be given the names of the Commissioners, at least, before they arrived at the stage when the Bill was reported. It was most important to recollect that everything must depend upon the character and conduct of the Commissioners.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. J. W. Barclay.*)

MR. ASSHETON CROSS observed, that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had censured the conduct of the Government in showing undue partiality to Irish measures, and in bringing forward an important Scotch measure at that hour. He must remind the hon. Gentleman that, at that period of the Session, unless the Bill was got through that night, it was impossible for it to pass. That fact was clearly understood in Scotland. As to the general charge of neglect of Scotch Business, he begged the hon. Gentleman to remember how much time had recently been spent upon matters relating exclusively to Scotland. If he took the trouble to count up the nights spent on the Scotch Roads and Bridges Bill, and other measures, he would find that as much time had been spent in Scottish matters as on those relating to Ireland. In regard to the measure now before the House, did hon. Members wish it to pass or not? If they did, he hoped that at that hour they would not refuse any longer to go into Committee.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR said, it was, no doubt, very convenient for the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Scotch Members ought to go into this matter without further discussion; but it was not at all agreeable to those for whom he spoke to follow that advice. The Home Secretary did not explain how he differed from the Report of the Royal Commission. The right hon. Gentleman simply said, dogmatically, that the Government did not agree with it, and had consequently brought in the present Bill; and he threatened that if it were not accepted, a precisely similar measure would be brought in again next year. Why were Scotch Members to be treated in this manner? Why was Scotland to be so served? Was the wisdom of the Home Secretary so great and so concentrated as to overcome that of the whole of the Royal Commissioners who had reported on the subject? But he hoped that the Lord Advocate might be able to supply the omission. In what state would they be if the Bill were passed? If, with the large experience of the working of endowments in England, it was found desirable for the Royal Commissioners to have full power to promulgate schemes, why should not the Scotch Commissioners also have the power? There was no reason to suppose the Scotch Commissioners would not do their duty as well as the English ones. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate had said that if the Bill were changed to that extent its chance of passing would be over; but he could not regard that as an excuse. The only point upon which he was satisfied was the promise of the right hon. Gentleman that the Government would, in the future, bring in a more firm and sweeping Bill than the present. For his part, he could not see any reason why two measures of reform were necessary. There was no reason why everything should not be done by the present Bill; and he was entirely dissatisfied with the feebleness and weakness of the present measure, which he thought would do no good to Scotland. He should certainly vote for the adjournment of the debate.

MR. M'LAREN wished to protest against the assumption that the people of Scotland were of the same opinion as the Royal Commission, and that they desired their recommendations should be adopted. From that view he entirely dissented. He believed that if this were to be made a test question, an enormous majority of the people of Scotland would be in favour of giving the trustees three years to decide as to the schemes they would propose, and have the matter settled by a local body rather than handed over to a Government Commission with no local knowledge. In Scotland, the opinions generally were that the Government plan was the best. All those who took the other side in this controversy could require was that the Government should be pledged to bring in an additional Bill at a subsequent period.

COLONEL MURE hoped the Amendment would be withdrawn. It was the desire of the people of Scotland that the trustees should have an opportunity of proposing reforms. Many of the trustees who now desired reform were trammelled by local influences and prejudices. If the Bill passed in its present form, it would have the effect, in every locality, of giving the trustees an opportunity of reforming themselves; and, at the same time, hold over them the probability of being dealt with if they neglected to reform. He would himself be exceedingly sorry if the period allowed for reform were shortened. He quite agreed with what had been said that the names of the Commissioners should be announced before Report.

Mr. RAMSAY said, that the general object of the Bill was to secure the better administration of the Endowed Schools and Hospitals in Scotland. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) was not very accurate in the figures he had given, for there was no institution in Glasgow that possessed £48,000 a-year. He did not remember that there was any other institution in Scotland, which enjoyed so large an income as Heriot's Hospital. [Mr. M'Laren reminded the hon. Member of Hutchinson's Hospital.] He thought it was a mistake to say that that institution had £48,000 a-year, it was not yet one-half of that amount. He thought the Bill was of very little consequence in an educational point of view, as the Commissioners who were to be appointed had not the slightest power to do anything. They might report to the Secretary of State, but that was all. And yet it was proposed to pay several of those Commissioners. What were they to be paid for? They could do nothing but report to the Secretary of State. He objected altogether to such a proposal, and should move in Committee that it be rejected. He should do that not simply on the ground of economy, although that in itself was a very important element, but also on the ground of efficiency. The work could be done without any payment, and it certainly would be a great blunder if the provision for payment of the Commissioners were retained in the Bill. He hoped, when they came to discuss the details of the measure, the right hon. Gentleman would give careful consideration to the arguments he should adduce against his proposal.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, he knew in his part of the country the opinion about the Bill was that it was one which might do some little good; but that the clauses giving the Secretary of State power to interfere were not nearly strong enough. Therefore, he should give effect to what he believed to be the opinion of his constituents by voting for the Motion for adjournment, unless the right hon. Gentleman would distinctly tell them that upon Report the Government would name the Commissioners they proposed to appoint.

Mr. YEAMAN hoped his hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) would withdraw his Motion for adjournment. No doubt, improvements could be made in the Bill; but they must remember that the end of the Session was fast approaching, and if the measure did not come on that night, they would not have an opportunity of discussing it again this year. He had not such little confidence in the Commission it was proposed to appoint; and he considered that the Bill might be passed in a very short time, if those Gentlemen who were not pleased with it would at once proceed with their Amendments.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the hon. Member for Forfarshire to withdraw his Amendment. The Scotch Members had had very frequently to complain of the neglect of Scotch Business in past Sessions, and especially of Scotch Business being held over until the early hours of a morning. But this Session the Government had certainly behaved better towards Scotland, and it was, undoubtedly, the case that a longer time had been spent on the Scotch Roads and Bridges Bill than on any other measure save the Cattle Bill. It was better to have the measure now before them at such an hour than not to have it at all, and he hoped it would pass this Session.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, he had seen many Bills, quite as important as the one before the House, taken at such an hour in the morning. He was quite satisfied, and he thought the House ought to be, with the discussion they had had on the Bill, and he hoped they would at once go into Committee. Of course, the measure was not all they could desire. A strong Government could not always produce as strong a Bill as might be wished for; but he thought the one before them, as far as it went, was a good Bill, and he objected to its being postponed until another Session. They should take it now for what it was worth, remembering that half a loaf was better than no bread. He had every confidence that the trustees of endowments in Scotland, when they knew the feeling and temper of the House and of the Scotch Members upon the subject, would voluntarily produce such schemes of reform in the management of their institutions as would meet with the approval of all parties.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he should be happy to withdraw his Motion for adjournment, especially as the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) was satisfied to proceed with the Bill at such an hour.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Application of Act) *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Interpretation of terms).

On the Motion of Mr. ANDERSON, Amendment made, in page 2, line 3, after "charitable," by inserting "or for the establishment and maintenance of a public library;" also, in page 2, line 6, after "charitable," by inserting "or for the establishment and maintenance of a public library."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Governing body may resolve to apply for a Provisional Order).

MR. YEAMAN moved, in line 20, after "thereof," to insert "or for the transference of such institution and the endowments thereof."

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, in his county there was a number of small endowments, and he should be glad to know if the effect of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dundee would be to combine these several endowments in one?

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, it would be competent to do so under the Bill as it stood.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Governing body may present petition to Secretary of State) *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Commissioners may inquire and report to Secretary of State) *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Power of Secretary of State to issue Provisional Order).

SIR WILLIAM CUNINGHAME, in moving, in page 3, line 8, to leave out from "or" to "requisite," in line 10, said, his Amendment was placed upon the Paper immediately after the second reading of the Bill, and the object of it was to make it a purely permissive measure; and yet, at the same time, effective as a permissive Bill. He would leave it to the trustees to say if any alteration should be made; and he was glad to see that, since his Amendment had been down, the Lord Advocate had proposed to make an alteration very nearly to the same effect. He thought the trustees should have power to make alterations which were not inconsistent with the general principles of the Bill, and the simplest and most straightforward thing was to allow them to bring forward schemes for the reform of these institutions.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he should, if necessary, second the proposition of the hon. Member opposite. The Amendment was not inconsistent with that of the Lord Advocate's, but entirely consistent with it. He therefore hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that by the Amendment it was proposed to strike out certain words, the want of which would compel the Secretary of State to accept the prayer of the Petition presented to him.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL understood that that had been already conceded by the Secretary of State, when he provided that the proposals of the Government should be substantially the same as the recommendations of the trustees.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he expressed no opinion upon the wording of the clause. He left that entirely to his right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate.

SIR WILLIAM CUNINGHAME did not understand what the word "substantially" might mean. It certainly was rather a doubtful phrase.

MR. RAMSAY considered that the hon. Member for Ayr (Sir William Cuninghame) had got conceded to him all he could expect. To go any further in the direction desired by the hon. Member would be to still further weaken a measure which, as it was presented, was weak enough. He therefore hoped the Lord Advocate would not give way any further.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR would like the word "substantially" to be interpreted.

DR. CAMERON thought the Amendment of the Lord Advocate would exactly carry out what was necessary.

Amendment *negatived.*

THE LORD ADVOCATE moved, in page 3, line 9, to insert, after the word "modifications," the words "not being inconsistent with the general principles thereof."

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR thought the Amendment a very unwise one. He thought the Commissioners should have full power to make alterations for the benefit of the public, and they ought to be able to decide what changes were required in the interest of the country.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY thought the fact of the Secretary of State having to determine what changes were consistent would be likely to lead to a great deal of dissatisfaction. Was the Home Secretary to be absolute in his decisions, or subject to the revision of the Courts of Law?

MR. M'LAREN regretted the reference to Courts of Law. If the Home Secretary thought the proposals of trustees reasonable, he would allow them to go before Parliament, and if he did not, he would stop them. There was no reason for Courts of Law coming within the four corners of the Bill at all.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Provisional Order to be laid before Parliament) *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Several governing bodies may concur in applying for Provisional Order) *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Governing body may apply for transference of endowments to other governing bodies or school boards).

MR. YEAMAN moved, in page 4, line 1, after the first "of," to insert "the institution and."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 11 (Commissioners to be appointed).

MR. M'LAREN moved, in page 4, at end, to add the words—

"And no Commissioner shall receive any payment except for such travelling expenses as he may incur in the service of the Commission."

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he would accept the Amendment.

MR. RAMSAY thought the object in view would be better met by the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

MR. M'LAREN expressed his willingness to withdraw his Amendment in favour of that of the hon. Member, which was to the same effect, but differently expressed.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAMSAY then moved, in page 4, line 20, to add, at the end of the Clause—

"Provided, That such Commissioners shall receive no remuneration except for such reasonable travelling or other expenses as may be incurred in the discharge of their duties under this Act."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Commissioners to report).

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR remarked that it would be well for the Commissioners to make a Report every three months.

MR. RAMSAY thought it would be a little too much to expect the Commissioners to make a Report so frequently.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Saving powers of governing bodies under special Acts, &c.).

MR. M'LAREN moved, in page 5, line 9, after "Parliament," to insert "or Provisional Order."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Commencement and duration of Act).

MR. RAMSAY moved, in page 5, line 16, the substitution of the words "seventy-nine" for the word "eighty," as the time allowed for trustees to send in schemes for the reform of their endowed schools and hospitals. He believed the Government had accepted one year for the period in question.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 16, to leave out the word "eighty," in order to insert the words "seventy-nine."—(*Mr. Ramsay.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'eighty' stand part of the Clause."

THE LORD ADVOCATE could not accept the Amendment, as it was perfectly obvious the Commissioners would not be able to report in time.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL thought the time fixed by the Bill was perfectly reasonable, and hoped the Amendment would not be accepted.

MR. C. S. PARKER said, that the Report of the Royal Commission was issued in February, 1875, and trustees had had long notice to prepare for reform. From year to year they had been in expectation that the Bill would pass, and they ought, therefore, to have their plans ready. In his opinion, it would be desirable to shorten the time. If the schemes were required to be prepared in reasonable time, those trustees who stood aloof, declining all reform, could be the sooner dealt with, if necessary, by a further measure.

MR. M'LAREN thought it unlikely that large bodies of trustees would agree in any general plan for their several endowments, and therefore considered it desirable that a longer rather than shorter time should be given within which to send in schemes.

MR. RAMSAY hoped the Government would accede to the Amendment; for although he agreed that there should be a period of grace, he thought it was unduly extended by the Bill.

THE LORD ADVOCATE remarked that he had already said that he could not alter the period fixed by the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 42; Noes 24: Majority 18. — (Div. List, No. 244.)

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR thought the Government should give way, seeing that the majority of the Scotch Members had been in favour of the Amendment.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, the Government could not do this, seeing that the majority was nearly two to one.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR: But not of Scotch Members.

Clause *agreed to.*

THE LORD ADVOCATE moved a new clause, empowering the Commissioners to be appointed under the Bill to report to the Education Department, from time to time, their views with regard to the promotion of higher education in Scotland.

New Clause (Commissioners to submit conditions, &c.,)—(*The Lord Advocate,*) —*brought up*, and read the first and second time.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY observed that there had been a good deal of difficulty with regard to the power of the Commissioners. It would not be satisfactory to them to be asked to give advice without having some control; and he, therefore, objected to this clause being introduced into the Bill. The Commissioners ought, if they were to have any control over education in Scotland, to be a representative body, reflecting the wishes and views of the people of Scotland; and, if so constituted, would have more title to represent the Scottish people than the Education Department in London, which was to overrule them. He hoped the Government would not press the clause.

THE LORD ADVOCATE thought it impossible to conceive that the views of such a body of gentlemen as the Commissioners would not be of use to the Education Department.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR characterized the clause as a petty one, which was not likely to be of much value. The power of expressing opinion without the responsibilities of giving practical effect to their expressions was totally antagonistic to sound administration.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL regarded the future action of the Commissioners with considerable suspicion. Their views would most likely be of a Conservative character, and they would seek to keep education in the old grooves. He was strongly of opinion that the Education Department in London would be more likely to exercise a sound discretion than the Commissioners.

MR. M'LAREN considered that the influence of the Education Department in London upon the Commissioners would most probably be deleterious. It would be better for the Government to omit the clause, and leave the control to the Scotch Department to be formed, the announcement of the creation of which had been hailed with pleasure by the Scotch Members.

Mr. RAMSAY wished to state that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy did not, in his opinion, represent the views of the majority of the people of Scotland.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR agreed that the clause would be very useful; but if the Commission was constituted according to the opinion of his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren), which would mean that they would not know much about carrying on educational work, it would be a dangerous trust to give them.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY protested against the control of education being taken away from Members of the House and vested in a body sitting at Edinburgh. If the Commissioners consisted of Professors in the Universities, their opinions would, at least, be known; but if they were nominated by the Government this even might not be the case, and they would know no more about the views of the people of Scotland than Members of that House. That being so, he should take a division against the clause.

Question put, "That the Clause be added to the Bill."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 51; Noes 12: Majority 39.—(Div. List, No. 245.)

Bill *reported*; as amended, to be considered upon *Thursday*.

### WAYS AND MEANS.

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £14,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*;

Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday*.

### ELDERS WIDOWS' FUND [DEFICIENCIES].

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of the Revenues of India, of such sums as may be required to make good the deficiency in the Elders Widows' Fund, and to enable the Trustees from time to time to meet the current liabilities of the said Fund, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to enable the Trustees of the Elders Widows' Fund to apply the Capital of the said Fund in aid of Income, and for other purposes relating thereto.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*.

### PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General, Bill to amend and continue the Acts relating to Election Petitions and to the prevention of Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Solicitor General.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 281.]

### DISQUALIFICATION OF MEDICAL RELIEF REMOVAL BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Rathbone, Bill to remove disqualification by medical relief for Infectious or Contagious Disease, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Rathbone, Sir John Kennaway, and Sir Charles W. Dilke.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 282.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Tuesday, 30th July*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Naval Discipline Amendment * (175); Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland) * (174).

*Committee*—Debtors Acts Amendment * (163).

*Third Reading*—Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland) * (172); Corrib (Galway) River * (166); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (169); Freshwater Fish Protection * (173), and *passed*.

*Withdrawn*—Charitable Trusts (150).

### CHARITABLE TRUSTS BILL.—(No. 150.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

### BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that since the Bill had passed through some of its most important stages, objection had been taken in various quarters to some of its provisions. He would have been able, he thought, to satisfy their Lordships that some of those objections were groundless, and that others could be met by very simple Amendments; but, looking at the state of Business in the other House of Parliament, he did not consider he would be justified in proposing alterations which might occupy some time in discussion, and, at the same time, leave no hope of the Bill passing this Session. Under those circumstances, he moved that the Order be discharged.

Motion *agreed to;* Order *discharged;* and Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

## METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE.

### ADDRESS FOR RETURN.

LORD TRURO rose to ask, what steps, if any, have been taken to increase the efficiency of the protective and detective Police in the Metropolis and its suburbs, and to move for the Report of the Committee appointed in 1868, to investigate the condition of the Metropolitan Police Force, and that specially appointed to inquire into the constitution and condition of the detective department of that Force. He said that this was not the first time he had had to trouble the House with metropolitan questions. On the last occasion, his remarks had reference to the outrages that had taken place in the neighbourhood of London, and about which the noble Earl opposite (Earl Beauchamp), by his answer, proved himself to be either uninstructed or misinformed. No doubt, the noble Earl made application to the sources whence he thought he would derive full and accurate information; but all he did was to entertain the House with airy speculations as to the Metropolitan Police—speculations which afterwards turned out to be entirely without foundation. He (Lord Truro) referred at that time to the unsatisfactory condition of the detective department. But the noble Earl, in reply, assured their Lordships that that department was exceedingly efficient, and hinted that his (Lord Truro's) information was not to be relied upon. Their Lordships would remember what happened shortly afterwards. Highway robberies of the worst description were committed, and it came to light that the detective department was in a condition than which it was impossible to imagine anything more disastrous. Upon consideration, the Government thought it expedient, if not actually necessary, to institute some inquiry, with a view of improving both the protective and detective departments of the police. And whatever steps they took were not taken a moment too soon, for it turned out that some members of the detective department were in actual complicity with thieves, and were even worse than those they were paid to look after. Now, it had come to him in the way of rumour that Her Majesty's Government had appointed a Committee of four gentlemen—as able and as well qualified for the work as any that could be found—to investigate the condition of the detective department; but he had reason to believe that they did not think it desirable or essential to direct them to consider whether any steps should be taken for the improvement or increase of the protective police. If he were misinformed on that point, he should rejoice exceedingly; but, if not, it would be his duty to tell the Government that the Metropolis, and especially the suburbs, were not satisfied with the supervision and protection that was given them by the Police. Whilst he was not justified in anticipating the reply that would be given him, yet he knew enough of these inquiries to understand that it was just within the verge of possibility that the noble Earl opposite would refuse to produce either of the Reports for which he asked. Of course, there were cases in which secrecy was a matter of great moment; but the Reports in question, although they might contain some matter which it was not desirable to publish, ought, in his opinion, to be laid on the Table for the information of the public. If it were not injurious to the Public Service that the Reports should be produced, what could be the reason for withholding them? Was it the fear of exposing to criminals the secrets and mysteries of the system provided for their detection? It could scarcely be that, for their Lordships could not doubt for a moment that thieves were already very well acquainted with all the duties and operations of the police in relation to themselves. Although there might be some material which it would be desirable to conceal, he could not help thinking that it would be to the interest of the public that portions of the evidence should be published, with the view of remedying the defects which might exist in the Force. Of course, the Government had a right to retain them, if they thought there was no ground for producing the materials. In the Report of 1868, there were certain recommendations which — not in his judgment alone—it would be desirable to carry out. One of those recommendations was, that there should be an increased number of Assistant Commissioners. Since the passing of Sir Robert Peel's Act there had been two Assistant Commissioners; but the amount of metropolitan business which had arisen since the appointment of those two men made it unquestionable that other Assistant Commissioners should have been appointed. After the Committee of 1868, he believed that it was intended to appoint two Assistant Commissioners and two gentlemen of remarkable ability and admirably qualified for the posts were selected; but for some inconceivable motive, the original intention was abandoned. He could not help thinking that some efforts must have been made to induce a re-consideration on the part of the Government of their intentions; for those two men were relegated to very inferior positions—they were practically relegated to positions analogous to those of district Inspectors. Would it be difficult to suggest that there should be four Assistant Commissioners, instead of two? He understood that recently, under the recommendation of the late Committee, there had been appointed a very able, active, and intelligent man to look after the detective department. If that functionary was left alone to superintend the detective department, he would be buried in its business. Originally the detective department was managed by many men. The amount of business was even then overwhelming, and yet there had been a great increase of business since. However industrious that officer might be—and he believed there were no words too strong to be spoken of his abilities—yet the business must be so great that it would be unjust to leave him single-handed. It would be found necessary, on the part of the Government, to give him additional assistance. So much as regarded the detective department. As regarded the protective department, he believed it was the opinion even of the Government that that department was at the present time underhanded by no less than 1,000 men. He was well aware that Her Majesty's Government, like all other Governments, desired, as far as possible, to avoid throwing any additional expense upon the Consolidated Fund; but the additional expense was as nothing compared with the security and happiness which the inhabitants of the Metropolis desired, and were entitled to. What was the state of the Metropolis? There had not been a popular re-distribution of the police to give to the suburbs that security which he was quite sure the Government would desire. On a former occasion, the observations which he made were treated by the noble Earl opposite and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, with a merriment not by any means common to their Lordships' House; but he had raised the question solely in the interest of the public. He would conclude by moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

*Moved*, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Report of the Committee appointed in 1868 to investigate the condition of the Metropolitan Police Force, and that specially appointed to inquire into the constitution and condition of the detective department of the Metropolitan Police Force.—(*The Lord Truro.*)

Lord ABERDARE said, that when he first went to the Home Office, he found that the Committee of 1868 had been appointed by his noble Friend the present Secretary of State for India, who had been carrying out some of the recommendations of the Committee. It was his duty to consider the whole of the recommendations, and he was only too glad to give effect to some of them. He found that his noble Friend had already appointed two officers of great distinction; and it became his duty, and the duty of the Chief Commissioner, to consider whether the detective department might not be strengthened. The charge then brought against the police was that they were too much of the nature of a military Force, and that they were not so successful as they should be in the prevention and detection of crime. Before Colonel Henderson had been a year in office, the number of detective police was increased from 17 to 252, and 22 divisions of police were strengthened. They were carefully selected, and not the slightest charge had been brought against any of the officers so appointed. That very large increase was made for the purpose of detecting crime, and to enable the police to become more intimately acquainted with the habits of the criminal population. The charges of which certain detectives were convicted some time ago were brought only against three or four officers who had been a long time in the Service, and the remarks that had been made were utterly inapplicable to the great majority of the Force. During three years in which the new system had been in operation, certain classes of crime had been decreased by one-half. Burglaries, for instance, had decreased from 800 to something over 400; while robberies with violence in the streets had decreased in the same proportion. He could quite understand the necessity of examining, from time to time, into all these departments; but he must say, considering the enormous extension of the Metropolis, that it was marvellous they did not hear more frequently of charges against the police. Every year there were added to the population 70,000 persons; and of that increase, 20,000 came into the outer radius. There was thus, in new localities, a large number of persons who were unknown to the police. His noble Friend had said that he had been informed that the police was 1,000 men below its numerical strength; but he should be very much surprised and disappointed if he did not hear that the rule of Colonel Henderson had been enormously successful. His noble Friend should guard himself against bringing such sweeping charges as those he had done against an entire body of men, when it was clear that the offences were confined to only three or four of the officers. It had been said that if the Government refused to lay the Report on the Table, the public would say that there was something in it which they did not care should be known; but he should like to know what assistance the head of a Department was to get if he could not sometimes receive reports which were not to be published.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said, he was sure that the noble Lord (Lord Aberdare) had not said one word of the police which was not warranted by the manner in which they discharged their duties. He thought their Lordships would be convinced that it was quite impossible that the Report should be published. The Committee of 1868 received evidence on the distinct understanding that the evidence so given was of a confidential character. All those who were invited to come forward would have great ground for complaint if, some years afterwards, the information which they had given was laid before Parliament. There were many matters on which Ministers required information which could not be published. It was quite impossible, without injury to the Public Service, to produce the Report which the noble Lord desired. Besides, he understood that Questions had been asked in the House of Commons with regard to the Committee of 1868, and the production of the Report had been invariably refused. With regard to the detective police, that service, as their Lordships knew, had been re-organized. The Report which Colonel Henderson made to the Secretary of State would be out in a very short time, and it would contain full information as to what had been done. It was not possible yet to judge of the work of re-organization; and he was afraid that if further alteration was made, such would not conduce to the establishment of that settled system which was most desirable. The noble Lord had adverted to the increase in the population of the Metropolis; but he had not adverted to one material part of the increase—that was, the increase of the area of the Metropolis. During 1877, there were no less than 14,410 new houses, 270 new streets, and two new squares, representing 39 miles and 1,623 yards placed under police supervision. That was a remarkable increase. Since 1849, the number of new houses built exceeded 300,000, new streets, 7,388, and new squares 82, the length of new streets and squares being 1,287 miles. For 1877, the number was 14,410, showing a considerable excess on any previous year. Now, as to the question, whether it was necessary to make any large increase in the strength of the Metropolitan Police, he was not prepared to offer any opinion; but he must distinctly repudiate the assumption of the noble Lord opposite, that it was the opinion of the Government that the Force was underhanded to the extent of 1,000 men. If the Government had considered it so underhanded, they would, of course, before then have taken steps to bring up the force to the strength necessary for the efficient discharge of its duties. As showing that the Government were alive to the matter, he might remind the noble Lord that in 1868, the then Home Secretary (Mr. Hardy) directed an increase of the force to the extent of 1,000 men, in order to meet the enlarged demands of a growing population. He was not prepared, at that moment, to say that he would advise Her Majesty's Government to repeat that step. The noble Lord said that the metropolitan suburbs were "not satisfied." Now, as one having a residence in a suburb, he believed that the people were satisfied; at any rate, he had not been made aware of the dissatisfaction which the noble Lord alleged to prevail. Of course, in cases where there was a vast amount of wealth and property collected on an area like that of the Metropolis, it was impossible that there should not be some complaints against the police in their protective character; but he was convinced that, on the whole, the inhabitants were satisfied with the manner in which the duties of the Force were carried out. The Force itself was at this moment exceedingly popular. There was no difficulty in obtaining recruits; the number of long-service men was greater than at any previous period; and, as the Parliamentary Returns showed, the state of discipline was highly satisfactory. That being so, he was utterly at a loss to know why the noble Lord should have brought such sweeping charges against the Metropolitan Police. The noble Lord had spoken of outrages and "highway robberies of the worst description." Certainly, a robbery of an unusual character had taken place at Blackheath last year; but it would be investing that occurrence with ridiculous importance to call it a "highway robbery of the worst description." In considering whether the police efficiently discharged their duties, the question to be answered was, was crime on the increase or was it not? He did not think it was on the increase. According to the statistics, in the last half of the year 1877, the number of felonies committed in the metropolitan district was 2,209; whilst, in the half-year ending June 30, 1878—both periods, be it remembered, containing three months of short days and long nights—the number was 1,734. Subsidiary statistics, also, went to show that the epidemic of crime which seemed to prevail last year was now passing away, and that the efforts of the police to control the criminal population were being attended with success. Under those circumstances, he thought their Lordships would be of opinion that the observations of the noble Lord went far beyond the necessities of the case, that his allegations that the public were not satisfied had not been proved, and that the Motion for the production of the Reports ought not, therefore, to be assented to.

Lord TRURO would be perfectly satisfied with having elicited the statement just made by the noble Earl opposite, and with having called forth the observations offered by the noble Lord who was, for a considerable time, Secretary of State for the Home Department, and whose services he, for one, considered had never been duly appreciated. If the noble Earl said that he (Lord Truro) had made sweeping charges against the detective department, it must, of course, be true. For having unwittingly done so, he must express his regret, at the same time saying that he did not for a moment mean to suggest that there was not in that large body many men who discharged their duties faithfully and honourably, and to the satisfaction of the public. But, at the same time, he must say that there was a strong impression abroad that the department was infected to a much larger extent than it appeared to have been, according to the statement of the noble Earl. He had derived his information on the point from the Press and from rumour; and those two sources certainly justified the suspicion that dissatisfaction existed in the detective department to a greater degree than could now be proved. The noble Earl had accused him of exaggerated language in reference to the robbery at Blackheath. Well, all he could say was, that for a gentleman's carriage to be stopped, and for loaded pistols to be presented at the heads of those inside, with a demand for their money or their lives, was, in his opinion, a very tolerable outrage.

Earl BEAUCHAMP did not say that it was not an outrage. All he said was that the circumstances did not warrant it in being described as a "highway robbery of the worst description."

Lord TRURO was himself unable to conceive a robbery of a worse description, unless, indeed, it was accompanied by murder. The noble Earl had referred to the decrease of crime as proof that the police were discharging their duties efficiently, and that ample protection was given to suburban property. But not many weeks ago he read, in the Charge of one of the Judges presiding at the Old Bailey, that in the space of five months there had been no less than 39 burglaries in Hackney and Clapton. That was pretty well for one district. He, therefore, adhered to his language, that the metropolitan suburbs were not satisfied with the protection afforded them by the police; and he was sure that they would not consider the statement of the noble Earl a satisfactory answer to the complaint he had made. He did not intend to suggest, by his remarks, that the Government were of opinion that the Force was underhanded to the extent of 1,000 men; but he had heard a great many people say that, looking to the deficiency of the protective department, it was very desirable that the strength of the Force should be increased, the number, of course, being left to the judgment of the Government. Now, as to the general character of the police, it occurred to him that the men received more than enough military instruction; whilst they were not afforded sufficient of that sort of instruction which sharpened their intelligence and qualified them to a greater extent for the detection of crime. It was perfectly true that they might be seen marching on a curb-stone with an exactitude that would do the heart of a military man good to see; but he did not discover in them that activity and power of observation which policemen in the Metropolis ought to exhibit. As far as appearance went, everything was very satisfactory; but there was an absence of that vigilance, sharpness, briskness, and attention to duty which was desirable in a great Metropolis like London. Whilst making these observations, he was bound freely to admit, with the noble Lord below (Lord Aberdare), that it was remarkable that a population of 4,000,000 people should have their persons and their property protected with the efficiency even of the present time.

On Question ? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

## ARMY — THE AUXILIARY FORCES — THE MILITIA—CLOTHING REGULATIONS.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH called attention to Paragraphs 20 and 25 of the Regulation for the supply of clothing, &c., to Militia regiments issued last January, and asked, Whether they could not be re-considered and made to apply only to articles supplied to men who had been enrolled subsequent to the dates mentioned in Paragraph 25? He had no intention of impugning the general wisdom of the Regulations referred to; but he thought he should be able to show that Paragraphs 20 and 25, if read together, would inflict a certain hardship upon a few men of the Volunteer Force. Paragraph 20 revised the rule relating to the length of time that articles issued to the men were to last. Where formerly it was five years, it was now six; where formerly it was four years, it was now five; and so on. In passing, he would just like to say that if the articles issued under the new rule were not stronger and more durable than those now in use, it would be only at the expense of smartness that the additional wear would be got out of them. The bargain made with a number of the men when they were enrolled was that at the end of five years the articles served out to them should become their own property; but the effect of the change in the Regulations would be that a man who did not re-enrol after five years would lose his right to those articles, because it was now laid down that they were to last six years. It might be replied that all bargains on the subject of clothing were liable to revision at the option of the Secretary of State for War; but he ventured to say that if the men were made aware of the existence of an arbitrary alteration of this kind, it would give rise to a soreness and a feeling of ill-usage that it was highly desirable to obviate. Again, it might be said that the value of things was not very great; but that would not, in his opinion, prevent dissatisfaction, if the new Regulations were carried out to their full extent. The Highland regiments would be injuriously affected by them; but as they had not yet, in many instances, finished their trainings, the full hardship had not been discovered, and that might account for the fact that few or no representations had been made on this subject. His object in bringing the subject under the notice of the House was to try to induce the Government to provide that the Regulations should apply only to men enrolled after the dates mentioned in Paragraph 25.

VISCOUNT BURY, on the part of the Government, said, it was perfectly true that it used to be the practice in the Militia that, at the end of the five years, certain articles became the property of the men, and that the period had now been altered to six years. It was equally true that the new Regulations hit principally the Highland regiments. Her Majesty's Government desired to deal fairly, and even generously, with the Militia; and he must confess that in looking into the matter, there did seem to be a certain amount of hardship inflicted by the change. Without entering into any details, he would suggest that the noble Lord should talk the matter over with him, in which event he had no doubt of being able to propose some alteration that would meet the views of the noble Lord.

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Tuesday*, 30*th July*, 1878.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Clare County Writ, *nominated.*

*Report*—Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling) [No. 325].

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—*Resolution* [July 29] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution* [July 29] *reported*—Elders Widows' Fund [Deficiencies] *.

*Ordered* — *First Reading* — Consolidated Fund (No. 4) *; Marriages (Fiji) * [285].

*Second Reading*—Education (Scotland) * (156).

*Committee*—Contagious Diseases (Animals) [204] —R.P.

*Committee*—*Report*—Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) * [277]; Elders Widows' Fund * [226]; Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment * [252].

*Considered as amended*—Prisons Authorities Act (1874) Amendment * [246].

*Considered as amended*—*Third Reading*—Commons Regulation (Expenses) * [273], and *passed.*

## QUESTIONS.

### THE INDIAN CONTINGENT—PAYMENT —THE RATE OF EXCHANGE.

QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, To state the arrangements for paying the troops from India, as respects the coins and rate of conversion used for the issue of those coins in lieu of the rupee coin; and, whether the same rate of conversion is in force for officers as for soldiers; and, if not, what rates are used for those two grades, and on what ground a distinction is made between the soldier and his officer?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, the Question was one which would have been more properly addressed to his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War, who did not happen to be present. The position he believed to be this — the troops sent from India to Malta received an advance of pay in rupees in India; but from the date of the expiration of that advance the payments at Malta were made in sterling, and it had been decided to pay the troops at the rate of 2*s.* for each rupee, which was in excess of its value, and to treat the excess as an extra allowance. As far as the officers were concerned, it was, as he understood, decided to pay them at the current rate of exchange, which was about 1*s.* 9*d.* for each rupee.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR gave Notice that, on an early day, he should call attention to the question.

### MINES REGULATION ACT, 1872—EXPLOSIONS IN COAL MINES.

QUESTION.

MR. BURT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If, with reference to the case of Thomas Corlett, who lost his life on the 3rd instant by the premature explosion of a "shot" in the Henry Pit, Whitehaven, he has reason to be satisfied that the provision of the Mines Regulation Act which prohibits the use of iron or steel prickers was complied with; and, whether, seeing there is reason to believe that a great number of prickers similar to that which is alleged to have produced the explosion referred to are in use at the same collieries, he will direct the inspector for the district to call the attention of the owners to the subject?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had made inquiries into the case in question, and he had reason to believe that the provision in the Mines Regulation Act had been complied with, and that the pricker used on the occasion was not made of iron or steel, but of some soft pliable metal, probably copper, which, although the safest, was not absolutely free from danger. The Mines Inspector for the district had issued a circular on the subject, and he hoped that the attention which had been called to the occurrence would insure that a proper pricker was used, not only in the district, but throughout the whole of the mining districts in the country.

## TAXATION IN ST. KITTS.

### QUESTION.

MR. GREENE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is true that heavy taxation has been recently imposed in the Island of St. Kitts upon articles, hitherto admitted free, used in the cultivation of the staple; whether any official proposal has been made for the amalgamation of the St. Kitts Treasury with the Treasuries of the other Islands in the Federation, thus subjecting St. Kitts to burdens not its own; and, whether he, before consenting to such changes, if they are contemplated, will allow the holders of property and others interested in St. Kitts to lay before him the serious objections entertained against the amalgamation of Treasuries, and consequent further increase of taxation?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, I am not aware that any such taxation as that described in the first part of the hon. Member's Question has been recently imposed, nor has any official proposal been made for the amalgamation of the St. Kitts' Treasury with the Treasuries of the other Islands. Of course, any persons claiming to be heard would be heard before any serious constitutional changes were adopted; but the object of an amalgamation of the Island Treasuries, I apprehend, would be, and the result of it should be, not an increase, but a decrease of expenditure and taxation.

## INDIA—THE RECENT FAMINE.

### QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the Under Secretary of State for India, When the Papers relating to the statistics of mortality caused by the recent famine in Madras and Bombay, and which it was stated on Monday last by the Secretary of State would be laid before Parliament, will be in the hands of Members; and, whether, considering the statements which have recently appeared in the public journals that the mortality in the North-West as recently as April last exceeded by a hundred per cent. its normal rate, the Papers to be produced will include statistics on this subject?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Sir, I am much obliged to the hon. Member for giving me an opportunity of stating what really happened with regard to this matter. In accordance with the pledge which I had given to this House, I laid these Papers upon the Table the moment that they arrived, and on the very day on which he spoke, my noble Friend had also moved for them in the House of Lords. I have seen the proofs of a great part of the Return, and hope that it will not be long before it is distributed; but we are very anxious not to leave out any facts which throw light upon the subject. At the best, however, the Return must give a very imperfect account. As regards the mortality in the North-West, we have just received a despatch from India in which there are two paragraphs referring to this subject. In accordance with the hon. Member's wish, they shall be added to the other Papers.

## BAR EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE BILL—LEGISLATION.—QUESTION.

DR. KENEALY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government intend to re-introduce the Bar Education and Discipline Bill next Session?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he could not positively state whether the Bill in question would be re-introduced again next Session. It was a Bill which had been for two consecutive Sessions before Parliament, and it had not been possible to get it passed. It would, therefore, be necessary, when the Government came to arrange what Business they were to take up next Session, to consider what course should be taken with regard to it. He might take that opportunity of stating that there was a desire in the House that they should proceed that night, after the Adjournment of the Debate, with the Committee on the Contagious Diseases' Animals Bill, and he hoped that there would be no objection to that course.

## CRIMINAL LAW—THE REV. H. J. DODWELL.—QUESTION.

Mr. BURT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he has received medical reports concerning the state of mind of the Rev. H. J. Dodwell; and, if he has any objection to lay the same upon the Table of the House?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that the House would see that, for obvious reasons, it would not do to make public, Reports which were practically of a confidential character. It would not be fair to the objects of the Reports in many cases that they should be made public. He was sorry to say that, in this particular case, the substance of the Report was that it would be dangerous to the public, at present, to allow Mr. Dodwell to be released from the Broadmoor Asylum.

## SOUTH AFRICA—OUTBREAK OF THE NATIVE TRIBES—THE TRANSVAAL.

### QUESTION.

Mr. A. MILLS asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any official intelligence has been received from the Cape of Good Hope of the engagement reported to have taken place between the Kaffirs and British troops at Meguet Heights, in the Transvaal; and, whether the statements contained in the newspapers of the losses sustained by the British Forces are correct?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, that he had not received intelligence of this engagement, and he hoped the statements referred to were not correct.

*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## EASTERN AFFAIRS.—RESOLUTION.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SECOND NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [29th July].

"That, whilst this House has learned with satisfaction that the troubles which have arisen in the East of Europe have been terminated by the Treaty of Berlin without a further recourse to arms, and rejoices in the extension of the liberty and self.government of some of the populations of European Turkey, this House regrets:—

"That it has not been found practicable to deal in a satisfactory manner with the claims of the Kingdom of Greece, and of the Greek subjects of the Porte:

"That by the assumption under the Anglo-Turkish Convention of a sole guarantee of the integrity of the remaining territories of Turkey in Asia, the Military liabilities of this Country have been unnecessarily extended:

"That the undefined engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the better administration of those Provinces have imposed heavy responsibilities on the State, whilst no sufficient means have been indicted for securing their fulfilment:

"And that such engagements have been entered into, and responsibilities incurred, without the previous knowledge of Parliament."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

And which Amendment was,

To leave out from the first word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learnt with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire,"—(*Mr. Plunket,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, the hon. Member who closed the debate last night—the hon. Member for Glamorganshire (Mr. Hussey Vivian)—seemed very much troubled in his mind in endeavouring to determine to whom ought to be assigned the credit of what he called the triumph of the Treaty of Berlin. The House will recollect that he spoke a great deal upon the question as to whether the triumph was to be given to one side or another — whether to the Government or to any of the right hon. Gentlemen who sit on the front Bench opposite. Now, Sir, I beg to say that the view which Her Majesty's Government take of this matter is far different from that which the hon. Member supposes. We are not in the mood to be claiming for ourselves a great, a brilliant triumph in reference to that Treaty. The country has been brought much too near to that most dreadful of all things—a general European war—and we have been much closer than, perhaps, many hon. Gentlemen believe, or are aware of, to that dire calamity—to make us approach in any tone of vain-glorious triumph the great events which have taken place. Instead of viewing the matter as a triumph for ourselves, we have only one feeling with regard to it—that of great thankfulness to Almighty God, who has enabled us to bring about the happy result of peace without resorting to the terrible extremities of war. Nor would it, I think, augur well for the future peace of the world, if any hon. Member of this House—much less if any Member of Her Majesty's Government—were to try to assume that we have triumphed over neighbouring and allied Nations in the great events which have taken place in the recent Congress at Berlin. We desire once for all to say that we do not entertain those unworthy views of triumph; we do not wish it to be considered that one Power has triumphed over another; we do not wish to claim that we have triumphed over Russia. We put aside these things—but what we do say, and what we do boast, has triumphed, is the good sense and the good feeling of the nations of the world, who have shown that they have profited by the growth of the humanities of civilization.

The noble Lord the Member for the Radnor Boroughs (the Marquess of Hartington) has said most truly that the policy of the Treaty of Paris has failed, and that another policy must be substituted for it. I quite agree with him on this point. The noble Lord also said that the reform of the Turkish Empire, as attempted under the provisions of that Treaty, has proved to be an impossible undertaking, and I will admit, generally, the fact, though the cause of the failure has been, in my opinion, different from that assigned to it by the noble Lord. I fully admit that the attempt to secure joint action on the part of the European Powers with regard to Turkish affairs has failed, that the policy laid down by the Treaty of Paris has been unsuccessful, and I most fully concur with the noble Lord that the time has arrived when a fresh policy must be substituted for the old one. Her Majesty's Government knew this well enough long ago as regards these transactions, and they therefore approached the question with the deepest sense of the responsibility under which they were acting, and with a full knowledge that a new point of departure must now be taken in reference to Turkish affairs, and that a new order of things must henceforth be established, which must vitally affect every Power in Europe. It is on this account, that we have never hesitated to state how grave we considered the situation to be. This new position of affairs has been set forth with great clearness by that distinguished Frenchman, M. Gambetta, who certainly, by his political bias, cannot be held to be disposed to view this question with an eye prejudiced in favour of England, or of the Conservative Party. M. Gambetta, in discussing the new position created in Europe by the Treaty of Berlin and the Anglo-Turkish Convention, said to *The Times*' Correspondent—I quote from an important document recently published in that journal, the authenticity of which has, I believe, been never doubted—

> ". . . . Austria is placed as sentinel at one end of the Eastern area; while, at the other, England has been called upon to mount guard. The return of England to a less narrow policy rescues the two States, France and England—the two most liberal, most commercial, and most productive countries in Europe—from the temporary isolation into which they chanced to fall."

I accept his description of the present state of affairs, and I hold that the new departure which has been taken by England and by Europe, in consequence of the action of Her Majesty's Government, is very well set forth by that statesman in those few, but pointed words. Further, when we look at Turkey herself, as she has been left by the Congress of Berlin, we find she has got an entirely new position. She has now got a concentrated power in Europe which will be more easy for her to wield than the dispersed power which she formerly possessed. We may, therefore, fairly consider that, under this new state of things, she may become far stronger than she was before.

Considering, then, the gravity of the position, looking at the new departure in the politics of the world, acknowledging the changes which we have now either caused or sanctioned, Her Majesty's Government feel that we have no right to complain of the fullest criticism; but I venture to say that in criticizing our policy, not only Her Majesty's Government, but also the country itself will expect that the criticism of hon. Members opposite should be fruitful —that it should not be merely a lamentation over the past—but that they should suggest some alternative policy for the future in place of that which has been adopted by the Government. On behalf of Her Majesty's Government, and on behalf of the interests of the country, I feel that I cannot press this point too much home. While I put this strongly, I need hardly add that I am confident that there is not a Member of the Government who would not willingly agree that faults may have occurred here, and occurred there, in our policy with regard to the Eastern Question at a time of fearful perplexity, when Europe was convulsed from end to end. To expect that the Government of the country should make no mistakes or even blunders during four years is, to me, a matter too absurd for argument. We, however, believe that, taken as a whole, our policy has been a right and a just policy, and we claim, now that its main conclusions can be appreciated, that, in criticizing it, some alternative policy should be brought forward by those who disapprove of it. It is of the utmost importance to the country, as well as to the Government, to ascertain, with a view to the future and to the position of hon. Gentlemen opposite, what other practical scheme of action could be suggested. The House will, therefore, I am sure, forgive me if I take up some little time in endeavouring to find out what it is that our opponents really suggest.

In commencing my search for this alternative policy, I must confess that I can find no alternative policy in the Resolutions which have been brought forward by the noble Lord the Member for the Radnor Boroughs. They bear the old stamp of extreme mildness, of which we have seen so much in the forms of the attacks which have been made upon us in Parliament by the acknowledged Leaders of hon. Gentlemen opposite in former Sessions, and they evidently show no intention of entering into a real fight on the question. Look at the Resolutions—they are even milder than those of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), which dwindled before the scathing criticism of this House and of the country some twelve months ago. As then, I cannot find an alternative policy in the Resolutions, I must look for it—where we have been led to look for it before—in the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite, which, as the Resolutions which they propose to this House increase in mildness, seem proportionately to increase in violence of expression, both inside and, still more outside, these walls. Looking, then, at the speech—not at the Resolutions of the noble Lord the Member for the Radnor Boroughs last night, I find towards the close of that speech, the key to the position of hon. Members opposite. The noble Lord said—

> "And we wished, further, to prepare the way, if possible, when the time for reflection should come—as come, I believe, it inevitably will—so as to enable the country while there is time, to retreat from this false, and as I think, ill-advised course with honour, and to retire from a position which we believe that neither its interest, nor its duty demands that it should assume."

As far, therefore, as the noble Lord is concerned, I gather that the alternative policy of hon. Members opposite is to reverse that of the Government. Looking also at the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), delivered at the dinner of the Cobden Club on the 20th of July, I find that that right hon. Gentleman said—

> " . . . It will be our duty and your duty, not merely in Parliament but out of it, through good report and ill report, to do the utmost to prevent the country being absolutely committed to this dangerous policy, and, if possible, to seize the first opportunity of reversing it."

[*Cheers.*] I am glad to hear those cheers from hon. Members opposite, because they confirm distinctly what I am assuming — that the alternative policy put forward by the Liberal Party is the reversal of the policy which has been pursued by Her Majesty's Government. Very well, that is clearly understood now. You mean to reverse our policy. But let us get rid of mere words. What does reversal mean? In the speech of the noble Lord the Member for the Radnor Boroughs last night, one leading feature seemed to shine forth with peculiar prominence, and that is that he did not see why Russia should not have Asia Minor. There could be no doubt as to his opinion; he treated the subject very distinctly; he said he did not see any difficulty in the matter as regarded our Indian interests, and, in fact, he led us to suppose that that might be one of the reversals of our policy of which he was dreaming. Then the hon. Member for the Elgin Burghs (Mr. Grant Duff), who held an important office—that of Under Secretary of State for India—in the last Liberal Government, also gave us another little hint as to the way in which he thought the policy of Her Majesty's Government ought to be reversed, for that hon. Gentleman had no hesitation in saying that a European Prince ought to be placed upon the Throne of Constantinople. That, certainly, is a definite policy. I should be inclined to say more, I should call it a startling policy; and I venture to say that I cannot yet bring myself to believe that either of those hon. Members is really ready to propose a reversal of the policy pursued by Her Majesty's Government in the direction which their speeches to which I have alluded would lead us to suppose. ["Hear, hear!" *and counter cheers.*] Well, if they do mean to do so, Her Majesty's Government will be very happy to meet them when they go to the country on the question that Russia should take possession of Asia Minor, and that a European Prince should be placed upon the Throne of Constantinople. They seem, however, to me to be propositions impossible to be accepted by men of sense at this moment — so impossible, that I decline to entertain them as intended to be serious suggestions for practical consideration at the present time. Evidently, then, we have to look further for this alternative policy, and I, therefore, again put the question, what does this reversal of policy mean?

In order to ascertain this, there will be, I think, nothing so useful as to study for awhile the history of the treatment of Turkey by England during the last 20 years, since the Crimean War —that is to say, during the last 20 years which have elapsed since England joined with the Great Powers in endeavouring to improve the administration of affairs in Turkey, on placing her within what was called the concert of the European Powers. It will throw much light on various things —on the plans of the Opposition for the future, and also on the views have guided Her Majesty's present Government in the course they have adopted. During three-fourths of the period I have named, there was a Liberal Administration in power. I will divide that period of 20 years into three parts, because I think they have each very marked features and I commend to the notice of the House, as giving invaluable information as to this question, the Blue Book published, I think, last year, containing the despatches from the Foreign Office from 1856, respecting the treatment of the Christians, and administrative and financial reforms in Turkey. For some 10 years or more, this country was governed by Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell, putting aside the very short interval in which the Conservatives held the reins of Office; then there was the period of five years when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was at the head of Her Majesty's Government; and then there are the four years during which the present Government has held Office. Now, to be begin with the period for which we are responsible, with regard to these last four years, I cannot think that anyone will assert, when they consider what the position of Turkey has been during the greater part of that time, that we could have done very much to carry out the intentions of the Treaty of 1856 in support of useful reforms in Turkey. We found that country almost or completely bankrupt; she was distracted by years of foreign intrigue; her Government was shaken by domestic insurrection; her Ruler was dethroned, and met with a miserable death; several of her leading Ministers fell by the hand of the assassin; and, during a great part of the period, she has been at war with her great and overwhelming neighbour. Well, during those four years we have, nevertheless, seized every opportunity of expressing, in various ways, our strong wish and anxiety that the reforms, which are necessary for the improvement and comfort of the people, should be introduced in Turkey; but how anybody could suppose that a country could introduce large reforms under such circumstances, I cannot myself for one moment imagine. For my part, the real marvel has been how Turkey has managed to keep peace at all in her Asiatic dominions, and to send the great armies into the field as she has done, instead of its being a matter for astonishment or blame that she has not reformed and re-modelled her institutions and administration at such a crisis in the affairs of the nation. So much for the four years for which we are responsible. Let us now go back to the 10 years immediately following upon the Treaty of 1856, when men of great distinction belonging to the Liberal Party—Lord Palmerston, Lord Clarendon, and Lord Russell — were prominent Members of the Government of this country. If you look into the despatches of that period, you will find that England was constant in her watchfulness over Turkey; that she was continually pointing out and suggesting reforms, and doing all she possibly could do to secure their being carried out, in order to ameliorate the condition of the various races of that Empire, and to secure its stability. That is in accordance with the best traditions of the Liberal Party, and the improvements which were then made were very considerable. Now—to confirm what I have said as to the real improvements then effected—I appeal to most impartial testimony. Hon. Gentlemen cannot have forgotten the most remarkable memorial which was said, and I believe truly, to have been presented to the German Emperor on behalf of American missionaries in Turkey—just before the late war broke out—who are the ablest of European agents in Turkey—[*Laughter*]—I mean the ablest civilizing agents of the West. I speak from personal knowledge gained on the spot of the labours of not a few of those remarkable and distinguished men. The Memorial requested him, if I remember right, to use his influence to prevent the transfer of Turkish territory to Russia. And why? After stating that they had lived in all parts of Turkey, they represented to the German Emperor that the improvement in that Empire since the Crimean War had been considerable; that there was much greater security for life and property, that kindliness of feeling between creed and creed was on the increase, that the advancement in education had been great, and that though much was still to be desired, the real advance had been so considerable, and toleration of all religious and civilizing agencies was so complete, that a change to Russian rule would be a misfortune for the people. Our Consuls also, if hon. Members will look over many of their Reports, tell the same story. But I will appeal to better evidence still. In 1871, shortly after the late Government—that, be it remembered, of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone)—came into power, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was asked about these matters; and in connection with these questions, it must be remembered that any answer given on large questions connected with Foreign Affairs, must be held to convey the views of the Prime Minister of the day, as the Prime Minister is always held to be specially cognizant with, and responsible in concert with the Foreign Secretary for, these matters. Sir John Gray asked—

"Whether the Sultan's Government has recently taken steps in favour of civil and religious liberty; and, whether any advance has been made in securing that Christian evidence shall be admitted in Courts of Justice on a footing equal to that of testimony given by Mahomedans ?"

Viscount Enfield, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in answer, said—

"All accounts from Turkey agree in confirmation of the progress made in that country by the Sultan's Government towards toleration, and much has been done of late years towards raising the position of the Christian population in Turkey. The Imperial Ordinances promulgated by the Porte within the last few years have granted to its subjects, irrespective of religious distinctions, privileges and immunities hitherto accorded to its Mussulman subjects alone—namely, equality as regards the levying of the taxes, the just administration of the laws, and the right of admission into the public service of the Empire; but up to the present time it is only in mixed causes that Christian testimony is on an equal footing with that of Mahometans. I may add that recently a Christian has been nominated to a seat at the Council of Ministers at Constantinople." — [3 *Hansard*, ccviii. 313.]

In answer to another Question by Sir John Gray in the following year, namely—

"Whether the authorities of the Ottoman Porte are giving effect to the provisions contained in various edicts issued by the Sultan of Turkey during recent years in favour of his Christian subjects ?"

Viscount Enfield said—

"The latest report from Constantinople, received two days ago, states that, as a general rule, the edicts in favour of the Christians are fairly carried into effect, and that, as a class, they have no reason for complaint."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxiii. 454.]

In answer to another Question in the succeeding Session, namely—

"Whether any advance has been made in securing that the evidence of Christians shall be admitted in Courts of Justice in Turkey on a footing equal to the testimony given by Mahometans; and, whether certain inhabitants of that country at present suffer from disabilities in reference to military service and the devolution of landed property ?"

Viscount Enfield replied—

"The latest reports from Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople state that in all the Turkish Courts, excepting those administering the Koran Law, there has been an advance towards placing Christian evidence on a footing of equality with that of Mahometans. In all criminal cases, without exception, Christian evidence is admitted in the new Court. Christians are not taken for military service, and pay a tax instead; but this is now regarded by them more as an advantage than as a disqualification. With regard to landed property, Sir Henry Elliot says that the subjects of the Sultan, of whatever creed, as well as all foreigners, are stated to be upon the same footing."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxvii. 900.]

In answer to a Question by Mr. A. Johnston, during the same Session—

"What information has been received by Her Majesty's Government as to outbreaks of Moslem fanaticism in Bosnia; and, whether they contemplate any representations on the subject to the Sublime Porte, in concert with other Christian Powers ?"

Viscount Enfield further said—

"No information has been received at the Foreign Office, either officially or otherwise, as to outbreaks of Moslem fanaticism in Bosnia, and the latest despatches from Her Majesty's Consul at Bosna Serai makes no mention of any such circumstance."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxvi. 1786.]

Surely, Sir, I am now justified in asserting that real improvements and reforms had been spreading in Turkey during the 10 years when the old policy of England towards that country was maintained by the Liberal Ministers of that day. I now proceed to examine the third portion of the 20 years—that is to say, the five years when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich guided the affairs of the nation, and had with him the noble Lord the Member for the Radnor Boroughs (the Marquess of Hartington), the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), and Lord Granville. Now, these are the Gentlemen whom I can hardly be wrong in saying have taken the most prominent part—amongst our public men —since we have been in Office, in urging upon the country the paramount duty of providing for the welfare of the subject-races of Turkey; in season, and out of season, sometimes in Parliament, oftener at public meetings, sometimes under the trees of their parks, sometimes even at railway stations, they have poured forth their feelings on this subject, and denounced the apathy and neglect of the Government; indeed, there is hardly a place of public resort which I can think of where they have not proclaimed to England their intense anxiety for the Christian subjects of Turkey. Quite lately, again, at Southwark, the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) has re-iterated the assertion that the cause they had supported from the first was the cause of the subject-populations of Turkey. ["Hear, hear!"] Quite so. I am glad that hon. Gentlemen opposite acknowledge the accuracy of my description; but I am afraid I shall have to ask some disagreeable questions, views are really entertained, I do not think they ought merely to have been hinted at by the Leader of the Opposition, but should have been boldly stated, as a matter of distinct and formal censure, in the face of this House and of the country. I cannot, however, let even such hints pass, and I deny entirely that if we had adopted the Berlin Memorandum it would have saved us from war. What reason have you to suppose that Turkey would not have resisted by force of arms that threat of war which the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) appeared to hold out, of war against that Empire by England, in conjunction with the other Powers? Turkey was at that time confident that she could hold her own; and it was well known to be her feeling that if she was to yield to Europe, if she was to fall at all, she preferred to fall in the open field, rather than by a timid and cowardly surrender. It may be said that the measures alluded to in the Berlin Memorandum did not mean war; but I cannot have any doubt myself that the right hon. Member for Greenwich, at any rate, was prepared for war. In a speech made in this House in 1877, the right hon. Member said—

> "But if I am to look at the tone and tenor of the declarations of the Government for the last two or three months, I am sorry to say that they seem to me to be relapsing into a position in which the outrages inflicted by the Government of Turkey are to be contemplated as matters of sentimental regret, and for idle and verbal expostulations. . . . How are these terrible evils, which afflict Turkey and disgrace Europe, to be met? Are they to be met by remonstrances and expostulations only? The answer echoed back from the Ministerial benches is—'By remonstrance and expostulation only.' Now that, I believe, human nature, the conscience of mankind, and the civilization of the nineteenth century will no longer bear. . . . . It is time to remonstrate against remonstrances, and to protest against protestations."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxiv. 409-416.]

And later still, this year, quite recently, at the Southwark meeting, the right hon. Gentleman uses these words—

> "Because, as we were told by Her Majesty's Government, we ought to rest satisfied with sending in to the Turkish Government remonstrances upon paper, which we knew to be perfectly worthless, and because the firm, united voice of Europe, addressed to Turkey, and the prohibition to the Turks to carry over men and means of war from Asia to Europe, would absolutely and at once have precluded the Sultan from pursuing a course of resistance to the dictates of Europe."

Do you call that peace, or do you call it war? By all the laws which exist between nations—unless you are prepared to maintain that you ought to treat Mahomedan nations diferently from all others—were you to prevent a Sovereign from carrying his men and materials of war from one part of his Dominions to another, and presume to say that you are at peace with him. Why, it is simply and unmistakably an act of war. The right hon. Gentleman opposite was therefore prepared to accept the Berlin Memorandum, with the fearful alternative attached to it, in case the Sultan did not obey its behests, to which it sought to pledge those who would sign it, of plunging all Europe into war. Have you ever faced the difficulty into which such a war would have brought you? But, before you answer this, what right, I ask, human or divine, had you to go to war with Turkey in the way and for the reasons proposed by the Berlin Memorandum? Everyone must, of course, confess that you had, undoubtedly, no Treaty right, and, by what possible moral right could you have interfered in that way with Turkey? But, putting aside the morality of the matter, and supposing that you had committed that immoral act, what would have been the difficulties in which you would have placed yourselves, and what would have been the result? You would have had all Turkey alienated; and where, then, would have been your chance of getting her to make reforms? Our best hope now is that she will again listen to the good advice of England, as she listened years before. Moreover, the only nation which was prepared to join us actually in a war against Turkey was Russia; and England and Russia were to sail in the same boat in order to attack that great Mahomedan Power. You seem to think that is a trifling affair; but I suppose you will agree that you are an Asiatic as well as a European Power; and I wish to know how the Mahomedans of India would have liked your immoral and unreasonable attack upon the Head of their faith? Again, after you had crushed Turkey, were you and Russia likely to have agreed on the most suitable reforms to be carried out in Turkey, and would you not have been sowing the seeds of the most frightful war between Russia and yourselves, when you came to settle the future condition of that country? So much, then, for your specific of the Berlin Memorandum as likely to have averted the late war. I think I have shown that it would probably have brought on a much more serious one—a war in which England herself would have been engaged—the extent and misery of which it is difficult to conceive. Beyond this, I cannot find anywhere a shadow of an argument to confirm the insinuations, rather than the assertions, of some of the Liberal Party that the peace now obtained, and the advantages which attach to it, could have been secured by Her Majesty's Government before the war broke out, and that thus its horrors might have been avoided.

I turn, then, to the more formal attacks which are made upon our policy in this House, and I take up the first Resolution of the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), as regards Greece, and who can deny that it has evidently been written with very trembling fingers? It almost answers itself in its own words, inasmuch as it expresses a vain regret that it is not practicable to do more for Greece. Do you expect the Government to do more than is practicable? As a matter of fact, we have done a great deal, and England may well be proud of her work; for we have saved the Greeks, where they are the larger element of the population, from the dominion of the people whom they particularly dislike — the Slavs. We have saved them from a re-arrangement of their institutions by a Russian Commissioner, who was to have re-cast the whole condition of the Greek and Slav Provinces; we also have saved them from a two years' occupation by a Russian Army to be not exceeding, and, therefore, probably amounting to, 50,000 men. And as for the rectification of the frontier of Greece, surely hon. Gentlemen opposite cannot presume to treat as a slight matter that which has received the unanimous approval of Europe? The frontier proposed for Greece is that which King Leopold I. of Belgium urged should be made her frontier, and the refusal of which caused him to decline the Crown of Greece. Surely, hon. Gentlemen will not stake their knowledge of Greece against the deliberate opinion of one who was always held to be one of the astutest men in Europe. As no statesman in Europe would propose the partition of Turkey, knowing all the horrors to which such a proposal would give rise; as such a view was the opposite to that universally expressed at the Berlin Congress; and as the object of England and of Europe is to diminish as far as possible the partition of that Empire, which seemed to be the effect of the Treaty of San Stefano, it would obviously have been the greatest of mistakes to start a new crusade of partition on behalf of the Greeks. I cannot, then, but express the hope that the Government of Turkey, with that increasing wisdom which they show every month —[*A laugh*]—I do not know why the Turkish Government, as well as other people, should not learn experience by the lapse of time—will see that there is no humiliation in this rectification of the frontier, and that it is to their own interest to strengthen Greece. They will remember that the Great Powers have sanctioned these arrangements; and they will recolleect, too, what England did in the matter of the Ionian Islands, when, on it appearing to her to be a matter of English and European policy to strengthen Greece, neither she nor the world generally thought it any degradation to herself to give those islands up and add them to the possessions of the Greek nation. I would, then, express the earnest hope that Turkey will take the same view, and will see no humiliation in that rectification of frontier, when it is a matter of State policy both for herself and for Europe to strengthen a friendly neighbour.

I come, then, to another criticism—the attack upon the preliminary Agreement between England and Russia, which has been gravely denounced by hon. Gentlemen opposite as the "bad means" by which the Treaty of Berlin has been obtained. I would ask hon. Gentlemen opposite to put it to themselves, in all soberness and frankness, how were we to obtain the Congress at all without it? The all-important object was to get the Great Powers of Europe into the Council Chamber: the peace of the world, as far as man could see, turned upon that issue. Russia, with her victorious Armies in a strong position at the very gates of Constantinople, had refused all previous offers to subject the whole Treaty of San Stefano to the verdict of civilized Europe. Hon. Gentlemen will, I conclude, have not forgotten that there was a long interval between that refusal and the meeting of the Congress; and, surely, they are not so ill-informed as not to know that during that interval communications were constantly going on between all the different Courts in Europe as to the means of obtaining such a settlement as would make the meeting of the Congress a hopeful one? Lord Derby himself — whose opinion has lately appeared to have acquired extraordinary weight with hon. Members opposite—has said that no Congress ought to meet without some such provision, and without something more than a mere chance of coming to an agreement; and I think that if you will consider what has passed, you will come to the conclusion that Germany, at any rate, judging from the very late date at which her invitations to a Congress were issued, was not at all willing that the Congress should meet unless there was some probability of the two Powers most opposed to one another having arrived at an understanding. Of course, Sir, communications were passing between every Court in Europe, and every Court knew well that we were in fact acting as the champion of European views in the face of Russia; that any Agreement we made with Russia would represent the general wishes of Europe —with whose wishes we had made ourselves intimately acquainted, and of whose views we were the interpreter—and every Government was well assured that, after all, the Anglo-Russian Agreement would necessarily be subject to the reversal of Europe after full discussion in the Congress. I would ask hon. Members to consider carefully the position of Russia at that moment. Unfortunately, she had a strong idea, very much owing to the persistent assertions of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that England, or the English Government, wanted to go to war. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had made that statement in every part of the country, and from the benches on your side of the House, and from half the Dissenting pulpits of England, had gone forth the cry that Her Majesty's Government desired war. Do you think that Russia had not heard those announcements? Unhappily, she had heard them, just as before she heard those assertions of the right hon. Gentleman that we should never go to war—assertions which paralyzed the right hand of England at a time when her voice would otherwise have been most potent in the interests of humanity and of peace. At that moment, Russia, believing with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone), in spite of our most solemn denials, that the English Government, which was evidently supported by the country, really desired to go to war, of course, required some assurance, before she went into the Council Chamber and agreed to be bound by the verdict of Europe, that all the fruits of her campaign would not be torn from her, and that she would not be obliged to leave the Congress in utter discomfiture, and to plunge into all the uncertainties of another struggle at a later period of the year, with England better prepared, owing to the delay, and herself in a worse condition. That is the real state of the case, and to taunt us with that Agreement, and with having entered into it secretly and against the wishes of the Powers of Europe, simply shows that there is a want of appreciation of the real circumstances of the case, or a lack of consideration of what has been occurring, on the part of hon. Members opposite, and that they have not observed that not a Power in Europe has protested against the Agreement.

I proceed to deal with another of the leading criticisms upon our action in these momentous transactions. The Government is attacked on the subject of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, and hon. Members opposite attack the Guarantee of Asia Minor by England against further aggression by Russia—our increased responsibilities, as they call it—and they are profuse in their condemnation of the secrecy which we maintained respecting this affair, also—namely, the transaction by which that Convention was obtained. Now, Sir, in regard to this, what was the position of the Government? It was, indeed, a most grave one. Certain facts had become known to us before the Congress of Berlin, and we had ascertained, from communications with the other Powers, that there was a general disposition to allow Russia to retain her Asiatic conquests—I need hardly add that what actually passed at Berlin fully confirmed the opinion we had formed respecting the views of the Governments of Europe as to non-interference with Russia's Asiatic acquisitions — when, therefore, it became clear that Europe would not interfere to prevent Russia from keeping the Armenian fortresses, and when it also became clear that Russia would not give up these fortresses unless forced by a war to do so, surely all this made up a very serious state of things, which those who had charge of the destinies of England had very carefully to consider? It must be remembered that if we had taken no steps to counteract the subjection by Russia of these Armenian fortresses, a great deal more than that would have been implied—than the mere material extension of Russian territory and power. India would have seen, the whole of Asia and Egypt would have seen, the world would have seen, that all Europe banded together was not prepared to prevent the Russian advance in Asia Minor, and they would have seen that England was not prepared either, or was not able, to check it. When it was seen that England, fully armed as she was seen to be at that moment, was not prepared to prevent that advance, what would have been the inference which the populations of the world would have drawn from this? It would simply have been inferred that whenever Russia liked she might step into Asia Minor. That, surely, was a most grave position, and the Government had consequently to consider the alternatives with the utmost care. Were we to go to war for Kars, Ardahan, or Batoum? I do not believe there is any hon. Gentleman in this House who would have wished to do that. Were we to leave matters alone, and allow the old drifting process to go on? I do not believe any hon. Gentleman, after calm consideration, would say that he really thinks that would have been a wise course. Were we to try the effect of a European Guarantee of the integrity of Asiatic Turkey, if we could persuade the other Powers to adopt such a course? I do not think, after the experience of the broken reeds of the various Treaty barriers of 1856, anyone will be found to contend that a general Treaty Guarantee of the integrity of Asia Minor would have been very much worth having. What, then, was the determination of the Government? We determined to do all we possibly could to oppose the retention by Russia of these Armenian strongholds; but we felt bound, knowing what was the general feeling of Europe, to take a security of our own, and to face by ourselves, and relying upon ourselves alone, our own responsibilities. Accordingly, the Anglo-Turkish Convention was decided upon, by means of which we determined to secure ourselves against the dangers of anarchy and disturbance which were immediately imminent, and against the perils to the interests of our Empire, which were as surely threatened by the new position which Russia would thus have obtained. Well, then, you ask us as to the corresponding obligation which we have put upon the Sultan. You ask us to give details as to the Article relating to the administrative reforms in Asiatic Turkey which the Sultan is pledged to us, by this Convention, to introduce. Respecting these points—matters, I agree, of the highest interest and importance—I would observe that the whole of Europe assembled at Berlin concurred in our view, that it was a matter of the last policy to respect, and in every possible way to maintain in future, the authority and independence of the Sultan; and that being the case, I would ask those who press us to give details, could anything be so fatal to that independence and authority, which all Europe, as well as England, desires to uphold, as to go into such a matter at present and to discuss in this country the details of a scheme of reform which has not yet been communicated to a Sovereign who, I believe, earnestly desires reform?—for the many transactions which we have had with him have convinced us that he is a Ruler of most generous aspirations and full of desires for the improvement of the condition of his people. [*A laugh.*] I should have thought hon. Members opposite would have hailed that fact with delight; but, however that may be, I think I may venture to say that we must have better opportunities of forming an opinion on this subject than hon. Gentlemen opposite can possibly have. At all events, then, though, in the very interest of the object we all have in view, we must decline to discuss these matters in detail, it must be quite clear to everyone what must be the broad features of the reforms which are absolutely essential — the doing away with the farming of the taxes, an improved administration of justice, a more certain tenure of office for the Judges, the establishment of a sound police system, and a prolonged and secured tenure of office for the Governors of Provinces. These are all points from which the best and greatest results may be expected, and I should have thought that hon. Gentlemen opposite would feel perfectly assured that we should lose no opportunity of pressing them upon the Sultan. They will be so pressed, and we have every confidence that in His Majesty we shall find a willing response to whatever pressure we may bring to bear in the interest of the general welfare of his Empire. And, now, as to the allegation of secrecy. The secrecy respecting the Anglo-Turkish Convention seems to press very heavily upon the minds of some hon. Gentlemen opposite; but, surely, they are exaggerating greatly the amount of that secrecy of which they so grievously complain? The actual arrangements were, no doubt, secret; but they cannot have omitted to observe that in every journal in Europe, as well as in every Council Chamber, it was a matter of general notoriety that England would find it absolutely necessary to take up some new point of defence. Why, Sir, the thing was treated as a matter of course in every corner of the world, except, apparently, on the Opposition Benches of the British Parliament. Do not hon. Members know that Egypt, Syria, and an Island in the Ægean, had all been openly suggested from various quarters? It is no secret that Egypt and Syria have even been urged from influential foreign quarters upon the attention of the Government; and, as for a military post in the Ægean, I remember the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Sunderland, who sits opposite, wrote to the newspapers, urging that Mitylene should be seized by the Government. [Sir HENRY HAVELOCK: I recommended that the Island should be purchased, not seized.] Well, that it should be acquired by the Government in some way or other. In the face of such circumstances as these, the allegations of surprise and intense secrecy break down altogether. As to the actual arrangement, which was made when hours were valuable, and when the peace of the world was daily, I may say hourly, at stake, it was essential that a long discussion should not take place, and it was absolutely incumbent on the Government to take the responsibility on their own shoulders and not to shrink from deciding upon what, to the best of their judgment, and with knowledge such as others could not possibly possess, they thought right and just, leaving the country to do hereafter in regard to the Government what they thought right. We refused, then, to take as military posts any one of those places which would be likely in any way to be offensive to other friendly Nations, or which would interfere with the general Sovereignty of the Sultan, and we determined to occupy, with the consent of Turkey, the Island of Cyprus, which had been of no value to the Sultan for many years, but which might be made prosperous, and which we considered to be the place whose acquisition by England would be least likely to wound the susceptibilities of other great Continental countries, or to be held injurious to their interests.

There is one other point of criticism to which I will refer—which has been alluded to by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke)—and that is, that these communications ought all to have been laid before Parliament. It is said, in an off-hand way, and as a matter which will be conceded at once, that Parliament ought to have been consulted. But, to look at it first from the practical point of view, when the peace of Europe was hanging in the balance, when the decision, peace or war, was a matter of days, how, I ask, could Parliament have properly been consulted? As a practical matter, what would have occurred; and what encouragement have we had, in our experienceof the last two years, to consult Parliament upon this Convention at such a critical moment, when time was everything? Why, Sir, who can doubt what would have happened? We should have had discussions without end; hon. Gentlemen would have said that the time had now arrived when obstruction was legitimate; we should have spent our nights in divisions; and we should have had every sort of arrangement for interfering with the proceedings of the Government. With that prospect most certainly and surely before us, should we have been justified—ought we ever to have been forgiven—in the interests of Europe, of Russia, of Turkey, and of England—in the interests, I may almost say, of the human race—in putting off indefinitely the settlement of the Congress, because there was some fanciful desire on the part of some hon. Members that Parliament should be let into the secret earlier? I use the words "fanciful desire" advisedly. Looking back upon precedent, what do I find? I find that in the year 1853 a most important Treaty was negotiated and ratified between England, France, Norway, and Sweden, which bound the Powers, in case Russia sought to obtain a settlement on, or a cession of territory in, Norway or Sweden, to put their Military and Naval Forces at the disposal of Norway and Sweden, in opposition to Russia. Was Parliament consulted before that great Guarantee was entered into? I have looked in vain for any record or evidence of such a consultation. Then there was the Treaty of 1839, guaranteeing Belgian independence. I am not aware, again, that Parliament was consulted in regard to that Treaty before it was entered into. Then there was the cession of Corfu; the first intimation Parliament had of that event was in the Queen's Speech, in which Her Majesty said that She had already offered to cede to the Greek Government the Ionian Islands, if they could arrange a stable Government. In that case, also, the nation's honour was pledged previously without the authority of Parliament. I come now to a more important matter still—the Declaration of Paris—an act which altered the whole of our maritime position, which abolished privateering, which altered the law affecting neutrals—I may be wrong, but I do not remember that Parliament was consulted before the Declaration of Paris was entered into. Therefore, with respect to the cry that Parliament ought to have been consulted, as far as precedent goes, it is all against you, and I think the judgment of all men of common sense, who desire peace, and look at the matter from a practical point of view, will also be against you.

I feel I owe the House an apology for having occupied its time at so great a length; but there can hardly be a graver question brought before the House than the one we are now discussing, and one which calls for more careful and thorough examination. Hitherto, our mouths have been necessarily to a great extent closed, in the interest of the negotiations which have constantly been going on, and we have been content to bear much misrepresentation and misapprehension. Now, we welcome the moment when silence is no longer necessary. I have acknowledged fully, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, that it is a new departure—the starting point of a new state of things, both for Europe and the East. I have shown what are and were the alternatives offered to us, and I have proved, I hope to the satisfaction of the House, that those alternatives are either so fanciful, or so perilous, or so very full of evil omen to the most precious interests of the whole Empire, as practically to offer no alternative course at all. I have proved, I trust, that the only policy which hon. Gentlemen opposite are seriously able to offer to the country, is a policy of drifting and neglect, which must, if carried out, end in anarchy and disaster. Cannot you, then, forget for one moment that it is a Conservative Government which is carrying out this national policy; and may I not for once appeal with good hope of success to the Liberal Benches, whether it is not possible for them to rise above Party differences —whether it is not possible for them to take the view of Lord Russell, Lord Clarendon, Lord Palmerston, and their other great Leaders in the past, and only to think of the welfare of the hapless populations of those historic lands, whose good government they are so anxious to promote, and who have for so long suffered from the lack of those blessings which we are now endeavouring to secure for them, and only to consider the great interests of England and of the civilized world? Not seldom, during the last 25 years, I have myself wandered under the glorious winter sun along the valley of the Nile; and during spring time and early summer over the flowery plains and hills of Syria, or have traced the course of the Tigris and the Euphrates—those noble rivers so worthy of their ancient fame — I have wandered, too, amongst the Armenian mountains — and amidst many another scene of beauty, or of ancient renown, the glories of the wonderful East—and the one same longing cry has always reached me—and every Englishman who knows these races will confirm what I say—the one same cry has always arisen from all the best in all ranks of these toiling and long-suffering populations—"When are you coming?" [*A laugh.*] Yes; "When are you English coming?" Are you surprised; are you ashamed that they should wish for the advent of England? Are you not proud that the oppressed and the suffering should invoke the great name of your country? Hon. Gentlemen opposite may interrupt me if they like—but the deed is done, and England is coming at last to those peoples. She is coming—but in far different guise from the conquerors of old, who have so often trod down those lands. She is coming, not to dispossess the Sovereign of those vast realms, but to strengthen his hands and to confirm his rule, and with all those various races longing for her advent and her succour. She is coming—but not selfishly and alone. She invokes the aid of all civilized Europe. She invites to join her the German, the Italian, the Frenchman—and may many a son of France, of like type as the noble-minded M. de Lesseps, assist us in the high enterprize. Yes, we are coming—and we hope, if security from foreign attack and peace and justice at home is secured to those lands, to bring in our train, by the enterprize of our people, those good things which our civilization, our long peace, our just government, have long ago brought to us—the railroad, the steam plough, the manufactures, and all the varied blessings of commerce, and all the arts and employments of peace, by which we have so greatly benefited. May it thus, indeed, be our happy lot to be the pioneers of the return of civilization to the East, whence the arts originally sprang, and to bring to her fertile shores all the arts of the West, with the happiness and prosperity of which she has been so long deprived. We acknowledge fully the difficulties before us; we do not underrate a single one of them; but the responsibilities of the position are there already—and not of our making — and cannot be avoided by declining to face them. If, then, as I believe I have proved, there are no safe or honourable alternatives, let us not shrink from the glorious enterprize; and if, unsought, and by the very necessity of things, in addition to all the blessings which have been bestowed upon England, it should appear that there may be added to all these the crowning honour—that noblest of all enjoyments, the pleasure of communicating the good things we have to others—the prospect is surely one worthy of our greatest enthusiasm. Yes, let us gird up our loins for the accomplishment of the noble task; let us invite the civilized world to join with us; let us thank God and take courage—

> "Such blessings peace to happy Britain brings,
> These are Imperial works and worthy Kings."

MR. GLADSTONE *: Mr. Speaker, I desire, in the first place, to discharge one of the most agreeable portions of my duty. I cordially congratulate the noble Lord (Viscount Sandon) on his first appearance as a Member of the Cabinet, in one of the great debates of this House. He had long, in my poor judgment, before he became an Adviser of the Crown, given evidence of his capacity to take a responsible part in the conduct of public affairs; and it is with very sincere pleasure, both on account of those from whom he descends in the last two generations and on his own account, that I see him occupying his present position, and that I have heard the doubtless very able, certainly very eloquent, but I am afraid I am obliged to add, in my opinion, somewhat imaginative speech, which he has just delivered. Whether it was that the noble Lord found the subject before us so intricate, or so narrow and limited, I know not; but it happened that he quitted the field of that subject, and that one-half, at the very least, of his speech was occupied by a discussion of the conduct and policy of Liberal Governments in former years, with relation to the Eastern Question. I think I am within the mark when I speak of that proportion of the noble Lord's speech. I am unable, Sir, to follow the noble Lord with fulness into that part of his discourse. What I have to say is unhappily a great deal too much, perhaps, for the patience of this House; certainly too much to allow me, with any sense of moderation, to deal with matters which appear to me to be very indirectly and partially connected with the great, complex, and difficult subjects of this debate.

I will only take notice that the noble Lord has, with great fairness, admitted on behalf of the Liberal Governments, down to 1866, that, in his opinion, they pursued a very good and useful course with respect to the Sultan of Turkey and the condition of the Turkish Empire. But the noble Lord has drawn a contrast to the disparagement of the late Government which I regret, and regret the more because I am not prepared to argue with him in detail at this time. He says that answers were given, in the time of the late Government, by the then Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Viscount Enfield), to Questions put in this House, with which I, as Prime Minister, and as therefore specially conversant with the business of the Foreign Department, must have been acquainted before they were given. Now, before the noble Lord made that statement, did he refer to his hon. Friend the present Under Secretary of State, to know whether the Under Secretary refers to the Prime Minister of the present Government all the answers which he gives in this House to Questions put to him, even upon matters in themselves of great importance, in the Department of Foreign Affairs? The noble Lord is entirely wrong in supposing that such answers, if unconnected with the actual transactions of the day, commonly come before the Prime Minister. With those replies I had no concern. I do not, however, hesitate to admit, in the main, the allegation of the noble Lord. When the late Government was formed, Lord Clarendon, who was Foreign Minister, considered carefully in what way he could make himself most useful with reference to the East; and he determined, with my entire concurrence, that by far the best mode of applying his efforts at the time would be to endeavour to arrive at a *modus vivendi*—a good understanding with the great Empire of Russia, as regarded our relative positions in the regions of Central Asia. The interest attaching to that question was the same as that which appears now to supply a governing motive for many hon. Members forming the majority of this House—namely, the safety of our Indian Empire. That design was actively and successfully prosecuted by Lord Clarendon during his too contracted term of Office. Unhappily for his country, he died in the summer of 1870, and immediately after his decease, there broke out the Franco-German War, with a train of serious questions attaching to it, and with the effect of engrossing the care and attention of Europe. These matters had hardly reached a settlement when we found it our duty to confront that singularly delicate and difficult controversy with the United States, which ended in the Arbitration of Geneva, and not very long before our expulsion from Office. And the noble Lord, who cannot but know of that state of foreign affairs, in the years to which I have referred, of the profound disturbance of Europe in 1870 and 1871, of our own anxious occupations in 1872 and 1873, in relation to the American Settlement, and who must also know what was our condition in this House, and the arduous course of legislation in which we were incessantly engaged, notwithstanding, does not scruple to bring against us the great, and, as he thinks, damning accusation that, with mind and time so charged with all these subjects, we did not likewise make a spontaneous and thorough investigation into the condition of the Turkish Empire, both in Europe and in Asia, and that at a period when nothing had occurred which would suffice to give to the question a place in the thought and care of the Powers of Europe. The noble Lord, I must say, does not appear to me to have made himself master of the elementary facts which bear upon every such case. It is not in the power of any European Government to raise the Turkish Question effectually at its own will and pleasure. It cannot be raised, unless circumstances occurring elsewhere, and generally within Turkey itself, give it that position in the view of Europe which compels attention, and which obviously requires, in the general interest, that it should become matter of practical consideration. Such was not the case when we were in Office, but such has been the case ever since the beginning of the rebellion in Herzegovina.

I am now, Sir, obliged, with much regret, to advert to a personal question. Twenty-four hours ago I had not the smallest intention of touching upon a matter which is to me extremely repulsive. I mean the question of personal charges introduced into political controversy. Some words which fell last night from the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket), in moving his Amendment, rendered it necessary for me to notice the subject, although I do not in the least degree complain of those words. But, in addition to his remarks, I became aware this morning of language which was used last night, and which enhanced my obligation to take notice of this matter. A declaration was made by Lord Beaconsfield, which led me to think it my duty to address to the noble Earl a short letter, and that letter, with the permission of the House, I will now read—

"July 30, 1878.

"Dear Lord Beaconsfield,—I find you are reported in *The Times* of to-day to have made last night a reference to a speech delivered by me at Oxford, and in which you stated that I described you as a dangerous and even a devilish character. I shall be obliged by your informing me on what words of mine you found this statement. You are likewise reported to have said that during the controversy on the Eastern Question I have indulged in criticisms replete with the most offensive epithets upon your conduct and in description of your character. Will you have the goodness to supply me with a list or selection of those offensive epithets, applied not merely to your measures, but to your personal character, and with a note of the times and places at which they were used? If you have been inaccurately reported, I ask your pardon for having troubled you with this letter, which is, I need hardly add, of a public nature."

I thus addressed the noble Earl, because, if it can be shown that I have made use of such epithets and indulged in such attacks, it would be my plain duty to make apology for them. I have not yet received an answer, and I could hardly have expected it; for the letter has not been for very many hours in the hands of the noble Earl to whom it was addressed.

The allusion of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin University was to a passage in a speech delivered by Lord Beaconsfield on Saturday last. I had had no intention before this allusion of referring to the subject at all, and I would only now say of it that, when I read it, I reflected with some pleasure and some comfort upon the fact that it gave a much more innocent account of me than had been given in a speech delivered by the same noble Earl at Aylesbury about two years ago. The hon. and learned Gentleman said he regarded the speech of Lord Beaconsfield on Saturday, in this portion of it, as jocose. It was hardly so regarded by the author, who was delivering at the very same time an entirely opposite account of it. But the hon. and learned Gentleman said it was the result of provocation, which provocation had been given partly by me. I had referred to the Government, it seems, as speaking in the accents of "lisping babes." I do not suppose it is necessary for me to dwell upon that phrase. But I had also spoken of the policy of the Government as dishonouring to the country. I had so spoken, without doubt; and it was my duty so to speak; and it will be my duty so to speak again. But I deny that the fact that I had declared the policy of the Government to be a dishonouring policy for the country constitutes a personal provocation, or can be rightly regarded as a personal attack. I claim in the fullest and largest sense for all Members of this House the right and duty to describe, if they conscientiously and advisedly believe it, the acts and the policy of the Government of the day as dishonourable in themselves, and as calculated to bring dishonour on the country. I am the first to admit that they exercise this duty under a great responsibility. They ought not to make such charges lightly. They ought not to make such charges without a full examination of the facts. They ought not to make them, except in a spirit of readiness to confess themselves mistaken, upon adequate proof that they are wrong. But, subject to this limitation, I believe that the doctrine of the hon. and learned Gentleman is totally untenable. If you forbid Members of this House to denounce, when they see cause, the policy of the Government as a dishonouring policy, I would almost go as far as to say that you may soon proceed to shut the doors of the House. By such a doctrine you will be denying to Members of Parliament what I will not now call a privilege, but what is one of their most sacred obligations. You will likewise take from the country one of the best guarantees it can possibly have against abuse and malversation in the conduct of public affairs. I beg the hon. and learned Gentleman, of whom I make no complaint whatever, to understand that however painful it may be—and it is most painful—to resort to these hard and condemnatory terms, they are, nevertheless, when the occasion arises, an absolute necessity of free Parliamentary discussion. The liberty of speech which we enjoy, and the publicity which attends our political life and action, are, I believe, the matters in which we have the greatest amount of advantage over some other countries of the civilized world. That liberty of speech is the liberty which secures all other liberties, and the abridgement of which would render all other liberties vain and useless possessions.

I now pass on to some very grave matters, of which the noble Lord (Viscount Sandon) seems to think he has satisfactorily disposed. I, however, having listened to the admirable speech in which the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition (the Marquess of Hartington), moved his Resolution, and to the able speeches delivered last night in its support—I refer particularly to two which I was so fortunate as to hear from the hon. Members for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) and for Glamorganshire (Mr. Hussey Vivian)—cannot think he has disposed of or answered them in any adequate degree. The noble Lord seemed to me—taking a wide range over an unbounded field—to overlook the fact that we are now gathered together primarily for the purpose of examining in detail the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, in the course of most important negotiations which necessarily—I refer to the Treaty of Berlin—have not been until within the last few days within our knowledge. I have a serious charge to make against the Government with respect to their attitude and conduct at Berlin. Having such a charge to advance, justice requires of me that the Government shall have no reason to complain of want of minuteness and precision in the references I shall make to the different portions of the subject, and in the evidence I shall produce to support my statements.

Now, Sir, in regard to the Treaty of Berlin, I must, in common with every other reasonable person, contemplate it, in the first instance, as a Treaty which brings us an assurance of peace. In that view it must be to us all a matter of infinite thankfulness. That is a statement which I freely offer to the noble Lord; but I fear that I must part company from him when we come to consider the questions how and by whom it is that peace has been brought about, and what amount of gratitude we owe in this respect to Her Majesty's Government. I state nothing new to hon. Gentlemen opposite, when I repeat my previously expressed opinion—that for many months past we have been unable to discern any danger to the existence of the peace which was re-established at San Stefano, excepting in the opinions, and the warlike preparations, of Her Majesty's Government. From no other quarter has there proceeded any act or indication which appeared seriously to threaten the peace of Europe.

When I come to examine the work done by the Congress at Berlin, I find it capable of being sketched in general outline as follows:—Roumania, instead of remaining a tributary State as heretofore, has become independent, and has received some accession of territory, on which I shall have further to remark. Servia, which was also tributary, has acquired its independence, and likewise an enlargement of its bounds. Montenegro, which was independent, but whose independence had not, or had not recently, been acknowledged by Turkey, has obtained from Turkey a recognition of that independence. It has also received a slight enlargement of territory, crippled, I am sorry to say, both in amount and by means of invidious and unworthy regulations, without a word of objection from us, and in consequence of the selfish jealousy of Austria. Moreover, the Treaty intends, and partially provides, that the frontier of Greece is to be somewhat enlarged. In all these points we are dealing with an absolute alienation from Turkish rule, and, upon the whole, the effect of this portion of the Treaty is that, in round numbers, 7,000,000 of persons who were formerly either under the direct Sovereignty or Suzerainty of the Porte, are to be henceforward as free from it as we are. It appears to have been said, upon high authority, that it is a great mistake to suppose that Turkey has suffered partition. However, the first great fact at which I have arrived is that 7,000,000 of people formerly under her rule, either absolute or modified, are now entirely and, as I trust, for ever, exempted from the yoke.

I come now to another class of cases, and I look first to Northern Bulgaria. I find that it is to be a virtually independent Province, though it will nominally remain in a condition of vassalage. That vassalage, as I understand, will be marked by no other feature than that of an obligation to pay tribute to the Porte. Such a state of things is very nearly equivalent to a total emancipation.

I next come to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and here I must make an observation in answer to the noble Lord. The noble Lord says I have claimed to have been from the beginning in favour of the subject-populations of Turkey. I had made that claim, but in saying it was so from the beginning, I did not mean from the beginning of time, or from the beginning of the century; but I meant at the moment no more than this—It was from the beginning of the present Eastern Controversy in 1875-1876. My meaning, Sir, was that, for one, I utterly repelled the doctrine that the power of Turkey is to be dragged to the ground for the purpose of handing over the Dominion that Turkey now exercises to some other great State, be that State either Russia or Austria, or even England. In my opinion, such a view is utterly false, and even ruinous, and has been the source of the main difficulties in which the Government have been involved, and in which they have involved the country. I hold that those Provinces of the Turkish Empire, which have been so cruelly and unjustly ruled, ought to be regarded as existing, not for the sake of any other Power whatever, but for the sake of the populations by whom they are inhabited. The object of our desire ought to be the development of those populations on their own soil, as its proper masters, and as the persons with a view to whose welfare its destination ought to be determined. Applying this test, Sir, to the next case which comes before me—namely, the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, I can speak of the arrangement made at Berlin with only a partial satisfaction. Those Provinces have been handed over to Austria under terms of studied ambiguity. The populations have not been placed in a position to assume for the future paramount control of their own destinies. But although they have not attained to an absolute freedom from external control, they have been as completely severed as Servia and Roumania from the dominion of the Porte; and I am free to admit that there are circumstances connected with their internal condition which may render it expedient that, at any rate for a time, the military strength of a great Power, and its regular organization, should be made available to secure for them the blessings of an orderly, and in many respects, of a free government.

If that be so, Sir, then, in addition to 7,000,000 of people who have been absolutely cut off from the Ottoman Empire, there must be, as I reckon, 4,500,000 more, in round numbers, who, although not formally separated from Turkey, yet practically have bid to her a final farewell. Before the late war, there were not less than 17,000,000 of people who were subjects of the Ottoman Empire, in absolute or qualified subordination, and out of those 17,000,000, it appears that not less than 11,500,000 have undergone a total change in those relations—most of them by the possession of formal independence, the others by the attainment of what is, in effect, practical liberation.

Now, Sir, if even this were all, it seems a little difficult to lay down the doctrine that there has been no partition of Turkish territory. We have, indeed, been told that the rule of the Sultan in Europe has been concentrated exactly in the same sense as a man's body is concentrated when his limbs have been amputated. It is reduced, curtailed; it is hemmed in on every side by absolute or qualified freedom. If that be concentration, it is concentrated; but not otherwise. There was a partition of Poland in the last century — almost exactly 100 years ago. Now, what do we mean when we speak of the first partition of Poland? Poland had a population of about 12,000,000 before that partition. By that partition it was reduced to between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000. In the case of Turkey, a population of from 17,000,000 to 18,000,000 has been reduced, as we learn upon official authority, to 6,000,000; and yet we are gravely told, upon the same high official authority, that it is quite a mistake to suppose that there has been any partition of the Ottoman Empire.

I have not, Sir, however, gone through the whole work of the Congress. We have had most important engagements undertaken by the whole of assembled Europe with respect to Armenia. The noble Lord appears to be under the impression that although Russia has acquired a new frontier for herself in Armenia, that is all which has occurred, and that with the exception of that single change, the entire field of Asiatic Turkey has been left open to us by the Treaty of Berlin. The noble Lord must have overlooked that Article of the Treaty which refers to the future condition of Armenia. It is not a field left open to us. The whole of the Powers of Europe have required from the Porte the reformation—which means the transformation—of the government of Armenia. They have obtained from the Porte a Treaty stipulation to that effect. That Treaty stipulation has been concluded by Turkey, not only with all the Powers, but with each Power. In the Treaty of Paris, in 1856, the Powers made provision against the single action within the Turkish Empire of any among them. There is no such settlement in the Treaty of Berlin. The covenants of Turkey are covenants with all, and are likewise covenants with each, and each Power with which the engagements have been contracted would be entitled to call Turkey to account for the breach of those engagements. There is, therefore, a most important provision made for the future intervention of Europe in the internal affairs of that portion of Asiatic Turkey which borders upon the Russian frontier. I must, however, Sir, revert to Turkey in Europe, with which I have not yet completely finished.

Eastern Roumelia is to be constituted as a separate Province, with local autonomy. In Lord Salisbury's Agreement with Count Schouvaloff, this territory was described as Southern Bulgaria. It appears to have been thought by the British Government that an essential change would be effected in its future condition by altering its name to Eastern Roumelia. However profound that conception may be, I very greatly regret that it has not been in the power of the Congress at Berlin to give more full development to some of the essential portions of its plan, and among them to the meaning of local autonomy in Eastern Roumelia. So much has been left, both here and elsewhere, to be worked out by subordinate agencies, that a great amount of uncertainty still attaches to many and very important portions of the work of the Congress, and a doubt is even cast upon the final issue which its labours may take, and upon the probable duration of its arrangements. What, for instance, is to be the meaning of local autonomy in Eastern Roumelia? There is in these words an elasticity such as may admit of a return of all the old abuses; or, on the other hand, of the establishment of a system under which life and property and the honour of woman will be secured, and the management of the local affairs will be virtually committed to the hands of the population. All this, we find, is to depend upon an International Commission. We do not know precisely in what way that Commission is to be appointed—how it is to be composed, under whose influence it will act, what spirit will animate its proceedings; and I deeply lament the uncertainty which hangs over this and other portions of the arrangements vital to the happiness of the subject-populations; but yet I hardly recognize the principle on which it proceeds, especially in this aspect—that neither the Regular nor the Irregular Turkish Forces are to act for any purpose within Eastern Roumelia. The Irregulars are absolutely forbidden; the Regulars will simply have a right of military passage for the defence of the Northern frontier. This is a most important gain in the cause of civilization; and although we are told that Roumelia has been restored to the direct political and military rule of the Sultan, yet, if its government is to be settled in conformity with the spirit of the promises that have been made, much will have to be done, if not for absolute political freedom, yet for the extinction of the horrible mischiefs and the debasing influences to which it has hitherto been subjected under the rule of the Porte.

I come now, Sir, to the case of Crete and of the Hellenic Provinces. With respect to Crete, I find that what is called its organic law is to be taken as the starting point. I do not much care what is the starting point, as compared with the direction in which we are starting, and the distance to which we are travelling. The organic law of Crete is not a good law. In that Island there are, at the very least, as I believe, four Christians to one Mahommedan, and a fundamental provision of the organic law is this—that in the representation of the population the Mahommedans, who are one-fifth, and the Christians, who are fourth-fifths, are to have respectively an equal number of representatives. The Governor of Crete has been a Mahommedan appointed by the Porte, I believe, without any effective limitation, and the organic law of Crete has, I fear, been little better than a dead letter. However, it involves an admission of principle that may work itself into something worth having. We must not criticize too much the minute details of a great arrangement. Taking the whole of the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin together, I most thankfully and joyfully acknowledge that great results have been achieved in the diminution of human misery, and towards the establishment of human happiness and prosperity in the East.

It is impossible, Sir, not to be struck by the contrast which these great negotiations present in their bearing upon two great races—the Hellenes and the Slavs respectively. There are, unhappily, as I think, many Slavs remaining in Eastern Roumelia, and the work of the Congress is fundamentally defective so far as they are concerned; yet, upon the whole, and subject to deductions in detail, a great work of emancipation has been accomplished for the Slavs of the Turkish Empire. The Slavs relied upon Russia, and this is the reward which they have received. But there is a population which has, for us, perhaps an even greater, certainly a more fascinating, interest. This population did not rely upon Russia; they, indeed, very studiously severed themselves from Russian interests. During the war a portion of the Hellenes of the Turkish Empire—I do not speak of those of the Kingdom—a portion of the Hellenes of the Turkish Empire put up prayers in their churches against Russia. They sent to the Ottoman Government voluntary contributions to aid in carrying on the war against Russia; they declared themselves in very strong language to be hostile to Russia and to her designs; and what is the treatment that they have received at the hands of the Congress? Does it not cause to you, the majority of this House, some pain and some misgiving when you examine the different results of the different courses which have been taken by these two different nationalities? The Slavs who relied upon Russia have, in the main, obtained what they desired; the Hellenes, who relied upon England, have, in the main, failed to obtain it. So much for the work of the Congress at large. One word as to the bearing of that work upon Russian designs. I do not see that Russia, in what concerns herself, has much to complain of. If her purposes have been at all crippled, it has been, not in what she sought for herself, but in what she sought on behalf of others. She has obtained the sanction of Europe to her territorial conquests; she has established, free from all European interference, her title by Treaty with Turkey to a large war indemnity. As respects that indemnity, she is subject to no other pledge whatever than that she will not interfere with revenues already under hypothecation—a limitation which I conceive to be of a very narrow scope. When we look to the reduction of the Bulgaria of Berlin as compared with the Bulgaria of the Treaty of San Stefano, I do not find in the change which has been effected any interference with those projects of intrigue which you conceive to be the incessant purpose of Russia. On the contrary, if it be true that Russia is perpetually engaged in the prosecution of such intrigues among the subject-races of Turkey, you could not possibly have provided her with a finer field for them than you have provided in your arrangements for the political severance between the Bulgarians on the Northern side of the Balkans and the Bulgarians on the Southern side, in the valley of the Maritza. Within a few miles there will be two portions of one and the same race, with the same language, traditions, religion, and ecclesiastical organization, but differing materially in the possession of political privileges; the one virtually independent, the other, as we have been told, under the direct political and military rule of the Sultan. Such a distinction in the condition of men who are nationally brothers in the strictest sense, offers to Russia an admirable opportunity for intrigue. A small Bulgaria would enable Russia to retain a far greater influence within its limits than a large Bulgaria; and a Southern Bulgaria, though called Roumelia, will supply her with further opportunities.

I now come, Sir, to touch upon a question of the most serious character—namely, the attitude and action of the British Plenipotentiaries in that great Assembly at Berlin—for a great Assembly it was—with respect to the series of points brought successively under their notice.

And here justice requires me to state that if, at a former period, in speaking of the two noble Lords by whom we have been represented, I have drawn a distinction between Lord Beaconsfield and any other Member or Members of the Administration, I am not about to revert to any such distinction on the present occasion. It appears to me that the two British Plenipotentiaries who did the main part of the work at Congress were acting together in perfect harmony. I do not now speak of Lord Odo Russell, who discharged, as he was sure to discharge, his duties with great ability; but whose labours were chiefly in a province different from that of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury. Now, Sir, what, as an Englishman, I am disposed to expect and to ask from the English Plenipotentiaries in a European Congress is this. They represent a country which holds itself up to be the freest of all nationalities in Europe, by its traditions, by its institutions, by its principles, by its feelings. We are, therefore, entitled to expect that when the great States of Europe meet together in Congress, our Plenipotentiaries shall be Representatives of the views and principles which prevail in England; that they shall lean towards the side of freedom and away from the side of servitude. Has that been the case with our Plenipotentiaries in the late Congress at Berlin? I state with deep regret, with a readiness and desire to be confuted if I am wrong, but, for the present, with a too firm conviction, that the course adopted by our Plenipotentiaries at the Berlin Congress has been precisely the reverse of that which I have pointed out. I have reluctantly arrived at this conclusion after a careful study of the whole of these Protocols. Now, I admit most fully that I ought not to make such a statement as that just made without showing precisely what I mean by it.

Before I proceed to do this, let me first specify that which is to be set down on the other side of the account. In two points, I admit that the British Plenipotentiaries took the right side. The first of them was the great activity shown by Lord Salisbury on the subject of the admission to the Congress of the Representatives of several of the minor States. Upon this matter, a zeal almost exuberant, at any rate ample, was evinced by the Representatives of England; and there can be no doubt that it excited sanguine expectations in the minds of those who represented the minor States as to the results which would follow their admission, and at the very least as to the course which England would adopt in defence of their interests. But, Sir, I am compelled to ask this question—Did any one of these minor States take one sixpence-worth of benefit from the admission of its Representative to the Congress? I have examined, as well as I could, the circumstances and particulars of those admissions. The Envoys were most courteously allowed to enter the doors. They, no doubt, made their bows with due ceremony. They submitted the statements they had to deliver, and they were bowed out again; and this, no question, with the same courtesy as that which had attended their entry; but it does not appear that in any one single instance any one argument or statement made by them had the most remote, or even infinitesimal, effect upon the decisions adopted by the Congress. I would almost go so far as to say that their admission to the Congress was not worth the railway fares and the hotel bills which their respective countries would have to pay on account of the mission of these gentlemen. Another point on which the English Plenipotentiaries showed a great zeal was that which related to the establishment of perfect religious liberty within the emancipated States. Absolute and perfect equality, civil as well as ecclesiastical, political as well as civil, was required to prevail in every one of these new States. In the case of Lord Beaconsfield, it is appropriate to remark that he, who had, with a courageous consistency, insisted on the emancipation of the Jews at home, was taking a part very appropriate in insisting on this provision in the arrangements abroad. I cannot quite say the same with regard to his brother Plenipotentiary, who had been a stout opponent, to the best of his ability, of political enfranchisement among us. It is likewise a little amusing to observe with what edifying zeal all the great States of Europe united to force religious liberty upon those new-fledged bantlings of politics, on their first view of the light of day; and yet these great States have hardly in any case learned—perhaps we ourselves have not perfectly learned—to adopt it at home. It certainly does not exist in France, where the most distinguished preacher of his generation—the Père Hyacinthe—delivers religious discourses in Paris, not in the enjoyment of a right given him by law, but under a permission renewable from time to time by the Government. It certainly does not exist in Austria, where the Old Catholics have had to send their children to schools of which they did not approve. But I perceive tokens on the part of one or two hon. Gentlemen, which remind me that I am entering into details that can very well be dispensed with. I thank them for the intimation, and will at once proceed to matters more important to the present issue. I must, however, point out that, in this instance, where the British Plenipotentiaries were right, there was virtually no contest in the Congress. Except upon a single point in reference to a single State, all were of one mind.

I have already said that, as a general rule, the British Plenipotentiaries took the side opposed to that of freedom. Now let us see what part they actually played. When the Congress came to deal with Bulgaria, which was to have full practical emancipation from the Turkish rule, what do we find? We find, simply, that they directed their attention to limiting in the utmost possible degree the local area of the new State, even to the extent of taking from it districts inhabited by a pure Slav population. So far as regards the striking off from the Bulgaria of San Stefano districts inhabited by Hellenes, they were perfectly right; but so far as they severed the Southern Slavs from the larger privileges of their Northern neighbours, they worked against liberty as well as against policy.

Next, when I look to Roumelia, I find that the British Plenipotentiaries laboured to extend its limits as against Bulgaria; but, at the same time, to limit its internal liberties as against the Porte. The views of those Plenipotentiaries are fully set out in the Protocols. I can prove what I have said by an abundance of references, but I am content to take only the proof to be found at pages 76 and 79 of these Papers. It will there be seen, with regard to Roumelia, what the English Plenipotentiaries proposed to provide in case disorders should arise within that State. They proposed to provide that the Governor General should have the right to call in Ottoman troops without any limitation, when he deemed it necessary; but they left it to the French Plenipotentiaries to suggest that, in the exercise of his power of sending troops into that State at the call of the Governor General, the Sultan should be bound to make known the measure to the States of Europe, together with the reasons for it. This is the form of the Article as it stands. Now, I say that in this instance the British Plenipotentiaries clearly leant towards the side of servitude in proposing that the Ottoman troops should be called in, and they left it to the French Plenipotentiaries to introduce the important qualification leaning towards the side of freedom, by requiring that the Porte, when it sent in those troops, should be responsible to Europe. ["No!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite will run a risk of obliging me to do that which I have no desire to do—namely, to multiply the citations by which it is but too easy to prove that the Plenipotentiaries have acted in the manner that I have described.

Even in the case of Montenegro, the proposal was that the Treaty of Berlin should state that the independence of that country was definitively recognized. The word "definitively" was not an unimportant word, because, at a former period of the history of that heroic State, her independence had, if I am not mistaken, for once, at least, been already recognized by Turkey, and the recognition had been withdrawn or neutralized by after events. The word, therefore, had a substantive meaning on behalf of freedom; but who was it that proposed to strike out that word? It was the British Plenipotentiary. I will not now detain the House by instituting a detailed comparison between the limits of Montenegro as settled by the Treaty of Berlin, and as settled by the Treaty of San Stefano. I do not pronounce upon the changes with universal censure; but, on the whole, the alteration is not to the credit of Europe. It has evidently been dictated by the will of Austria, and wrung from the necessities of Russia.

Now, with respect to Austria—the favourite Power of Her Majesty's Government. We know perfectly well that her history has been one long series of efforts to resist and repress freedom wherever it arose. She opposed the emancipation of Greece; she opposed the union of Italy, and put down, by violence, all the efforts made by the people of that country. She opposed the union of Germany. And, although Constitutional government has been established within her own dominions, it was established, not by free will, but by compulsion; and even now, when it has been so established, it does not in the least degree appear that the spirit of her Parliamentary Government has become favourable to the extension of freedom among neighbouring peoples. Nay, for once in his life, even the Turkish Plenipotentiary appears to have made a more liberal proposal than Austria with regard to Montenegro. But the British Plenipotentiaries supported the Austrian proposal as against the proposal of Turkey.

I now pass to Servia. A question arose with respect to the annexation of a very small district to Servia under the name of Vranja. It was apparently a matter of limited account; but, however limited it was, we find, as usual, the British Plenipotentiary on the side hostile to the emancipation of the people, and a piece of the district had to be cut off in order to neutralize his opposition. A further question arose with respect to Servia. It had already been required by the Congress that she should, in respect of the territory added to her, bear a portion of the Turkish Debt. This was quite right; but there was a further question, whether she should still be liable to pay tribute to Turkey—that is, to pay it by redeeming it in a capitalized form. I do not enter into any review of the conduct of Servia in this matter; but I look simply to what has taken place in the Congress. Servia had obtained her freedom fairly and adequately, in a military sense, by the share which she took in the Russian campaign. Why was she to be saddled with the liability of paying tribute to Turkey, when she had effected her own liberation? So thought the Congress; but not so thought the British Plenipotentiaries; and here the British Plenipotentaries are found, as they are always found when there is a practical issue, on the side least favourable to freedom.

I now come to the question of the cession to Russia of a portion of Bessarabia, which she had lost in 1856, and which she required to be restored at the cost of Roumania. When we arrive at the discussion of this question in the Congress, we find that the British Plenipotentiary delivered an eloquent speech against the separation of Bessarabia; but this speech was made before an assembly of gentlemen who had been previously informed, on unquestionable authority, that England had already made known her intention to agree to the Russian demands, unless Russia, persuaded by British rhetoric, should think fit to recede from them. I admit that a protest was made in brave words. Braver words one could not wish; but they were words alone. The British Government, so far as we know, had taken the lead in assuring Russia that she had only to hold to her point and that Bessarabia should again be hers.

But let us take the matter upon the most favourable issue. The British Government had thus reluctantly been compelled to perform, or to sanction, a cruel act towards Roumania. Surely, then, it was quite obvious that in all other matters it would do the best it could for Romania. Well, Sir, there arrived an opportunity for testing its intentions in a practical manner. There arose a question with regard to the imposition of a tribute upon Roumania, or, which is the same thing, of a pecuniary redemption of tribute similar to that which had arisen in the case of Servia. Now, Sir, nothing in the world could be clearer, nothing higher, than the title of Roumania. She had committed no act liable to an imputation of bad faith towards Turkey. During the whole of the earlier troubles, during the whole war of 1876, she had steadily maintained tranquillity, and had done nothing to add to the embarrassments of the Porte. When she did enter into the war in 1877, it was under circumstances which amounted very nearly to physical, and, at the very least, to a full moral, compulsion. Having taken her part, she fought with a gallantry surpassed by none. Unaccustomed to arms, her children acted in such a manner as would have done credit to veteran warriors, and to a nation inured to military pursuits. If ever a country fairly and honestly had gained its independence, it was Roumania; and yet there arose for Roumania, also, this question of tribute to Turkey. The Congress determined that Roumania should not pay any such tribute; but, even here, there was an opponent, and that opponent was the British Minister.

I say then, Sir, that in this Congress of the Great Powers the voice of England has not been heard in unison with the institutions, the history, and the character of England. On every question that arose, and that became a subject of serious contest in the Congress, or that could lead to any important practical result, a voice had been heard from Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury which sounded in the tones of Metternich, and not in the tones of Mr. Canning, or of Lord Palmerston, or of Lord Russell. I do not mean that the British Government ought to have gone to the Congress determined to insist upon the unqualified prevalence of what I may call British ideas. They were bound to act in consonance with the general views of Europe. But within the limits of fair differences of opinion, which will always be found to arise on such occasions, I do affirm that it was their part to take the side of liberty; and I do also affirm that, as a matter of fact, they took the side of servitude.

I come now, Sir, to the question of Greece, with respect to which we have already had some remarkable experience. My noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) stated, most ably, the case with respect to Greece, so far as it stood upon the Protocols; but my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea enlarged on that statement by particulars which, at the time, were imperfectly authenticated, and he was at once challenged by the Under Secretary of State. The question, however, which was put to him was, whether those particulars were included in the Protocols? They were not so included. Yet the Under Secretary of State, when he rose, did not contradict the statement of the hon. Member for Chelsea. The noble Lord (Viscount Sandon) who has followed to-night on the side of the Government, has not contradicted it. I have myself received information which tends to corroborate that statement. I must now regard it as a statement substantially authenticated, at any rate, until it shall have been pointedly dealt with by the Government. Let me consider, then, Sir, what, according to that statement, combined with the contents of the Protocols, is the history of the relation between England and Greece in respect to this most important matter? The Greeks formed an opinion that they were entitled, under the circumstances of their ethnical relationship, to the possession of Thessaly, Epirus, and Crete. I know not upon what conditions of tribute or otherwise they were to be taken over from Turkey, and I do not enter into those details. Well, what did Her Majesty's Government declare under those circumstances? It has been stated that at a former time they had informed the Greeks that they must not look to territorial acquisitions. I have nothing to do with the former time. I look to the Circular Despatch, written by Lord Salisbury, on the 8th of last June. That despatch contained the authentic and formal instructions of Her Majesty's Government to the Plenipotentiaries, and at page 3 of the Book of Protocols, hon. Gentlemen will find the short passage to which I now refer. Lord Salisbury there says—knowing perfectly at the time what were the claims of Greece—

> "The claims which will no doubt be advanced by the Government of Greece, in reference to some of these Provinces, will receive the careful consideration of Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary, and will, no doubt, also receive the careful consideration of the other Powers."

Now, I want to know whether those words did not bind the British Government to favour some not inconsiderable territorial claims?

An hon. MEMBER: Will the right hon. Gentleman read the whole of the paragraph?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am perfectly willing to read it, but it would waste the time of the House, and it has no relation whatever to the subject. Now, let us see what actually took place, and what sort of careful consideration was given by the British Plenipotentiary to the claims of Greece. I refer, of course, not merely to the Protocols, but to the preliminary *pourparlers;* and I say that the information, as it is now before us, is to the following effect:—The French Government, through its Plenipotentiaries, made a proposal, and endeavoured to obtain the assent of Europe to the proposal, that Thessaly and Epirus should be added to Greece. The particular condition of the arrangements we do not know; but they are matters of comparatively small consequence, which might and ought to have been treated, as I think, in a manner liberal to Turkey. This proposal of the French Plenipotentiaries, as we are given to understand, was met by a counter proposal of the English Plenipotentiaries; and they, instead of handing over Thessaly and Epirus to Greece, proposed—as we are now told by Lord Beaconsfield—to extend the frontier of Greece in the manner now described in the Treaty of Berlin. The French found their suggestion resisted by England, and they thought it expedient—nor can we wonder at, or blame, their conduct—to abandon it accordingly. But was that proceeding of England agreeable to the traditions of England upon this particular subject? I have stated in this House before what I now state again, what I know as matter of personal experience, and what is known likewise to official persons living, and connected, at least, with one other Power. Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell, on the cession of the Ionian Islands, sustained by the opinion of all their Colleagues, were desirous to take practical measures in the year 1862 for procuring the cession of Epirus and Thessaly to Greece. The Porte was unwilling to agree. There was no disturbance in Turkey at the time, and the Porte never makes any concession, except under the pressure of political necessity. I am not making a complaint against Turkey; I am only stating why, at that period, the plan did not take effect; but the tradition of England and its former intention were entirely abandoned on this occasion. The proposal was left to the Plenipotentiaries of France; and when it was made by them, it was resisted by the Plenipotentiaries of England. We are now told that what I may call the minor proposal—that is to say, the frontier described in the Treaty of Berlin, was the original proposal of Lord Salisbury. This statement is not sustained by anything that appears in the volume of the Protocols. But this is not all. This minor proposal is not a definite proposal at all; it is only a recommendation to the Porte, though some say it is a recommendation of a binding character. Some information has been supplied to me with regard to the diplomatic force of the French word *inviter*, and certainly it seems that *inviter* is a word that is occasionally, perhaps frequently, employed in an ultimatum; so that if you invite, in the French tongue, another party in a negotiation to accede to something, it means that if he does not accede you will compel him to submit. However, I pass on with the expression of the hope that these words will be found strong enough to carry force with them; but I wish to refer to what Lord Beaconsfield said about them, in a speech on Saturday last. The French Plenipotentiaries, having been defeated in the larger plan, adopted the smaller one, and proposed it to the Congress. When it was so proposed, although we are now told it was the original proposal of Lord Salisbury, the first Plenipotentiary of England said it was open to objection; but he consented to waive the objection in deference to, or for the sake of, procuring the unanimity of the Congress. Thus far, Sir, we perceive nothing but a persistent hostility, limited only by the more favourable desires of others, on the part of England to the pretensions of Greece. Lord Beaconsfield, who said a limited concession to Greece was open to objection, has not relinquished his idea. Indeed, it is but justice to him to say that he very seldom does relinquish any idea. And on Saturday last, in order, apparently, to reduce to nothing, if he could, the value of what the Congress has done for Greece, he stated in a speech that the Congress declared it did not feel justified in appealing to the Sultan to adopt even a step which might prove advantageous to his own interests; but that it expressed an opinion which he doubted not the Sultan was prepared to consider, in that spirit of conciliation which he had so often displayed. Here are two points—first, the spirit of conciliation displayed by the Sultan; secondly, the intention, which Lord Beaconsfield said, the Congress declared not to coerce him. What is the spirit of conciliation the Sultan has so often displayed? Is it that spirit in which he rejected the recommendations of the Conference at Constantinople? Is it that spirit in which he rejected the Protocol of London, toned down to the feeblest and most limited form consistent with any assertion of a practical interest on behalf of the subject-races? Is it that spirit in which, when Lord Derby made an urgent application for the punishment of the Bulgarian assassins, the Sultan met him by adopting a course which saved every man among them of the slightest consequence from capital punishment, or any severe punishment, and which, in regard to the arch-assassin of them all, Chefket Pasha, at whom Lord Derby had particularly pointed, exhibited itself by selecting him for almost immediate honour and promotion? This is the spirit of conciliation which the Sultan has displayed. It is his calamity as much as his fault. He is the unhappy heir of bad traditions and of triumphant wrong. Now, let me exhibit the effect of Lord Beaconsfield's last declaration. He says the Congress has declared it did not feel justified in compelling the Sultan to adopt any step with respect to Greece. I want to know where the Congress has made that declaration? I say, if it has made such a declaration, I cannot find it on record. If it be upon the record, I beg of you, here, and now, to point it out. I do not wish to detain you by any inaccurate assertion, but I have sought for it in vain. I find no such declaration upon the record. Why is it alleged in the speech of the Prime Minister? Is it thus alleged in order to have the same effect on the coming negotiations between Greece and Turkey, as the occasional or unofficial messages conveyed during the Conference at Constantinople, to the effect that England would not be, in any circumstances, a party to compelling Turkey to do that which the Conference had recommended? We remember the effect of those messages, the lively expressions of gratitude which they produced from the Sultan and from the Grand Vizier. As far as the facts go, the recent declaration of the Prime Minister, wholly unsupported by anything on the Protocols—nay, at variance with the Protocols as they stand—the recent declaration was probably intended to convey to the mind of the Sultan that, so far as England is concerned, he is perfectly safe, may do what he pleases, and need not give to Greece an acre or a yard of land. Surely such an intimation merits another of those grateful telegrams from the Grand Vizier and from the Sultan. Such, Sir, is the case with Greece, as it stands upon the evidence at present before us. The statement of it does not require to be heightened by the use of epithets—it is sufficiently exhibited by the facts.

I come now, Sir, to the Agreement made between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff. And I wish to ask the Government, at this part of the case, in what manner they reconcile the conclusion of that Agreement with the distinct professions upon which they had been standing for three or four months before, in the face of Europe? Nothing had so much excited the public mind in the early part of this year as the notion that there were, or might be, secret Articles of Agreement between Russia and Turkey. It would have been so wicked—would it not?—for Russia to have made a secret agreement in conjunction with the Treaty of San Stefano. But at last this phantom was laid. The Russians declared, in the most explicit language that they, at any rate, had no secret Agreement. We then contended that the whole matter of the Treaty of San Stefano was for the free, full, unbiassed consideration of Europe; it modified European law, and, therefore, it must go fully and freely to the consideration of Europe? Did it go fully and freely to the consideration of Europe? No; a secret Agreement was made between Russia and England; for all we know, it may have been intended that it should continue a secret Agreement, even down to the conclusion of the proceedings of the Congress. We owe the acquisition of a most valuable piece of knowledge, by the publication of this Agreement, to an agent to whom we are, I conceive, not particularly anxious to owe anything at all. Through that agent we came rapidly to the knowledge of its contents; and we found that, after all that had been said about the free deliberation of Europe, two of the Powers who were, or thought themselves, most interested in the whole matter, had consented together, in binding terms, as to the limits within which, not upon one or two, but upon every one of the most essential points, their action in the Congress was to be confined. Is that proceeding between two such Powers compatible with the full and free reference of the entire Treaty to Europe? It appears to me, I frankly own, that these two things are not compatible; nor will I rest satisfied with an opinion. I will go back to a precedent; I will cite the precedent of the Berlin Memorandum. Why was it, that when you refused the Berlin Memorandum, and that—most unwisely as I thought—you offered no substitute for it? In that unconditional refusal, as I have never dissembled, you clearly carried with you, to a very great extent indeed, the approval of the people of this country. Sir, it was because that Berlin Memorandum was a preliminary Agreement between three of the Powers of Europe; it was because England had been shut out from the preliminary declaration and conclusion; because it was felt, and justly felt, that a preliminary Agreement between some of the Powers on questions of importance, even although the supreme jurisdiction of Europe might, in the most explicit terms, be reserved, yet, notwithstanding, was a measure that greatly tended to limit the practical freedom and the legitimate authority of Europe in dealing with the entire question. I do not say you resisted the preliminary Memorandum on this ground exclusively. You set forth a number of arguments upon the case—arguments very far, in my opinion, from being conclusive. But that, I believe, was the ground on which the country supported you. Having resisted the Berlin Memorandum on that ground, and then having insisted that Russia should carry the whole of that Treaty without prejudice and without restraint into the counsels of Europe, you then proceeded to agree with Russia upon a secret instrument, which limited the discretion of two of the greatest Agents that were to appear in the Congress, by a compact binding each of them to the other, and thereby necessarily limiting the discretion of Europe itself. Sir, I should be very glad to know how, with reference to this part of the case, the Government can show the proceedings in the matter of the Salisbury-Schouvaloff Agreement to be conformable to that perfect good faith which ought to prevail in all the transactions of the Powers; which ought, especially, to prevail between this Power and the rest of Europe; and to which I, for one, had fondly dreamed that this country would cling, even were every other Power to show itself ready to compromise the high standard of its principles.

The last great subject before us tonight, and unfortunately the largest and most complex of all, and which, even if a long speech were exclusively devoted to it, could not be exhaustively discussed, is the Anglo-Turkish Convention. I am sorry to say, it is, perhaps, the most painful subject. I wish to say this plainly, and to give my reasons for what I say, waiting and hoping to be confuted, if happily I may be confuted; ready to apologize, if I speak in terms stronger than our debates shall require, upon these proceedings, which appear to me to lie entirely outside, not only the limits of all former precedents, but the limits of all rational policy. I believe this Convention to be a complete and absolute novelty in our political history; partly as to its contents and aims, and partly as to the manner in which it has been concluded, and upon which I am bound to say I feel even more strongly than with respect to its contents.

Now, Sir, what is this Convention in itself? What I have just said is applicable to a certain construction of it; but there are two constructions of it, and they are wide as the poles asunder. If you take it according to one of these constructions, then, I think, it justifies the very strongest epithets that can be used as to its unprecedented, and even its monstrous, character. If you take it according to the other description, it becomes a poor shadowy product, of an uncertain and precarious life, which may perhaps die of inanition at any moment, excepting, by-the-bye, upon one single point—the possession of Cyprus. It is provided, in the Convention, that if Russia shall surrender her territorial acquisitions in Asia, then Great Britain shall surrender Cyprus; but it is not provided that if Great Britain gives up the prosecution of the gigantic task to which she has committed herself in Asiatic Turkey, from the Black Sea down to the Persian Gulf, and to the Southern bounds of Arabia, that then also she shall, upon her desisting from her task, surrender Cyprus. Excepting in the case of a surrender by Russia, Cyprus would be, so far as it goes, a solid residuum.

I am bound to state that, upon the evidence of the facts, it appears to me that the acquisition of Cyprus has been the Alpha and the Omega of the conclusion of this Convention. The noble Lord (Viscount Sandon) holds us responsible for having been sufficiently informed as to this acquisition. He says it was spoken of in the newspapers. One newspaper wrote of Mitylene, another of Cyprus, another of Egypt, another of the coast of Syria. Therefore, says the noble Lord, in consequence of these isolated notices and comments, we ought to have been prepared for the production of the scheme now before us. This scheme, says he, is only a conditional Agreement; we have only demanded of Turkey that she should perform certain great operations. She has agreed to do so, by-and-bye. It is extremely likely that she may not perform them, and if she does not perform them we retire, and in retiring we have a convenient Island in the Mediterranean, which some people think may be very valuable to us. I do not agree in that opinion; but the Convention, in that case, would be reduced to very moderate dimensions. I am not sure whether this is the reading of the Convention adopted by the noble Lord. I am afraid it is not a true reading as adopted by Her Majesty's Government generally. It may be one not unreasonable. I do not believe that Turkey can or will perform the conditions that must be exacted of her; and, therefore, it appears, on this mode of construing the instrument, that the obligation towards Turkey may lapse and determine.

But then we have professed to enter into that obligation on the ground that the maintenance of Turkey in Asia is necessary for British interests. If so, it may happen that we may be compelled, in the view of Her Majesty's Government, to adopt this Convention under the more substantial of its two positive forms. We are not to assume the government of Asiatic Turkey. We are to proceed upon certain plans which the Under Secretary of State says he will not produce. He seems entirely to forget that all these things have been planned 10 times over at earlier dates. He forgets that a perfect scheme of reform for Turkey was published in the year 1839; and that another perfect scheme was published in 1856, after it had been framed under the advice of men of quite as high character, and quite as strong wits, as any of those who have taken part, or who are likely to take part, in the present proceedings. The Hatti Humayoun of 1856 is, as I believe, at this moment the law of Asia Minor, the law of Syria and Mesopotamia, and of Turkish Arabia. Are you going to repeal that law? Do you mean to sweep away all that was done by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe? You are going to undertake an enormous work. The Prime Minister says that you mean to produce order and prosperity out of chaos and anarchy. The noble Lord (Viscount Sandon), in an elegant peroration, which proved to me so strongly the extent of his imaginative powers, developed largely the view of the Prime Minister. To produce order and prosperity out of chaos and anarchy—out of the chaos and anarchy of 18,000,000 of people dispersed over a territory larger than Western Europe, is what is undertaken by Her Majesty's Government. All this they are to do, not with the united authority of Europe—they are to do it single-handed; they are to do it by the force of moral suasion; they are to do it by the force of that moral suasion which they have been employing for years, without the smallest effect, in pressing and urging Turkey to reform her government. What is the condition, all this time, of our own public affairs? Have we, the British nation, a great spare fund of energy applicable to this gigantic purpose? Why, Sir, our public affairs are in such a condition—I do not say it is mainly owing to the action of the present Government—but they have been taxing their brains to discover this and that Lilliputian method of expediting the labours of the House of Commons, which is already over-taxed more and more egregiously from year to year. Our own business is in enormous, and I fear, hopeless, arrear. Obstruction has become a most powerful instrument, which is due in a large measure to this arrear. Yet they are not afraid to undertake new and also boundless responsibilities. Turkey in Asia is to be managed as an outpost of British power; it is to be maintained and to be reformed. We have never been able to reform Turkey at all. We have never been able to effect reform in India, even with absolute power in our hands, through the medium of a Native Government. We have always been compelled, in order to effect reform, to take the direct Administration and Sovereignty into our hands. We are now going to attempt that which is wholly unheard of. An immense military responsibility is likewise to be cast on us. We are to defend, at the moment when Russia shall please to attack it, a frontier of a difficult and almost inaccessible character, 2,000 or 3,000 miles distant from our own resources, but conterminous with the whole mass of the unbroken territory of Russia. Together with this military responsibility, we undertake a complete social and political transformation. We are to re-construct the police of Turkey, the Judicature, the fiscal system, and the Civil Service. Memory fails me in the attempt to enumerate all the many-sided particulars of Ministerial benevolence. We are to reform the appointment of Governors, and, finally, we are to staunch all the fountain-heads of corruption in Constantinople itself, which have hitherto vitiated all the benevolent schemes that have been formed for the improvement of Turkey. This is the plan proposed for our acceptance, not for our own free consideration, but for our acceptance upon the responsibility of the Government. The proceedings of the Government have been carefully concealed from us in their inception and negotiation—concealed from us until the disclosure of them was of no use, weight, or value, because the full force of the Covenant, whatever that Covenant may be, has already been brought to bear upon us by the action of the Administration. Sir, I do not disparage the importance of reform in Turkey; but we ought to have regard to the amount of that which we undertake, to the success which we have hitherto achieved, to the means which we can bring to bear upon its accomplishment; for otherwise we run the most serious risk of practising delusion upon ourselves and others, delusion which, at a certain point, degenerates even into imposture.

What are the reasons for this unheard of—nay, in the sense I have described, this mad undertaking? I want to know at what period of history, and by what British statesman, such an act as this has ever been done? I have had some knowledge of those who have taken the leading part in the foreign affairs of this country for the last 40 years. I have sat in the Cabinet by the side of the Duke of Wellington, of Sir Robert Peel, of Lord Aberdeen, of Sir James Graham, of Lord Lansdowne, of Lord Palmerston, of Lord Clarendon, and of Lord Russell. I have known their modes of looking at these affairs; I have known the measure which they took of the rights, and duties, and powers of England, and of the limitations placed by a higher authority on all human power. Knowing the men, and the modes of action of the men, I do not hesitate to say that there was not one of them who would for one moment have consented to look at such a scheme as has been contrived and accomplished in the dark, by the Members of Her Majesty's present Government. It would be presumptuous for me, were I to speak, in the face of hon. Gentlemen opposite, in a tone equally confident of the late Lord Derby; but I have sat also with the late Lord Derby in the Cabinet of Sir Robert Peel, and I have the strongest conviction that if such a scheme had been presented to him he would, like his distinguished son, have entirely declined to be responsible for it, in part or in whole, as a device not within the limits of rational or practical politics.

Now, Sir, let us look at some of the reasons which have been given for undertaking some of these extraordinary responsibilities. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs says that other people have assumed responsibilities, and shall we take none? He seems to complain that we are entirely without responsibility. I had thought that in the condition of the British Empire we were tolerably well supplied. He says Russia is going to assume responsibilities. What responsibilities is Russia about to assume? For nine months she is to maintain possession by her troops of the territories that they occupy, and after that she will act only in concurrence and in partnership with Europe. What separate responsibility has Russia undertaken? Has the Under Secretary got another Schouvaloff Memorandum, not yet disclosed to us? No other responsibility of Russia is mentioned in the Protocols or in the Treaty. But Austria is going to undertake responsibilities. Undoubtedly she is. She will be responsible for a territory of limited extent, inhabited by 1,200,000 or 1,500,000 people, and that territory already surrounded, as to more than half its circumference, by her own territory. This responsibility she has undertaken, in the face of day, by the mandate of Europe. Her mode of obtaining it, whatever I may think of her general policy, has been perfectly honourable. No one is entitled to find the slightest fault with her procedure. She has obtained the consent of Europe, and the authority of Europe; her task is, at any rate, within limits; she is not going to take charge of half a continent; she is not going to proceed under an agreement made with closed doors, and imposed by her Executive Government upon her own people, on its own single responsibility.

So much for the responsibilities of others. But the Under Secretary has produced an argument much more extraordinary even than this. I really felt, when he used it last night, that there was something in it in full harmony with the high-coloured Oriental character of these proceedings. The hon. Gentleman has discovered that Russia is in the greatest possible want of recruiting ground; she has such a small population, and so very few men in proportion to her means of subsistence. Now, Sir, I have always been under an impression, in which I must have been completely wrong. My impression had hitherto been that Russia was a country with comparatively small means of subsistence, and a comparatively large number of inhabitants. Were this so, the business of recruiting is the easiest operation that could be conceived. It is also backed by the system of conscription. But as to the character of the recruiting ground of the hon. Gentleman, which he really might have drawn by copying from *The Arabian Nights*, I tell him this—that, if he has not got information contrary to mine, so far from Russia getting or requiring recruiting ground in Armenia, Russia, long ago in possession of Georgia, has not even extended her ordinary system of conscription to the South of the Caucasus. Is the hon. Gentleman prepared to contradict this statement? I have learned that the country of Georgia, into which I believe a year ago, or two years ago, Russia had not thought it worth while to extend her conscription, is a better territory for recruiting, has more population, and is better able to yield her soldiers, inhabited as it is exclusively by Christians, than that Armenia which has possessed and inflamed the imagination of the hon. Gentleman, and filled him with terrors, lest Russia should make use of it for her recruiting ground. Russia has not even carried her own system of recruiting into her present territory, towards the frontier of Turkey, and yet the hon. Gentleman tells us that it is her great scheme to acquire this Turkish territory, evidently less adapted for the purpose, to supply a poverty of men which does not exist, and under which she has never suffered, and is not likely to suffer. A more extraordinary piece of information than that given by the hon. Gentleman, proceeding as it does from an official source, can hardly be imagined. But I do not blame the hon. Gentleman. I believe that this strange conception is entirely owing to the poverty of his materials. It is, in reality, of a piece with the general idea and structure of that singular production which is called the Anglo-Turkish Convention, and which I am convinced will be the astonishment—it may possibly be the calamity—of our children and of our children's children.

It would not be well, Sir, however, that the whole business of supplying arguments should fall upon the Under Secretary. The Secretary of State has also made a contribution towards the discovery of reasons to be urged in favour of this scheme. It is to be found in the despatch which has been for some days in our hands. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs considers that throughout Asia Minor, as a consequence of the recent war, there will be a great disintegration of Ottoman rule, amounting nearly to a dissolution of society, so that if there is to be any hope of order or peace in that country, there is an absolute necessity for some kind of intervention. Now, Sir, in the first place, I beg you to compare this most deplorable state of things with the other reports which we have heard as to the concentration of the Turkish Empire. Why, if the Turkish Empire is concentrated, as is insisted upon by Her Majesty's Government, and not "partitioned," as other and foolish people have imagined, just as that concentration would enable the Ottoman Power to manage its affairs in Europe with more efficiency, why should it not do the same thing in Asia? The Turkish Empire will be concentrated in Asia, as an effect of the concentration in Europe, and will be concentrated in Asia by the abstraction of the territory which Russia has taken from it. But that is not all. In Europe the concentrated territory is to be administered under great difficulty by a minority of Mahommedans among a majority of Christians, by a Government of the Turkish fashion, with Governments of a very different and far better fashion upon the frontiers at short distances. In European Turkey the Porte has constantly been troubled by revolts. In Asia, so far from her having greater difficulties to contend with, her difficulties are infinitely less. Who has heard of revolts in Asia Minor or in Mesopotamia? Who are the inhabitants of Asia Minor in its centre? I do not speak of Armenia; but even in Armenia the Armenians are in a minority. Who, I ask, are the inhabitants of Central Asia Minor? They are the best and most solid of the Mahommedan population in the whole of the Turkish Empire, except that of Mesopotamia and the extreme South-east. Will the hon. Gentleman venture to contradict my statement? I am quite sure he cannot; and yet my statement is one which, if it be true, is perfectly fatal to the argument of the Secretary of State. Kurdistan may be a lawless tract; but I do not speak of Kurdistan, I speak of Central Asia Minor. Captain Burnaby is a good witness to call. I hope I may call him so, because he has been led accidentally to put into my mouth all manner of things which I never said, and consequently I hope that the mention of his name will be received with much favour by hon. Gentlemen opposite. He is without doubt a competent observer of things which fall within his own view. He has given a very interesting account of his ride through the heart of Asia Minor, and he writes that it is inhabited by a population mainly of Mahommedans, and enthusiastic in its loyalty to the dynasty and the Mahommedan religion. The fact is, that there is no evidence of the state of things stated by Lord Salisbury; it is entirely due to his imagination. This has been the least troubled portion of the Turkish Empire. Bad government prevails in it, but only as it prevails everywhere. Who has ever heard before of the doctrine set up by Lord Salisbury? Show me the documents in the voluminous records of the Foreign Office, of any anterior period, which are in harmony with this despatch of Lord Salisbury, and which represent a specially hopeless state of things in the interior of Asia Minor. I cannot but affirm that it is a despatch made to meet the case. I do not mean that Lord Salisbury has not persuaded himself of the truth of the statement he has made; but he is in a position of great difficulty—he has to find a justification for an extraordinary and an unheard of measure. Rebellions in Asia Minor are things unheard of. Grievances in Asia Minor have never yet produced that result. Your own witness (Captain Burnaby) is against you, and there is not the smallest pretence for saying that society in Asia Minor is in a condition of anarchy in a sense inapplicable to other portions of the Turkish Empire. And if it were so, this Convention does not refer to Asia Minor alone; it refers just as much to Syria, and Mesopotamia, and Arabia.

But the noble Lord says—"You have not given us an alternative policy!" My answer is, the Congress itself, so far as Armenia is concerned, has concurred in providing an alternative policy, and one most rational. Here is one of the most extraordinary among all the extraordinary parts of this unexampled proceeding. The principle of British policy for very many years has been to regulate everything relating to Turkey, so far as it was to be touched at all, by the common consent of Europe. On that principle the Treaty of Berlin has been framed with regard to the Province of Armenia. All the Powers that have signed that Treaty have taken from the Sultan an engagement for the good government of Armenia, and they are one and all entitled to enforce that engagement. With regard, then, to the very same matters and at the very same time, the same Government has been a party to providing for two totally different jurisdictions—the one of a higher and the other of a lower authority; the one of European authority, with the consent of Turkey, the other of the authority of a single Power, with that same consent. Each of these may come, and is likely to come, into conflict with Turkey; but they may come also into conflict with one another. On the 4th of June, you signed a Treaty with the Sultan, under which the Sultan binds himself to you to settle with you certain reforms that are to be introduced into Armenia, among other countries. On the 13th of July, you signed another Treaty of Berlin, with the Sultan also, and with a great many other Powers, representing an authority far higher than that to which you and the Sultan can pretend; and this authority, with perfect parity among its members, provides that the Sultan, in concert with each, and with the whole of them, shall introduce reforms into Armenia. What security have you, or have we, that these two authorities are to arrive at the same judgment on the reforms? There is very little doubt which of the two is superior. You may well talk of an alternative policy. You have provided, so far as Armenia is concerned, an alternative and a conflicting policy yourselves.

And how came this about? What we find is, that you had made your own secret arrangements with Turkey, withdrawn from the knowledge of the European Powers, and when the question of Armenia was raised in the Congress at Berlin, you were apparently not in a condition to disclose to the Congress—at all events, you did not disclose—that which you already had agreed upon for Turkey. The consequence of your alternative policy was that the Congress at Berlin adopted a system totally different to that to which you had agreed. The doctrine of the Government is that something was to be done. But something was done. The Sultan was already under obligations to Europe to execute reforms in Asiatic Turkey by the Treaty of 1856. If we wished to give effect to that obligation, why did not we invoke the authority of Europe? Is it not higher and stronger than ours? Do we mean to set up our own authority as greater than that of Europe? Do you think that we have a monopoly of humanity? Has our conduct, with regard to Turkey, been such as to show that the care of the subject-populations has been our interest alone, or has been more studiously propagated by us, than by other Powers of Christendom? Do you think that intervention in the Sultan's affairs is prejudicial and unwise when it is attempted by others, but beneficent and wise, when done by you single-handed? Now, suppose that the Sultan had made an agreement with Russia, to do, in a certain portion of his territory, that which he has agreed with you to do in far the larger part of it. Suppose a Russian Minister had said—"We are going to reform the Judicature, the police, the finances, the Civil Service of Turkey, and stop the progress of corruption in Constantinople." Would you have commended Russia for taking that course? Would you have allowed Russia to take that course? No; nor yet to do a tenth part of what you have done. You would have inflamed the country, and called out your Reserves, and adopted your military measures. Sir, the whole tendency of what Her Majesty's Government has done is to establish one law for others, and another for ourselves. Lord Salisbury has been speaking with some contempt of the philosophical historian, and he has said —if he be correctly reported—that the philosophical historian has often given countenance to wild and speculative ideas, which are not suited for the councils of statesmen. In my own opinion, the philosophical historian, when he gets his turn—and he will get his turn—will make a very formidable rejoinder; he will say that it is from the councils of statesmen, or councils which are called such, that, upon this occasion, there has proceeded the most extraordinary crop of wild and speculative ideas which were ever grown in the hottest of all the hot-houses of politics.

What, Sir, are the Ministerial representations of this design? It is said that, in order to defend the Turkish frontier from Russia, England must watch over the good government of Turkey in Asia; and, in order to enable her to watch over it effectually, she must take possession of Cyprus. I should not be at all surprised if the philosophic historian, when he comes to handle the subject, should be inclined to give a totally different version of the matter, and should repeat it in a manner something like this. No doubt, he will greatly improve the form; but he may say something of this sort—"England"—that is to say, an English Ministry—"wanted to get possession of Cyprus, that it might have something to show to the people of England, by way of averting the reproach of defeat, or of presenting the semblance of triumph. In order to induce the Sultan to make them a present of Cyprus, they undertook to defend the Turkish frontier against Russia; and in order to make the defence of that frontier decent, in a philanthropic point of view, they took from the Sultan stipulations for the good government of Asia," which all experience had shown to be worthless.

I cannot complain, Sir, that we have had no explanation of the motives which induced the Sultan to enter into this Convention. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State, in a moment of candour and great communicativeness—a quality in regard to which Her Majesty's Government have not signally erred on the side of excess—last night, did allow himself to tell us why it was that this Convention had been especially kept back from our knowledge. It was for this reason—If it had gone forth to the world, some ill-inclined persons would have persuaded the Sultan not to sign it. It was necessary, in order to make sure of the Sultan's signing it, that it should be done in the dark. That is not my statement; it is the statement of the hon. Gentleman who made it on the part of the Government. But why is it not good for the Sultan, as it is for everybody else, that he should do what he is called upon to do, after every opportunity of knowledge and information? If it had been known that this Convention was in the course of being negotiated, then there, as here, all the world would have had an opportunity of giving an opinion, and of giving information upon it. "No," says the hon. Gentleman, "that would have been utterly fatal; the Sultan would never have signed it. Secrecy was necessary in order to bring him to such a point." And is that, Sir, the account given by a British Minister of the motives for a British negotiation? Publicity would have exhibited all the facts, opened every mouth, thrown the full light of day on the entire transaction; but that, as we now know, in the judgment of the Government, would have been fatal to the signing of the Convention by the Sultan. It appears to me then, Sir, as I will say again, that we are truly in the region of *The Arabian Nights*, more than in the region of practical politics, as that region was known to the generation of our forefathers, or to my own earlier public life. The whole matter is so strange that, as we pass on from point to point, new wonders continually open upon us. It is not a matter of astonishment that—as has been stated so well by my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea—a large portion of the people of England has been so silent on the subject of this Convention. I do not believe that now, in this debate, however it might be prolonged, we should be able to view it in all its lights, or to open up one-half of the contingencies, or one-half of the dangers which, in the real and substantial conception of the scheme, it involves.

But, Sir, passing on from the matters which this Convention contains, I go to what is, if possible, more serious; and I want to know from Her Majesty's Government what is really their doctrine, and their view, about the binding force of Treaties? Upon this subject I am entirely and hopelessly confused. This country made a Declaration on the 17th January, 1871. I now tell Her Majesty's Government that I am going to attack their title, in point of honour and good faith, to conclude the Anglo-Turkish Convention in the way in which it was concluded. I say that they had no title. I say that the Convention, as it stands, is an offence against European law. I say that upon their own principles it has no legal force until the Powers of Europe shall have agreed to it. I want to know the opinion of the Government upon that subject, and if they do not agree with the opinion I have now given, I want to know how they could depart from a principle of their own which they have laid down in their own language, and on which they have strongly insisted during the present year? I go back, Sir, however, to the 17th January, 1871. The Assembly of Plenipotentiaries spoke thus—

> "They recognize that it is one essential principle of the law of nations that no Power can liberate itself from the engagements of a Treaty, nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the contracting Powers by means of an amicable agreement."

Now, Sir, I desire to know whether the Convention of the 4th of June does, or does not, modify the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris? I hold that it does modify those stipulations. I say that the cession of Cyprus to England — veil it as you like under the terms of "occupation" and "administration"—the delivery of Cyprus into the power of England, and all that legislative power over Cyprus, which you are going to claim, and which you are going to exercise—I presume under the authority of the Sultan—is totally at variance with both the spirit and letter of the Declaration of London, in its application to the Treaty of Paris. By the Treaty of Paris, every Power in Europe is bound to take an interest in that question, for it bears upon the integrity of the Turkish Empire. It is a matter of common concern, and particular signatory Powers have no right to deal with it by separate arrangement. Supposing that Russia had taken Mitylene; juridically, the question would have just been the same, and it would then have been true, as it is now true, that her assumption of it had no legal validity without the assent of Europe. That is not my opinion alone. What was your own language a few weeks ago? Lord Derby said, on the 8th of March, in this year, on your behalf, in a despatch—

> "It will be desirable to have it understood, in the first place, that no alteration in the state of things previously established by Treaty should be acknowledged as valid, until it has received the assent of the Powers."

That was the language of Lord Derby on the 8th of March. Accordingly, the alterations made by the Treaty of San Stefano in the state of things previously established have either been reversed, or have since received the assent of the Powers of Europe. But what title have you to make other alterations on your own motion only? If you may thus act, may not Russia thus act? If Russia may not thus act, what right have you to take such proceedings? If the Porte is entitled to give over Cyprus to you, is she, or is she not entitled, I ask again, to give over Mitylene to Russia? If she is entitled to do the one and not the other, show me the international and juridical grounds on which you found that difference. It is quite time that the question should be asked, and that the question should be answered. I am profoundly alarmed at the conduct of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the faith of Treaties. A few months ago they were gaining infinite credit from Europe—I admit the fact—as the champion of public law. They had made demands upon Russia which led them, undoubtedly, to a diplomatic victory. They required Russia to submit to the meeting of a Congress, on terms much narrower and closer than had been pressed on any other Power at any former period. They brought the Congress together under limitations imposed by their will—limitations which, as far as I know, had never been previously pressed upon the Parties to a European Congress. But Russia did submit; and by making their demand, and carrying their demand, Her Majesty's Government obtained credit, as the champions of public law. But what have they, since then, been doing with public law themselves? They sent their Fleet into the Dardanelles, and kept it there, even in the time of peace. Was not that a violation of public law? A hon. and learned Friend of mine, the Member for the Denbigh Boroughs (Mr. Watkin Williams), gave Notice of a Question on this subject to Her Majesty's Government, impugning the legality of their act; but the Notice of his Question was received on the other side of the House with such stormy manifestations as cannot easily be forgotten. It was a simple Question on a point of law; but whether, on account of its inconvenient character, or on some other ground, this method of meeting it was adopted, and with such effect that my hon. and learned Friend appears to have thought that, after all, discretion was the better part of valour, and that perhaps his Question had better not be put.

In the meantime, the British Fleet remained, and for a time, undoubtedly, without any sanction ever made known to us, within the Dardanelles in time of peace. Well, Sir, what declaration do we find before us in the Protocols, about that Article of the Treaty of London, which lays down the law of Europe with respect to the Straits? We find that Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary has taken upon himself to declare on behalf of England, without the consent of the other Powers of Europe, that we should determine for ourselves in what way we shall hereafter understand and construe that Article of the Treaty of London, which refers to the closing of the Dardanelles. What right has the British Plenipotentiary to make any such declaration? Lord Salisbury has inserted in the Protocols these words—

> "Considering that the Treaty of Berlin will modify an important part of the arrangements sanctioned by the Treaty of Paris of 1856, and that the interpretation of Article 2 of the Treaty of London, which is dependent on the Treaty of Paris, may thus become a matter of dispute:—'I declare on behalf of England that the obligations of Her Britannic Majesty relating to the closing of the Straits, do not go further than an engagement with the Sultan to respect in this matter His Majesty's independent determinations in conformity with the spirit of existing Treaties.'"

With respect, then, Sir, to that very

Treaty of London, which was concluded for the very purpose of establishing the doctrine that no single Power could either depart from, or modify, the stipulations of any engagement, England has claimed to record a declaration with regard to the closing of the Straits that she will not be bound by the letter of the Treaty, but will fall back on its spirit, and make herself alone the judge of that spirit. It seems to me that this is a breach of the Treaty; a flat violation, as it stands, of the Treaty of London. The Russian Plenipotentiaries not unnaturally met it by recording their counter-declaration that the principle of closing the Straits was a European principle, and that the stipulations concluded in this respect in 1841, 1856, and 1871, confirmed at present by the Treaty of Berlin, were binding on the part of the Powers in accordance, not with the spirit only, but with the spirit and the letter of the existing Treaties. Well, Sir, I use those citations mainly as illustrations of the vital and fundamental inquiry, what is the ground on which you claim your title to make this separate Treaty with Turkey, and to modify the law of Europe without the assent of Europe? I confess it appears to me that it is a clear infraction of the principles declared in London in 1871, and declared by yourselves in the earlier portions of the negotiations.

Now, Sir, have foreign Powers no ground to complain of the manner of our proceedings in this matter? We brought them to Berlin under the full belief that we ourselves were there for the purpose of maintaining a very high doctrine about European law, and of contending that the provisions of 1856 were unalterable, except by European authority. Under that belief we carried them through all the important parts, or very nearly all the important parts, of the Treaty of Berlin, and it was only at the close of the negotiations that they found out that we, in the meantime, not by European authority, not even with the knowledge of any Power in Europe, as far as we are informed, had, in concert with the Porte, and, as the Under Secretary has told us, keeping even Turkey purposely in the dark, lest the Sultan should refuse to sign—we had altered the Treaty of 1856, behind the back of Europe, by establishing a sole Protectorate, and a single-handed right of intervention in Asiatic Turkey, and by assuming the administration and occupation of the Island of Cyprus.

Now, Sir, this was in direct contradiction to the doctrine laid down by all previous authorities, and notably by Lord Clarendon, in a despatch, dated the 22nd July, 1854. Lord Clarendon says—

> "If such reforms are to be promoted by any foreign influence, it can only be by means of friendly counsel and advice, and not by an interference grounded upon Treaty engagements into which no State could enter without abdicating its independence."

In defiance of this principle you have taken a Treaty engagement with Turkey, and you have taken it alone. Now the great object of the Crimean War, and of the Treaty of 1856, was first of all to defeat and to prevent all sole interference with Turkey whatever, and to lay down the principle that whatever concerned Turkey should be the concern, not of one Power, but of Europe. Not only so, but there was another, and a noble portion of the policy of that time, which you have completely reversed. When England and France went into the Crimean War, they went into it as the champions of public law; and one of the first and most solemn acts which they performed was to contract a mutual engagement that, come what might, contending as they did for public law in the general interests of Europe and of civilization, neither the one nor the other should turn to her own profit the issue of the war, or use it for her own aggrandizement. What have we now done in connection with the principle involved in that engagement? Into the recent war we did not go. For the subject-races we lifted no arm of strength. What has been done for them has been done without us, has been done morally in spite of us. We contented ourselves with diplomatic war, not in their behalf, but against their cause. This war we carried on very actively through our Ambassador at Constantinople, against the Power engaged in the endeavour to liberate those subject-races—against her in that war, and in the best of her acts, although we aided her in her criminal proceedings in respect to Bessarabia; proceedings against which we protested, no doubt, in the face of the Assembly at Berlin, but with a written document, known to every one of its members, that, if only she would hold to her point, we were ready to concur with her. Now, Sir, that self-denying engagement on the part of France and England was a noble and an honourable act, and it stands in the most glaring contrast with what has lately been done. It had the entire approval of the people of this country; and I have yet to learn that the people of this country will approve of the reversal, by a stroke struck in secret, of the policy it embodied. The conduct of Her Majesty's Government in going to Berlin, and negotiating there in the guise of maintainers of that public law which they themselves knew that they had just set aside, appears to me to be of a character of which foreign Powers have a right to complain as a proceeding tainted with duplicity. It is not enough to say that no Power in Europe protests against it. It is not a very dignified thing for any great Power to protest, unless it has well considered the means it it may possess of giving effect to its protests. It is not bound to protest at a given moment; it may choose its own time; but we are bound now, and at every time, to proceed upon the principles which we believe to be the principles of justice, and to test the conduct of the Government by the application of those principles.

Is it possible Her Majesty's Government can believe that they have been behaving in a manner worthy of England to, for example, all the Mediterranean Powers? They say that they have spared the susceptibilities of France. I will not now speak especially of Italy, though I might do it, as she is a Power whose coasts are only in the Mediterranean; but I speak of France. How have you spared her susceptibilities? By making a secret contract with the Sultan, which extends to the government of the whole of Turkey in Asia, and so includes the region of Syria, of the historical relations of which with France you cannot but be aware. You have stepped in between France and her historical relations with Syria; you have affected her position in the Mediterranean by the acquisition of Cyprus; you have forgotten the honourable and leading part which France has already taken in matters of vital consequence connected with the internal condition of Turkey in Asia. Do you think that France has not cause to be jealous of these proceedings? As to her declarations, I do not pretend to be in possession of authentic evidence; but I listened with much astonishment to the language of the noble Lord to-night. The noble Lord to-night quoted a speech of M. Gambetta, which he thought favourable to the recent policy of England; and he said it would be admitted that M. Gambetta could not be considered as a friendly witness. Surely, Sir, the noble Lord could have given no attention whatever to the course taken by a portion of the French Press during the Eastern controversy. The reputed organ of M. Gambetta in the French Press—I speak of that which I believe is notorious—is *The République Française.* I have read *The République Française* from time to time during these transactions. I have never seen a notice in it of my own course, except in terms of the severest condemnation, and that journal has appeared to be nearly as much devoted as some of the journals of this Metropolis to the support of the policy of Her Majesty's Government upon the Eastern Question. I do not now enter into motives; but such is the fact. *The Journal des Débats* has maintained, as far as I know, a tone nearly similar. At the same time, in *The Journal des Débats,* within the last few days, I find this passage—

> "Let England represent to herself what her feelings would have been if France in the days of her power"—

"In the days of her power!" what a bitter reflection for the French writer at the moment!—

> "done what England has just accomplished, and if she had done it in the same manner."

Sir, had France taken such a proceeding, I know very well what England would have thought. The writer in *The Journal des Débats* goes on to refer, and to refer with perfect justice, to the opinions expressed in this country at the time as to the annexation of Savoy and of Nice. That annexation was one of trifling political consequence in itself. Nay, more; I will venture to say, as regards Savoy, what I could not state as regards Nice, it was an annexation which was not otherwise than agreeable to the real nature of the circumstances at the time. The annexation of these two Provinces was effected under circumstances which did not cause public scandal; yet such were the feelings aroused in this country, that I give it confidently as my opinion, that if it had not been for the commercial negotiations with France, and for the French Treaty of the same year, it is too probable that we should have found our way to war with France, out of jealousy against those annexations. A course tending manifestly in that direction was recommended in this House, not under the name of war, but under the name of a "Continental combination" against France, from this Opposition Bench, near which I now stand, by a Gentleman who then principally expressed the opinions of the Conservative Party on foreign affairs in Parliament—I mean Sir Seymour Fitzgerald. Sir, it would perhaps be agreeable neither to the recollections, nor to the hopes and aspirations of France, that she should commit herself to a protest at a time when prudence might recommend that her protest should be in words alone. But when I look back upon all the phases of this Eastern Question, I say of France, whether she protest or not, that I am grateful to France for the part she has taken on more than one occasion; and that I feel ashamed of the treatment to which she has now been subjected. The union of the Danubian Principalities, which was stoutly resisted by hon. Gentlemen I see opposite, was, perhaps, the very best thing that had ever been accomplished towards the liberation of the Christian populations in the East, towards establishing a barrier against Russia, and towards the general settlement of the question, within the last 20 years. That union was mainly due to the energetic agency of France; it was likewise mainly due to France that the intervention in the case of the Lebanon was instituted, and was carried to a close with the energy which the case required.

Allow me, Sir, to point out that that intervention ought, in my opinion, to have supplied a model for the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government. If they thought that the condition of Asiatic Turkey, as I strongly think, required the notice of other Powers, it was open to them at the Congress at Berlin to have proposed that principles such as have been laid down for Armenia should be carried into effect in other portions of Asiatic Turkey, and likewise that the provisions adopted in the case of the Lebanon would have supplied a precedent for giving shape to those provisions. That history, Sir, of the mode in which the disturbances in the Lebanon were dealt with was creditable to all concerned; but it was especially creditable to France. By the use of firm language, which always has its effect with Turkey, France, England, and Russia interposed to stop effectually a state of things which had reached the extremest horror in Syria. I heard to-night the description of Syria given by the noble Lord; but from that description it did not appear that he had ever so much as heard a whisper of the transactions to which I now refer. However, those transactions brought about an intervention of the Great Powers. Despatches were written, couched in intelligible language, and with the intention and determination that they should take effect; not as in September, 1876, when high words were idly wasted, but in a very different temper, and with very different courage and determination. Turkey was required to execute a great criminal—a person whose rank was no less than that of a Pasha, and that Pasha was executed accordingly. Arrangements were made for the government of the Province, with respect to which, avoiding all detail, I will only say they were of such a character that, under a variety of Governors, it has since, as I believe, enjoyed at least comparative peace, order, and happiness. I am happy to say that the British Government of the day vigorously co-operated to bring about those arrangements, which you have not condescended to copy, and which you have not sought the aid of Europe to extend in other portions of Turkey in Asia, choosing rather other methods of proceeding, more visibly connected with selfish and separate interests; but I am bound also to admit that of the honour, which was reaped by the whole of the intervening Powers, the principal share due on that occasion was due, not to England, but to France. And now France, in her comparative weakness—in the days, at least, when she thinks reserve still most befits her policy—is to see us, who in that affair were content to follow in her wake, and who, on the question of the Principalities, rather resisted than aided her, step in between her and her historical associations, and the just claims growing out of them. Are you sanguine enough to believe that such facts as these will not be unremembered by her in the days of her prosperity and her strength?

But, Sir, if foreign Powers have reason to complain of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, what shall I say of that conduct in its bearing upon the dignity and the rights of Parliament? The Treaty-making power in this country is a power of which I have some special right to speak at the present moment, because I have had the opportunity of declaring my opinions on a recent occasion, in the presence of important personages connected with Government. It is a power, Sir, of Prerogative, which in the abstract is difficult to defend; but which has been endured because it had been uniformly used with moderation, with careful regard to precedent, with a just estimate of the rights of the people, and with due knowledge of the existing sense and convictions of the people. When it ceases to be so used, and comes to be used in another manner, it is a power that becomes, in one word, intolerable. The British Constitution instead of being, as it has been largely admitted to be, the admiration of the world, would be, not the admiration, but the derision of the world, unless due regard were paid to the rights of Parliament in matters thus largely and profoundly affecting the welfare of the country. Now, Sir, have, or have not, Her Majesty's Government paid due regard to the rights of Parliament? They have yet to state their own case upon the subject; but at present it appears to me that they have made an imprudent, and even an unheard-of use of the Treaty-making power. They have gone beyond the limits of precedent; they have not adhered to known principles of action; they have not marched in concert with the convictions of the country, but have acted entirely without its knowledge or expectation. They have not only not developed and fulfilled the policy of former proceedings, but they have actually reversed that policy. The Treaty of Paris, as I have shown, rejected altogether the sole interference of any Power in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire; but you have laid hands on the Island of Cyprus, and you will keep it as long as you please; and you have taken powers under which your sole interference with Turkey will have no limit, except such as you yourselves may choose to attach to it. You have, therefore, employed your power upon principles the direct reverse of those on which Parliament had a right to suppose you would act. The Treaty-making power has hitherto been safe, because those who used it took care to have a knowledge of the public sentiment, and took care also that the country should be aware of the general aims which they were prosecuting, and the direction in which they marched. My hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea employed an excellent expression when he said it had been usual that all the general lines of negotiation should be known to the nation; and I believe you cannot show an important stipulation in a Treaty, or if you can it would be the very rarest exception, and one of comparatively insignificant weight, of which the general lines had not been known and familiar to the people, before the faith of the Crown was committed. Of all the cases quoted by the noble Lord opposite, and which have, no doubt, been collected by official care, there is not one that was secretly negotiated, and the negotiation carrying it to a point, placing it beyond the control of Parliament. The whole proceedings about the Ionian Islands—which he triumphantly cited—extended over many months; they were in the full knowledge of the country, and it was perfectly in the power of Parliament before the work was accomplished to interfere and arrest it if it pleased. The offer made by the Government was one in respect of which it was perfectly well known that it must depend upon the state of opinion in England. I now call upon hon. Gentlemen to produce, if they can, one instance of a Treaty of great importance, involving large and remote responsibilities, certain, in given contingencies, to impose heavy sacrifices upon the people, entirely beyond the lines of ordinary precedent, and reversing, as I have shown, established and vital principles of policy, which has been negotiated in secret, ratified in secret, and produced to Parliament only when it had received the final seal.

Sir, I must add that it is almost ludicrous to examine our relative positions with regard to the Treaty of Berlin and with regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. At this moment, if we had found, as we have not found, the Treaty of Berlin to be on the whole a bad Treaty, which it was our duty to defeat if we could, we find ourselves at liberty to make the attempt. We have not yet passed the day of ratification. This House of Parliament may declare itself in decisive terms against any Treaty before ratification. The intervention of a Parliamentary Chamber, by well-understood precedent, can stop the ratification of a Treaty. That is to say, the Government which chooses to stop the ratification of a Treaty, in consequence of such an intervention is not liable to a charge of bad faith. I speak from precedent, and from recollections which I think are tolerably clear. I refer to the case which happened in the year 1841 or 1842—but I think the former year. The question, which was of very great difficulty and importance, and was, at that time, of very considerable soreness between the two countries, related to the right of search at sea for slaves. A Treaty had been framed between the Governments of England and France. After that Treaty had been concluded and signed, the French Chamber manifested a spirit of ungovernable hostility towards it, whether by vote or any other form I do not now recollect. The French Government refused to ratify the Treaty, and the British Government accepted the decision of the French Government, and admitted that, however the act was to be lamented, it was within the rights that that Government possessed. And so we stand now with regard to the Treaty of Berlin. There is nothing in it which stands, perhaps, precisely as we should have anticipated; but everythings stands within a certain measurable limit of deviation, so to call it, from what we might have anticipated, and from what we were bound to anticipate. And yet there it would be in our power to interfere. In the case of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, on the contrary, we have a new and strange disclosure, almost like a revelation from another world, on matters totally unheard of in English politics, totally unknown to the course of our precedents, and no means are allowed to us of intervention or rejection. The ratification is carefully effected several days before the existence of the Treaty is made known. We are not told that it was kept back in order that it might be placed beyond our reach; but only that it was kept back lest the Sultan, if it were brought into the light of day, should refuse to sign it. Sir, the noble Lord who has last sat down is totally incapable of mockery or of unkindly action of any sort. Were it not so, I should have been tempted to suppose that he was mocking us when he said—" You ought to have known quite enough about it, for hints of all kinds were cast about."

This to my mind, Sir, is a most serious matter. I think we have lost greatly by the conclusion of this Convention; I think we have lost very greatly indeed the sympathy and respect of the nations of Europe. I do not expect or believe that we shall fall into that sort of contempt which follows upon weakness. I think it to be one of the most threadbare of all the weapons of Party warfare when we hear, as we sometimes hear, on the accession of a new Government, that before its accession the Government of England had been despised all over the world, and that now, on the contrary, she has risen in the general estimation, and holds her proper place in the Councils of Nations. This England of ours is not so poor and so weak a thing as to depend upon the reputation of this or that Administration; and the world knows pretty well of what stuff she is made. I am not quite sure however, that the world has the same clear and strong conviction with respect to the standard of our moral action as it has with respect to the standard of our material strength. Now, I am desirous that the standard of our material strength shall be highly and justly estimated by the other nations of Christendom; but I believe it to be of still more vital consequence that we should stand high in their estimation as the lovers of truth, of honour, and of openness in all our proceedings, as those who know how to cast aside the motives of a narrow selfishness, and give scope to considerations of broad and lofty principle. I value our insular position, but I dread the day when we shall be reduced to a moral insularity. I desire that sympathy should be cherished with every country, be its name what it may; and I fear that the conclusion of this Convention will be injurious to the action of that sympathy. The proceedings have all along been associated with a profession as to certain British interests, which, although I believe them to be perfectly fictitious and imaginary, have yet been pursued with as much zeal and eagerness, as if they had been the most vital realities in the world. This setting up of our own interests, out of place, in an exaggerated form, beyond their proper sphere, and not merely the setting up of such interests, but the mode in which they have been pursued, has greatly diminished, not, as I have said, the regard for our material strength, but the estimation of our moral standard of action, and consequently our moral position in the world. If that be so, Sir, with respect to foreign countries, with respect to Parliament, I believe the case to be graver still.

I am reluctant to trespass further on the patience of the House. I have already the opinions which I have now declared about the exercise of the Treaty-making power, I had not long ago an opportunity of expressing in the face of an important personage associated with Government. I must now add that I had the satisfaction of hearing commendation from that quarter given to the principles I had laid down, as to the manner in which the Treaty-making power ought to be exercised—that is to say, that it should be exercised with regard to the actual state of the convictions, and the knowledge, and the desires of the people, and not merely according to the idea that a particular Government might, however sincerely, conceive as to their interest. I am at a loss to reconcile those commendations.

I am afraid, Sir, that we have reached a state of things in which Her Majesty's Government have done great and needless harm to the rights and Prerogatives of Parliament. I do not even hesitate to say that although I believe the Treaty-making power has stood on firm foundations in this country down to the present year, and although it is most deplorable that anything should be said, or done, to bring it into question, yet such proceedings, as these most recent proceedings of the Administration, have a direct tendency to produce that effect, and, if persevered in, will undoubtedly end in raising controversies with respect to that power, which we should all of us be desirous to avoid.

I will not fail, so far as my powers carry me, in the duty of protesting against that course. I grieve over that which has been done. I am obliged to recall words which I used some 15 months ago in this House, with regard to the contingencies of the war which had then just broken out. I said that if the work of liberation was to be done, but was effected, without the approval, nay, rather under the ban, of England, as a man I should rejoice, but as an Englishman I should hide my head. That is the result which has actually arrived; and now, even at the last moment, and even in the Congress at Berlin, after the war had been concluded, with final results favourable to the freedom and happiness of mankind, the action of the English Government has not been directed to the extension of the work of liberation; but, on the contrary, to its contraction. I had myself begun to cherish the expectation and the desire that these keen debates—for keen they could not but be—on the great Eastern Question, were about to reach or even had reached their close; but while we were indulging in these fond anticipations, Her Majesty's Government were preparing a new stroke for us, and we were startled with a novelty even greater than any that had gone before. It is also one in respect to which we have, I fear, as yet, no justification for assuming that it is the last. On the contrary, we are perplexed with the apprehension that as long as these proceedings continue to be sustained by a majority in this House, and as long as the country has had no opportunity of passing its final and conclusive judgment, they will be repeated and renewed, from time to time, as may seem good to the Ministers in power. More and more damage will thus be done both to the great name and honour of this country, and to the Prerogatives and rights of Parliament, bound up, as they are, with the liberties of the people. First, we have the setting up of British interests, not real but imaginary. Then, we have the prosecution of these supposed British interests, by means of strange and unheard of schemes, such as never occurred even to the imagination of statesmen of other days. Then we have those strange and unheard of schemes, prosecuted in a manner which appears, as I conceive, to indicate a very deficient regard to the authority of the law of Europe, and to that just respect which is due to all foreign Powers. Then we have, associated with this grievous lack, a disregard, a neglect—it may, perhaps, even be said, a contempt—for the rights of Parliament. Lastly, along with all this, we create a belief, a belief rather strengthened than weakened by the evident absence of any eagerness on the part of Her Majesty's Government to give us financial information, that the result of those operations of the Government, so unsound in their foundation, so wild in their aims, is likely to be an increase of responsibility, with no addition, but rather with a diminution, of strength; a loss of respect abroad; a shock to constitutional instincts and practices at home; and also an augmentation of the burdens which are borne with such exemplary patience by a too confiding people.

MR. SIDEBOTTOM*: Sir, during the whole of the protracted debates which have taken place upon the momentous question which has so long agitated the public mind of this country, and of all Europe, I have never troubled the House with any observations; but as it is a subject in which I take the deepest interest, and upon which I feel very strongly, I hope the House will grant me its indulgence for a few minutes. Now, it would be most presumptuous in me to attempt to follow the eloquent speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. I am one of those who have often sat spell-bound under the influence of his surpassing eloquence, and have thought that his magnificent orations might well bear comparison with any of those most celebrated in either ancient or modern times; but in view of the peril to our common country, from which we have now so happily escaped, I had hoped that we had heard the last of these Party recriminations, that we should have laid aside all petty, personal, and paltry Party feelings, have risen equal to the occasion, and, instead of attempting to damage and weaken Her Majesty's Government, should have remembered that, whether Liberals or Conservatives, we are Englishmen alike, and have supported the Government in the difficult position in which they are placed. Now, to form an accurate judgment on the merits of this great question, it is necessary to take a broad, a wide, and comprehensive view of all the facts and circumstances connected with it. For ages the Eastern Question has been a problem from the solution of which statesmen have shrunk, and which has weighed like a nightmare upon the minds of the leading public men of Europe. A quarter of a century ago, in alliance with France, we fondly hoped it had been solved in the trenches of Sebastopol, and on the blood-stained heights of Inkerman and Alma. That hope was vain. The same causes which led to the Crimean War have been at work since, and have ultimately brought on the far more dreadful war which has now happily come to an end. It is vain to speculate, it is useless to argue, whether that war was caused by the chronic mis-government of Turkey, or by the reckless and insatiable ambition of Russia. There will probably never be any positive agreement on this score; but one thing is clear—it is perfectly certain that it was not caused by any act or deed of England; but that, on the contrary, every effort was used by our Government, in the first instance, to prevent the war, and afterwards to limit its area and bring it to a conclusion as soon as possible. And their motives for thus acting, and for pursuing that policy, are perfectly plain and obvious. Apart altogether from the abstract desire which every right-minded person must entertain to prevent the horrors and carnage and bloodshed of war, we had the strongest reasons for wishing to preserve peace. We have a great Eastern Empire in India, with the safety and prosperity of which it is scarcely too much to say the prosperity and greatness of England herself are inextricably involved; and we have, therefore, the most direct and cogent reasons for deprecating interference with the existing order of things in those regions, and for watching, with the greatest anxiety, that our direct road to that immense Possession shall neither be tampered with, or even remotely threatened, by any great European Power obtaining possession, on one pretext or another, of any of those countries or places which either directly or indirectly command the route. Hence the great interest manifested by this country in the Eastern Question; hence the instinctive feeling of the people that the action of Russia imperilled our interests; hence the firm resolve, clearly manifested by the vast majority of the nation, to support the policy of Her Majesty's Government in resisting her encroachments, and maintaining and upholding our own interests. Now, what are the facts? Russia went to war with Turkey ostensibly for the protection of the Christians. That war was carried on with varied fortune; but in the end she was completely victorious, and Turkey compelled humbly to sue for peace. Terms of the greatest harshness were offered, unnecessary delays interposed, and, in open defiance of the most solemn promises, the Forces of the conqueror pushed steadily forward towards Constantinople, till its towers were actually in sight. The negotiations for peace were conducted with the very greatest secrecy, and there can be no moral doubt whatever that, but for the firm, decided, and straightforward action of Her Majesty's Government in sending our Fleet into the Dardanelles, with instructions to keep open the water-way, Russia would have gained possession of those Straits, the command of which has been her ambition for generations, and would never have surrendered it, till torrents of British blood had been shed, and she had been expelled by force. If that was not her real object and design, why was our Government for so long kept studiously in ignorance of the real terms of peace? Why were we amused with all sorts of contradictory rumours, seemingly purposely intended to mystify and deceive? Why, when Turkey lay prostrate in the dust, and was humbly suing for peace, almost at any price, was the march of troops on Constantinople and the Straits pushed on with such impetuous haste? And why were torpedoes carried with the columns? There can be but one answer — because Russia fondly believed the glittering prize she had so long coveted at last lay within her grasp. Turkey was prostrate, France held in check by Germany, Austria the same, whilst England was supposed to be paralyzed and divided, and it was hoped that the story of the Bulgarian atrocities, and the line taken by some of our most distinguished statesmen, would render any decided action on our part impossible. It cannot, indeed, be doubted that a general feeling of horror was excited amongst us by the accounts of the dreadful atrocities in Bulgaria; but the sober sense of the nation soon perceived that there were far deeper matters to be dealt with; that it was of little use dealing with the effect, whilst the cause remained; that it was puerile attempting to heal the sore, whilst the cancer lay festering within; and more than a suspicion was raised that the best feelings of a generous people had been purposely excited and made use of in order to close its eyes to the deadly wounds deliberately intended to be inflicted on an ancient Ally and upon its own British interests at one and the same time. Well, Russia was soon rudely awakened from this dream, and enlightened as to the real and true state of public opinion in this country. The Government took prompt and determined action. The British Fleet passed the Dardanelles, a Vote of Credit was granted, the Reserves were called out, the Government were supported by overwhelming majorities in Parliament, and the whole country was roused to a sense of the danger with which we were threatened. I will not weary the House by recalling the indignation expressed when the terms of the infamous Treaty of San Stefano became known, nor the attempt by Russia to withhold its provisions from the consideration of the Congress. We all remember how these difficulties were overcome by the decided action of Her Majesty's Government, and by their great stroke of policy in summoning a contingent of Native troops from India, thus showing all the world that besides being a great naval Power, we were also one of the greatest military Powers. These events are now matters of history; but I have recalled some of them to the attention of the House, so that we may be better able to form a correct opinion on the question now raised. There seems to be little difference of opinion as to the advantages of the settlement made by the Congress in the Balkan Peninsula, therefore, it is unnecessary to occupy the attention of the House by dwelling upon it. All parties must admit its importance, and a comparison of the map showing the actual arrangement, with that of the Treaty of San Stefano, at once proves the immense results obtained by the labours of our Plenipotentiaries, and the reality of the concessions extorted from Russia; and I apprehend no such propositions as those of the cession of Cyprus and the Convention with Turkey as to Asia Minor would ever have been brought forward but for extraordinary exceptional circumstances. Certain facts, however, appear abundantly clear, and stand prominently forward. Russia, though foiled in the attempt to extend her sway to the very walls of Constantinople, has, as a result of the late war, obtained possession of certain positions in Asia Minor, which either directly menace, or may be used as a base for hereafter menacing our communications with India; therefore we have entered into this arrangement, to a great extent, in self-defence. And what are the objections raised? It is said—and the Resolution of the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) embodies the objection—that the action of the Government has been taken in the dark, and without the knowledge and consent of Parliament. Well, that is, no doubt, true; but the answer is obvious. Secrecy was necessary to the success of the negotiations, which might have been seriously compromised if our intentions had been proclaimed beforehand to all the world. The subject of Greece has been so much dwelt upon by previous speakers that I will not weary the House by repeating and enlarging upon the arguments already used. It is also asserted—and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich has given great prominence to the statement—that we have given great umbrage to foreign Powers, especially to France. Well, if true, that would be a great misfortune, and a deep and lasting subject of regret. But where is the evidence of its truth? The matter is, at least, doubtful, and the recent utterances of a distinguished French statesman would seem rather to imply that he considered the arrangement as, on the whole, satisfactory and advantageous to his country. At all events, we have given strong proof of our desire to pay every regard to the wishes and susceptibilities of France, by having only occupied such an island as Cyprus, instead of Egypt or Syria. It must not be forgotten that from our connection with India, we have a more direct interest in those regions than any other European Power; and in undertaking the responsibility we have, we are really defending the interests of France, as well as our own. No one lamented the misfortunes of France more than I did, and no one, when her trials were greatest, and her humiliation deepest, more confidently predicted her early restoration to her old position in Europe. That restoration has taken place sooner, probably, than would have happened with any other nation, and depend upon it, our true policy is to draw the bonds of friendship as close as possible, for the interests of both nations are, to a great extent, identical from their geographical position, their free institutions, and their advanced civilization. Great blame has also been attached to our Plenipotentiaries for permitting Roumania to be despoiled by the cession of Bessarabia. Well, that is certainly to be deplored; but surely they who have persistently advocated and supported the policy of Russia, both in this House and elsewhere, should be the last to complain. Russia distinctly stated she would not give way on this point. Would they have had us go to war with her for Bessarabia then, though not for our own British interests. If not, what alternative course would they have suggested? If the Congress had been broken up, and we had gone to war on such grounds, it is easy to imagine how emphatically such a policy would have been denounced, both in Parliament and throughout the country. But the chief objection seems to be that after protesting against secret understandings and special Treaties, we have ourselves, in taking Cyprus, appropriated a portion of the Turkish dominions; but the Government are also blamed for guaranteeing the dominions of the Turkish Government, described as the worst in existence, and I apprehend the last proposition is a conclusive answer to the first. We have not taken Cyprus by force; but have provisionally occupied it, with the consent of Turkey, for the very purpose of guaranteeing and maintaining her remaining dominions against the encroachments of Russia, and it seems somewhat inconsistent that the very same men should now blame the Government for occupying a comparatively small Turkish island, who even yet complain of our not having joined with Russia in coercing Turkey, who would have employed the British Fleet in preventing the Sultan reinforcing his armies in Europe by troops from Asia, and who have not scrupled to advocate the bag-and-baggage policy. The truth is, such an arrangement as that just concluded must always, to a certain extent, be a matter of compromise, and a broad and comprehensive view of its whole provisions should be taken. It forms part of a large policy connected with the whole future of Turkey, which we may be permitted to hope may conduce to the peace and prosperity of that distracted country; and when we have plainly stated our resolves, there is surely much less danger of our drifting into war, than if they were doubtful, and our conduct uncertain. We must remember that we have a great Empire to defend, vast interests to protect, and most complex questions to deal with. Russia commenced this war under the most solemn promise that she had no selfish ends in view, that she wanted no territorial aggrandizement, no increase of territory, was perfectly disinterested, and was actuated wholly, solely, and entirely by motives of philanthropy, and for the protection of the Christians. Well, it is as vain as it is useless to complain of her subsequent conduct. She has simply pursued the course which anyone who has studied her history might have from the first predicted. For generations she has coveted Turkey, and hoped one day to inherit its splendid domains, alike in Europe and Asia. From the time, indeed, of Peter the Great, through all the tortuous mazes of diplomacy, she has steadily, and patiently, and persistently waited, and intrigued, and fought for its possession; because she knows it would give her virtual command of the Mediterranean, enable her at will to close the Euxine Sea, and convert it into a huge Russian lake, go far to make her the first naval and military Power in the world, and enable her continually to threaten our highway to India. From the very first, her tale of making war to protect the Christians was a plausible pretext, a specious pretence. She herself soon threw off the mask, like Brennus of old, cast her sword into the scale, and scarcely any longer deigned to draw a flimsy veil of secrecy over her designs. With one foot on the Black Sea, and another on the Straits, with the real defences of Constantinople surrendered, and her armies, flushed with victory, encamped within sight of its walls, the prize seemed already at her feet, and the object attained which for generations had been her aim. This was the state of affairs with which the British Government had to deal, and in estimating the difficult work of the Congress and the value of its results, all these matters should be remembered and fairly considered. It may be that, as a purely abstract question, and without taking the surrounding circumstances into account, the policy of assuming such an undoubtedly great responsibility in Asia Minor may be open to question; but I apprehend the surrounding circumstances must be taken into account. They cannot be ignored, and the real question was, must we assume this responsibility, or must we allow Russia gradually to acquire possession of the country? We must remember, also, that these great results have been accomplished without one drop of British blood being shed, and that, in the eloquent words of the Prime Minister, our Plenipotentiaries have brought us back "Peace with honour." But besides peace, inestimable as that blessing is, we are by no means destitute of other countervailing advantages for any responsibility we have incurred. At such a moment as this, when peace and war have so long hung in the balance, and the swiftly-flying hours have borne with them the fate of Empires and the destinies of Europe, it may appear but of secondary importance to glance at the commercial aspect of the question; but when partial paralysis seems to have overtaken well-nigh every trade and every industry in this country, it is surely no light matter, nor one of the least advantages to be looked for from the labours of Her Majesty's Government, that there is now every prospect of a settled order of things being inaugurated both in Cyprus and in Asia Minor, of there being a good and staple government there, with security for the permanent well-being of the country, I think we may look for an extended and extensive trade, not only with Asia Minor, but with the countries adjacent, into which new life and vigour will be infused by giving full play to free and new national life. And when we contrast this state of things with what would have existed if Russia had been allowed to carry out her plans unchecked, we may well congratulate ourselves upon the improved prospects presented to us. It would, indeed, be the extreme of penny wisdom and pound folly — it would be in the last degree short-sighted—to permit Russia to carry out her ambitious and long-cherished designs without opposition. Setting aside for a moment the danger to our communications with India, what would be the effect upon our commerce if Russia became the mistress of Asia Minor and paramount in the Levant? Remember what is her commercial policy—that it is strictly Protectionist—which means, in her case, permitting no goods to be sold throughout the Dominions over which her sway extends, except such as are the produce of her own manufactories. Depend upon it, few more deadly blows could be aimed at British commerce and at British trade than Russia gaining supremacy in these regions. English merchants and English manufacturers might in such a case make up their minds to bid a final adieu to trade there. Depend upon it, our commercial and trading interests owe her nothing. But, disastrously as they would have been affected by the extension of her dominion, the damage to our reputation in India would have been a more serious matter still. To take no higher ground, India is one of our largest consumers, and anything which even indirectly threatens India is a direct blow to our trade. If, indeed, from any unfortunate conjunction of circumstances, we lost India, the blow would be well-nigh fatal to the manufacturing and trading interests of this country, and those who have so glibly cried "Perish India," ought also to have added "Perish Lancashire," and "Perish England's trade." The Government have been placed in a most difficult and trying position under circumstances as momentous as history records; and, in my humble opinion, we owe them a deep debt of gratitude for their untiring energy, their wise measures of precaution, for their warlike preparations, for averting from us the dangers of a great war, and for securing an honourable peace. Never was the truth of that wise saying of the ancients more strikingly exemplified—"*Si vis pacem para bellum.*" A hope has been expressed that "before long the time may arrive when they will pass under the view of the people." When that time does arrive, I, for one, have no doubt of the issue—no fear of the verdict. I believe the vast majority of the English people thoroughly approve and support their policy. They are deeply grateful for peace, for such a peace as has now been secured—a peace which in no respect compromises the safety, the honour, or the interests of England. They would have welcomed no other, for the ancient spirit of our race was fully aroused, and one single untoward event, one more forward step by Russia, would have raised a feeling, and evoked a warlike enthusiasm, impossible to control. When, indeed, does our history show it to have been otherwise? We may be styled "a nation of shopkeepers;" peace at any price principles may be promulgated, martial spirit may be supposed dead within us, but the first blast of the trumpet has ever blown such theories to the wind; and when we remember the position we occupied, and the estimation in which we were held by foreign nations but a few years ago—when we call to mind that besides being, beyond dispute, the first naval Power in the world, by bringing over Indian troops, combined with other wise measures, the Government have shown that we are also a great military Power, that, at the Congress just concluded, our wishes carried the greatest weight, and that, without striking a blow or losing a man, this country has been raised to a position higher than she has ever occupied since 1815. I, for one, say honour to whom honour is due, and that the whole nation ought to say, Aye; and when the proper opportunity is afforded, I am persuaded the majority will say that Her Majesty's Government have, by their conduct of foreign affairs, deserved well of their country.

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN said, at present he could neither see any prospect of the Treaty of Berlin being the unalloyed blessing which it was said to be, nor any symptom of the revival of trade which had been anticipated as one of the results of the Congress. The debate had ranged far and wide; but there was one point on which hon. Members opposite had touched with very sparing hands. Hardly any reply had been offered to the forcible challenge of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who affirmed that this was probably the first time in history when they were committed to a distinctly new policy, not only without a formal communication to Parliament, but without a word, a hint, or a whisper being vouchsafed to the Representatives of the Nation. That was a course which they were bound, in the exercise of their duty to their constituents, again and again, to protest against. In fact, they had entered on a new phase of Ministerial responsibility. Commit the country to engagements absolutely unlimited both in duration and extent—plunge it up to the neck in liabilities of which no man living could see the issue, and then, when the irrevocable step had been taken, come down and tell Parliament what had been done. That was the new theory of Ministerial responsibility which they owed to a Constitutional Cabinet. It was idle to speak of the power of the Crown, for its Prerogative had never been stretched to its theoretical limits, and there was not a precedent that would apply. The Treaties of 1839 and 1856 were made in the light of day; but the Anglo-Turkish Convention was a clandestine compact, hatched in the cellars of the Foreign Office "of Cerberus and blackest midnight born," and which was avowedly not made known, lest one of the contracting parties should shuffle out of it. Never before could it be said that Parliament sat to register the decrees of the Prime Minister; never since the days of Sir Robert Walpole had a Prime Minister treated the House of Commons with such ostentatious indifference and contempt, as had the noble Lord the present Prime Minister, of whom it might be said—

> "He doth bestride this narrow world
> Like a Colossus: while we petty men
> Walk under his huge legs and peep about
> To find ourselves dishonourable graves."

Hon. Gentlemen would wake up one fine day and find the Government had muddled away bit by bit the whole of the British Constitution. If they wanted to know the policy of the Government, they must look for it, not in the House of Commons, but they must go to the office of *The Daily Telegraph*, or, possibly, the Bow Street Police Court. They were on an inclined plane, the bottom of which was personal government. The purchase of the Suez Canal shares came upon the House like a clap of thunder; then came the transport of the Indian troops to Malta; next the Salisbury-Schouvaloff Agreement, of which they had not yet heard the whole truth; and, lastly, the Anglo-Turkish Convention; and the result of such a systematic course of dealing with the House of Commons was a mistrust, an uncertainty, and a disquiet so widespread that many people not unnaturally believed they had not yet got to the end of the business, and that there might be another Supplemental Treaty of some kind, or that some fine morning, about November or December, we might read in *The Daily Telegraph* an announcement that the whole of the Euphrates Valley had been annexed—a fact which would, probably, surprise no one. How about other nations? The Resolutions were not aimed at one of the most vulnerable points in the whole transaction; for there were two Powers who would not have gone to the Berlin Congress, if they had known of the existence of the Convention. They went with a secret Treaty in their pockets, and not until the negotiations had proceeded so far that it was practically impossible to break them off, did they spring it upon the astonished Representatives, like a man who played at cards with the ace of trumps up his sleeve. But things which would, in private life, be stigmatized as sharp practice, when done by a country attorney, were regarded as master-strokes of policy in a Prime Minister. This was not their traditional policy, for in 1855, Lord Clarendon was sounded by the Emperor Nicholas as to whether they would accept the Island of Crete, and Lord Clarendon replied that England desired no territorial aggrandizement, and could come to no understanding which was to be kept secret from the other Powers. Hitherto, their boast had been that if their hands were empty, at any rate they were clean; and though the English nation could afford to do many things, it could not afford to labour under the slightest suspicion of double-dealing. To find a parallel to what they had done, they must go back to the annexation of Nice and Savoy, from which France had never recovered, although there were differences in favour of France; she purchased the cession with blood, and they obtained Cyprus by a species of jockeying; she took the sense of the people, but they transferred Cyprus like a bale of cotton, or a barrel of herrings. It was a dangerous game, this game of annexation. To recur to the *simile* of the hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Grant Duff), it was all very well for the vultures, but what about the geese? It was said they were never on better terms with other Powers; and if the statement referred to the Governments, he could not question it; but if it referred to the peoples, he did. There could be no doubt of a permanent ill-feeling in France and Italy. The articles in *The Journal des Débats*, and in the organ of M. Gambetta, on the subject were not very pleasant or edifying reading to an Englishman; while as to Italy, having visited that country almost every year, and having friends there, he knew, on independent authority, that a change had come over the feelings of the Italians towards this country. The slight put upon them at the death of VictorEmmanuel was made worse by the unfortunate explanation in "another place." Some years ago English friendship was the pole-star of Italian foreign policy; now there was not a better hated nation in Italy than England. The hostility of Italy was a factor which would have to be taken into account in any future European complication. He should have thought that, as Italy was rapidly becoming a great naval Power, possessing as she did the third largest fleet in Europe, and as she lay across our road to India, a consideration for what were called British interests would have induced Her Majesty's Government to have adopted a line of conciliation towards that Power, instead of treating her to a course of what he might call judicial snubbing. So much for Italy; now a word as to Greece. He had always thought the true counter-balance to the Slavonic was the Hellenic element. The natural right of reversion to Constantinople belonged to Greece; but they managed to prevent her from making war upon Turkey, not by direct promises, but by vague hints that if she would only bide her time, she would hear of something to her advantage. What was the fact? It was not England, but France and Italy, that urged the claims of Greece at the Congress, and all that we did for the Greeks was to tell them that they were an interesting people, "and could afford to wait." The result of the present position would be that there would be a Grecian, instead of a Slavonic question to settle in the future, and the last stage of the Eastern Question would be worse than the first. But it was not so much to the Berlin Treaty that serious objection was made on his side of the House; it was to the Anglo-Turkish Convention they objected — a Convention entered into spontaneously and secretly. A great deal had been said about Cyprus; he had read a good many accounts of it, but they did not appear to be very consistent. One traveller, Mr. Clarke, wrote—

> "There is hardly upon earth a more wretched spot. Few words may forcibly describe it; agriculture neglected, inhabitants oppressed, population destroyed, pestiferous air, contagion, poverty, indolence, desolation."

On the other hand, it was said that it could be of no possible use as a naval station, there not being a harbour in it. With the strategical value of Cyprus he was not competent to deal; but to suppose that it could bar the road of Russia to India was absurd. They might as well say the possession of the Isle of Man would prevent the Germans from occupying London. The question was, whether Cyprus was worth the price—the almost unlimited guarantee we were giving for it? He disliked guarantees in private life and also in Imperial matters. They were like post obit bonds, for the sake of a little present relief, they might involve a heavy, though distant, liability. The present guarantee was absolutely unlimited, both in duration and extent. Supposing Turkey was found to be unable to perform the promises she had given, what was England to do? It had been said that they could back out of this engagement at any moment. That would be unworthy of a great country like England, after having entered into a Treaty; but he did not believe that it could be done. The real effect of the agreement would be, for the future, to put it in the power of Turkey to decide what English policy should be towards Russia; while the fortunes of England would be indissolubly linked to those of Turkey in Asia. In that case, they must either support one of the most corrupt Governments in the world, standing by and doing nothing, or they must take the bull by the horns and annex the whole of Asia Minor; and in doing this latter, many difficulties would have to be encountered. It was all very well to say that pressure would be put on Turkey;

but of what use had been the pressure put on Turkey in the past? They must remember that the Turks were Asiatics, who were unaccustomed to government, and who could be ruled only by the sword. Surely one India was enough. The reason why they governed well in India was, that they had the country free to themselves, having no rival there; but that was not the case in Asia Minor, for there they would come into contact with foreign Consuls, and others, who materially interfered with them; and the hardy mountaineers of Asia Minor, and the Italians, who had the trade of the Levant in their own hands, would be very different men from the servile Maharajahs of India. He had heard a great deal about the enthusiasm at Cyprus when the Queen's flag was hoisted; but he believed that every one of the Greeks who cheered on that occasion would be prepared to become Englishmen for two piastres. The noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon) said, that those who supported the Resolution were bound, not only to oppose the policy of the Government, but to say what they would themselves have done. His answer was simple; it was—"Keep what you have got, and don't commit that most unpardonable of strategic errors, of trying to defend an indefensible outwork." India was large enough to satisfy the most immoderate and insatiable ambition. There were two roads only to India. One lay over a salt and sandy waste, terminating with the most tremendous mountain barrier in the world; the other lay over an element over which we reigned supreme. His advice would be to keep the former route closed and the latter open; but by the policy they had adopted in Asia Minor, they would do neither. If hon. Gentlemen opposite were to say what was really in their hearts, he believed they would candidly object to the mode in which England had acted in this matter. Her Majesty's Government had gone into the Congress professing that the integrity of the Turkish Empire was essential to the peace of Europe, and come out of it with a slice of Turkey in their pockets. They had begun by declaring that the Sultan ought to be supreme in his own dominions, and had ended by entering into an arrangement which would practically make him a vassal to England. Napoleon III. at one time proposed to Lord Palmerston to take one or two islands from Turkey, in return for allowing France some territory on the main land; but Lord Palmerston replied that he could be no party to repeating in Turkey the partition of Poland, and added, significantly, that he believed such a step would shock the moral sense of Europe, and be fatal to any Government who should propose it. Whether the latter part of this reply was likely to be true, he did not know. They had been a good deal "educated" since Lord Palmerston's time; but of this he felt sure, that when the first feeling of exultation had died out, when the Brummagem lustre of this so-called victory had passed away, England would wake up, and discover, to her cost, that, instead of placing a chaplet of laurel on her brows, the Government had only succeeded in riveting a mill-stone round her neck.

Mr. BIRLEY said, that complaints had been made that the Treaty with the Porte had not been submitted to Parliament; but he believed that, as a matter of fact, it would be found that there were many instances of Treaties negotiated, even within the present generation, by the Government of this country, which had not been so submitted. In 1840, for instance, Lord Palmerston negotiated a Treaty of that kind against France. Well, that Treaty had never been submitted to Parliament; and, in the present case, it must be remembered that the Treaty could not have been carried out had it been submitted to Parliament before it was ratified, seeing that it was probable, as the noble Lord had intimated, that interminable debates would have taken place upon it. The Government were ready to submit the Treaty to Parliament now; but he had not gathered from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich what should have been the action of Parliament if the Treaty had been submitted before it had been completed. In the other House of Parliament no serious attempt had been made to raise this objection. It had been said by hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Treaty interfered with European rights as regarded Turkey, as if the question was merely one of annexation; but the fact had not been noticed by those hon. Members that the Treaty had been entered into only as an alternative for the acquisition by Russia of Batoum. If Russia dropped her unjust claim to that place, the Treaty would be at an end; and that would now be the best thing of all. It must also be recollected that we did not enter into this Treaty for our advantage, but for the benefit of the population of Asia Minor, upon whom we should confer great advantages; and we, therefore, entered into it with clean hands. He believed it would also be of the greatest benefit to Europe at large. He agreed with those who thought it was quite possible that we should derive direct, as well as indirect, advantages from this Treaty. We were perfectly ready to receive into the island, upon equal terms, every Frenchman, German, and Italian who might come there, and he did not think there was any ground for apprehending that the Italians would be jealous of our position in the Levant, and it was significant of that, that neither from Italy nor from France had any word of complaint come. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, in his speech that evening, had surpassed himself; it was a speech almost unexampled for ability, power, and severity; but he must point out that it was quite inconsistent with the tone of that delivered by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), and with the Resolutions he proposed. While the noble Marquess and the hon. and learned Member who had last spoken (Mr. Osborne Morgan) said the Treaty of Berlin, if it stood alone, might have been accepted—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich handled that Treaty with as much severity as the Anglo-Turkish Convention. It reminded him of the language used out-of-doors by some societies and clubs, which he thought was rather more passionate than discriminating. The right hon. Gentleman had raised some principles which were enough to make one's hair stand on end. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to treat Thessaly and Epirus as if they belonged to the British Plenipotentiaries, and as if the latter had a right to do with them as they pleased. The right hon. Gentleman also spoke as if on one side of the Balkans there was always to be good government, while there would be oppression on the other side. But it was quite possible that the government of Eastern Roumelia would be as good as that of Bulgaria, if not better, should Bulgaria be entirely exposed to Russian influence; and he (Mr. Birley) did not doubt that the arrangement in regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina was a wise one, and that it might be made to work advantageously, remembering the fact that the misgovernment of those States had, for the last year or two, given rise to great dissatisfaction. But he did not hold himself bound to endorse and defend every detail of the Treaty; indeed, he did not suppose the British Plenipotentiaries endorsed every part of the Treaty. They had to give and take, in order to avoid what might have broken out at any moment—namely, a terrible European war. All that he was concerned to do was to defend it as an arrangement, upon the whole, advantageous, and one infinitely preferable to the war which it had been the means of averting. It was hardly possible, however, that every disposition of the Treaty of Berlin would give complete satisfaction, or be perfectly free from objection; but when they saw Russia take up such a position as she had acquired on the Euxine, it was time for England to take some decided step, and such a step had been taken by the Convention with Turkey. He trusted that the question would hereafter be discussed with less heat and passion. He had no doubt Her Majesty's Government would be able to give a very good account of their operations. They did not rely merely on their numerical Party majority in the House, but on the feeling of the country, which had been pretty fairly expressed already; and he was sure that if it became necessary to appeal to the constituencies, their verdict would be in favour of the Government.

MR. EVANS desired to make a few remarks which, perhaps, would not find great favour on either side of the House. In the first place, he would briefly explain why he could not support the Resolutions of the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition, nor the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin University (Mr. Plunket), and he intended to ask a few questions of the Government. No doubt, they might agree to the first Resolution, taken alone. As to the second Resolution, one part of it expressed regret that additional territory was not given to Greece. Well, if there were any territory going begging, it would be very well to let

Greece have it; but he did not see how territory could be got, unless Turkey were dismembered to a greater extent than he considered desirable. The Resolution also regretted that the country had undertaken such enormous responsibilities. He agreed with that; because, although he did not say the incurring of those responsibilities could not be justified, he maintained that nothing had yet been said by the Government to justify them. The difficulty he should feel in voting for the Resolution was that it would seem to imply we ought to do nothing, and to such a proposition he was unable to assent. Considering our position as a great Asiatic Power, it would be most disastrous if anything occurred which caused us to be overshadowed by Russia in allowing her to extend her power into Asia Minor. Therefore, he could not vote for the Resolutions. Then, as to the Amendment, it was perfectly idle for any man, and more especially the Prime Minister, to say that this country had not assumed a great responsibility in Asia Minor. The Government had bound this country to see that the dominions of the Sultan should be properly governed, and he hoped the Government would give the House some further explanation upon the course they intended to pursue. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) said, it would probably be necessary to institute reforms in regard to the police, and in requiring that the Sultan should appoint competent Governors to manage the Provinces in Asia Minor, and that they should not be dismissed without good reason; but unless the Turkish police, for example, were entirely superseded by Englishmen or a force from the Punjaub, in case the Turkish Government should be unable to reform them, no good would be done. But what power had the Government got to take such a step; and so with regard to the appointment of Governors, and the means of defeating Russian intrigue? How would the Sultan carry out these reforms? The Government had promised to defend Asia Minor against all comers, and that it should be governed in a proper and decent manner; but it was too late in the day to expect that the Turkish Government would do that, as their promises had been broken over and over again, and it would be most unfortunate if this country had entered into these obligations without being able to carry them out. If the police should be placed under an able man, some good might be done; so if the Governors were like Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Richard Temple, or the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), and the people were compelled to obey them, then the country might be prosperous; but, otherwise, the whole thing would be a mockery and a delusion. Unless their powers were commensurate with their responsibilities, all expectation of their being able to regenerate Turkey might be given up. In regard to Cyprus, he had no doubt the Government of this country would introduce order and good management there, and that that would be a great benefit to the island; and if they were to defend the Sultan's possessions in Asia Minor against all comers, it was necessary that this country should have a station somewhere near them. In conclusion, he had only to say that he was one of those who were not satisfied with the Treaty of Berlin, and that for that reason it would be impossible for him to vote for the Amendment. A result of it was that the great disturber of Europe had been rewarded and aggrandized by it, and a very bad example had been given, which would encourage, instead of checking, aggression and advance, and this country had undertaken a responsibility of a very serious nature indeed.

Mr. GOLDNEY observed, that while he frankly allowed the eminent ability of the speech delivered that evening by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, he deeply regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have brought such a grave indictment as he had, not only against England, but against everything which had been done in the Congress at Berlin. The object of the Government in going there was to obtain that peace for which everybody pined. The two principal causes of complaint of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be the small amount of the concession to Greece, and the Anglo-Turkish Treaty, under which the Government had accepted certain responsibilities. He maintained that the language of the Resolution was vague and indefinite, and the charges of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich in reference to the attitude of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury towards Greece was entirely undeserved. It was quite evident from the Papers that our Plenipotentiaries, particularly Lord Salisbury, took special care that the interests of Greece should be protected by the Treaty of Berlin; and that in this direction Lord Salisbury went even further than the Representative of France, for his plan of protection would have included the questions of Macedonia, Thrace, and Crete, whereas the French plan only included Epirus and Thessaly. As regarded the Anglo-Turkish Convention, it seemed to him that Kars, Ardahan, and Batoum being in the hands of the Russians, they, by means of their occupation, would be able to command the trade of Armenia, and through Armenia to Persia, which trade now was admitted to be chiefly English, and which before the war amounted to some £6,000,000 a-year; and it was absolutely necessary, therefore, that some understanding between England and Turkey should be arrived at to enable that extensive and legitimate trade and influence being taken away from us and destroyed. He failed to understand the great objection which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich entertained to the principle of the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The Tripartite Treaty of 1856 was not only a collective, but an individual Treaty—that was to say, it gave each individual Power the right to interfere with Turkey. Consequently, England had a perfect right to agree with the Porte as to the best mode of carrying out her engagements towards the Ottoman Empire, and the acquisition of Cyprus was a means to that end. The cession of Cyprus was made for the purpose of enabling England—should the necessity arise—to protect the Asiatic Dominions of Turkey and her own interests in the East. But England had undertaken no obligation that did not rest on her under the Treaty of 1856. That Treaty was broken by the late war, and when it was seen that Russia was about to obtain Kars, Ardahan, and Batoum, England was bound to take the steps she did by entering into the Anglo-Turkish Convention—one which, he believed, would be beneficial to Europe as well as to Turkey. When he was in Turkey last year he was told by the Minister of Marine that what Turkey wanted from England was real rather than moral support. It was a mistake to suppose that Turkey only appointed Mussulman Ministers and other officials to manage her affairs. Her Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs was a Greek, her Minister of Finance was an Armenian Christian, many of her other Ministers were Christians, and her chief Plenipotentiary at the Conference was a Greek. If the Convention was carried out fully and fairly, and without cavil on the part of foreign Powers, it could not fail, in his opinion, to achieve the good results which its framers confidently expected from it. There would, by this means, at all events, be a long rest in the Eastern Question, and trade, which had been paralyzed, would revive. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, in the complaints he had made as on behalf of France and Italy, appeared to constitute himself the Representative of other nations in this matter; but until complaints were forthcoming from the nations themselves, the indictment which had been preferred by the right hon. Gentleman was simply an attempt to show that they had received injuries of which they had themselves said nothing. He could not but regard the course pursued in this matter by the right hon. Gentleman as being unpatriotic; and, great as must be the admiration produced by his ability, he believed and hoped that when his speech of that evening was calmly looked at, there were few men in the country who would not see that it was an unpatriotic speech, calculated to arouse the jealousies and ill-feeling of other countries against England, and to hold out to the populations of Turkey a direct inducement to unite their lot with Russia in rebellion against the arrangements which had been made by the Powers at Berlin. Indeed, he (Mr. Goldney) believed the right hon. Gentleman himself would, in his cooler moments, regret much that he had said on the present occasion. At all events, he (Mr. Goldney) was convinced of this—that the policy pursued by Her Majesty's Government would meet with the approval of the House and of the country, and would be beneficial to the nation at large; and, above all, would secure the blessing of peace to Europe, and increased and increasing civilization and welfare to Turkey.

Mr. STANSFELD said, he had listened with great pleasure to the speech of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich, which he thought might be truly described as unparalleled. He had had considerable experience of the House, and during the whole of his experience he had never heard an address which could compare with that delivered by his right hon. Friend on this occasion for ability, eloquence, comprehensiveness, exhaustiveness, and crushing power. Indeed, the question itself was too vast and complicated to be fully treated, except by his right hon. Friend. In following that speech, he would not travel over the whole subject; but confine himself to those points of which he had personal experience. The Chancellor of the Exchequer complained on Monday night of the tameness and dreary character of the debate; but he (Mr. Stansfeld) hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would no longer entertain any apprehensions on that subject, and would not attempt to repeat his statement. Indeed, it should be acknowledged that its character had been first raised by the noble Viscount who re-opened the debate (Viscount Sandon). The noble Viscount's speech was full of power and animation, and, as had been said, it did not lack the quality of imagination, seeing that the arguments which it contained were rather directed to a criticism upon the conduct of the Liberal Governments during the last 25 years, than to a defence of the position and policy of Her Majesty's Government, and of the Amendment which they had adopted. The noble Viscount said he was so struck with the mildness of the Resolutions proposed by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) that he thought their object was to avoid coming to a fight. He (Mr. Stansfeld) did not think that the noble Viscount could have made—he would not say a more unfair—but a more mistaken criticism. Turning to the Resolution of his noble Friend, he found that it rejoiced in the establishment of peace, and also in the extension to the Christian subjects of the Porte of the rights and blessings of self-government and liberty. The Amendment of the Government—for he had a right to regard the proposal of the hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) in that light—was entirely silent upon the point. He did not wonder at that, because it was an admitted part of the Eastern policy of the Government, in fact, it was perfectly clear when the House considered the terms of the Amendment, that they went into the Congress not to promote the liberty and self-government of the misgoverned and misruled native Christian subjects of Turkey, but, as far as possible, to prevent Russia from obtaining the legitimate results of her victories, and to re-instate Turkey. The Resolution of his noble Friend raised two distinct issues —one as to the treatment of Greece, and the other as to the unnecessary extension of our military liabilities, on both of which points the Amendment before the House was significantly silent, except, in so far as it expressed a vague hope that the issue of what had been done might promote the interests of peace, an amelioration of the condition of the native populations, and the maintenance of our Empire. The noble Viscount who commenced the debate that evening seemed to be under the impression that the policy underlying the proposals of his (Mr. Stansfeld's) noble Friend the Leader of the Opposition was that Russia should be allowed to possess herself of the whole of Asia Minor; but he appealed to the recollection of the House whether there was anything in the speech of his noble Friend to justify any such inference. They had been told that it was vain to look back at the past policy of the Government on this subject, and that the question to be decided was narrowed to approval or disapproval of what had been done. This was more particularly the case with regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. He propose to confine himself solely to that branch of the general question, and to consider, firstly, the policy of the Convention, and, secondly, the constitutional character of the means by which it had been brought about. In order to do this, he should traverse the propositions contained in the Amendment, the first of which was that the Convention was calculated to promote peace and to ameliorate the condition of the populations concerned. There had been constant difficulty in understanding the policy of the Government—a policy which had throughout been veiled in mystery, and confused by ever-recurring statements, each of which was inconsistent with the other. This feature had been remarkably apparent in the course of the present debate, more particularly with regard to the moving cause which had led to the making of the Convention. About the cause of the arrangement with Turkey there could be no doubt, because it was apparent from Mr. Layard's Correspondence. It had been said that the Berlin Treaty was not the policy of the Government, but that they had redressed its deficiencies by the Convention; and it appeared from the Correspondence that the object and intention of the Convention was altogether Asiatic. At any rate, in order to meet the danger, the Government had undertaken by the Convention most serious responsibilities —responsibilities, the serious character of which no man would deny. They had undertaken not only to guarantee the Asiatic Possessions of Turkey against Russia, but they had undertaken practically to secure to them good government at the hands of the Porte. He did not think that it would be denied that nothing but a pressing necessity and a good prospect of success could have warranted them in pursuing that course. The position taken up by Lord Beaconsfield was this—that if they did not interfere, Asia Minor was destined to become either a victim of anarchy, or the possession of Russia. What the Government had to show the country was that the means they proposed were the best for averting either of these things. He, however, denied both the propositions of the noble Lord. In England they believed almost universally in the decadence of Turkey. That had been the groundwork of their general view of this question. As a matter of fact, they believed that Turkey was a Power which had lost the faculty of governing subject-races; and, so far as Europe was concerned, her doom was only a question of time. He was not, however, prepared to extend this proposition to Turkey in Asia. He believed that Turkey might have a future in Asia. The result of the war, though Turkey had been crushed, was to show not the strength, but the weakness of Russia, for she had been exhausted, both in money and men. Lord Beaconsfield did not talk, like the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, of the imminent danger of Russia possessing Asia Minor as a recruiting ground; he talked of the possibility of the renewal of the war in 10, 15, or 20 years. If that was so, Turkey had time before her which she could have employed most usefully, if we had not interfered with her, in the management of her Asiatic affairs. If she was utterly incapable of doing this, there could be no blinder policy than that of binding up our fortunes with hers—a country destined to decay. Let the danger, however, be as great as they liked and as imminent, was this Convention the best way to meet it? He thought it was advisable that there should be a clear understanding and plain speaking between England and Russia; but one thing he could not understand, and that was binding ourselves to Turkey, placing ourselves in the hands of Turkey, and in the hands of Russia at the same time. They had engaged to defend Turkey against Russia. They had taken away that sense of danger which was necessary to supply the motive to Turkey for the good government of its Provinces. He was unable to reconcile the statement of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, as to the conditions under which the Guarantee would cease with what had fallen from Members of the Cabinet. He found no condition in the first Article of the Convention. The undertaking to defend the Asiatic Dominions of Turkey was given unreservedly. They had bound themselves, as the Turks well knew, to protect their Asiatic Provinces. What would be the almost inevitable consequence of an engagement of that kind? Turkey would no longer have the motive which she might otherwise have had to reform. By guaranteeing the Turkish Provinces, we had taken away from her the necessity of acting in her own defence. We had really entered into the arrangement, not for the sake of the Turks, but to defend our Indian Possessions, and this the Turks perfectly well understood; and so, being secured by us, she would not exert herself to defend her Asiatic Provinces. She would rely upon our guarantees, and upon our jealousy of Russia. Russia, on the other hand, if she were the intriguing country the Government said she was, would have every motive, temptation, and opportunity to intrigue, and she would further have the power, at any time when we might be engaged in war or in danger of war with other Powers, to choose that moment to compel us to fight in Armenia or elsewhere, at a great distance from our base of operations. Russia would never dream of attacking us in India, unless she had some other inducement than merely attacking our power in India. We had, in fact, laid the basis of her attack close to her own resources, and that without bringing our Indian Empire one mile nearer. If the Convention was conditional, the most probable end of the arrangement would be that, in the fulfilment of our obligations, we might put a pressure on Turkey until she threw herself into the hands of Russia, and then we would be holding Cyprus against both Russia and Turkey. These views were not based upon a narrow view of the duties or the interests of this country. The noble Viscount who spoke first to-night devoted a great part of his speech to an attack on the late Government, rather than to a defence of the policy of Her Majesty's Government. The noble Viscount attributed to the policy of the late Government a love of peace at any price and indifference to the safety and dignity of the Empire of England; but zeal for the safety and dignity of the Empire was not an appanage or monopoly of any Party in the State, and in his (Mr. Stansfeld's) views, the distinctive policy of the present Government; as he read it in the consequences of this Convention, was not higher than the policy of the late Government, but it was rather to be distinguished from it by the tying of our hands, and, consequently, diminishing of our power, against which he protested. If at any time the Empire of England should be threatened, England would know how to defend her own. Being of that opinion, he objected to an attempt to force the hand of England 10 or 20 years hence. The England of that time would, judging for herself the conditions of the time, know how, when, and where it was best to defend herself without the necessity of any legacy of instruction from this Government. Before that time came, it was his confident expectation that this Treaty, which in his conviction diminished our power, and might harass and impede the exercise of it, would have been condemned by the sober and permanent judgment of the country as a failure, as not being calculated to secure peace, to ameliorate the condition of these populations, or to maintain our Empire in the East, and that it would have ceased to exist.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: My noble Friend who opened the debate to-night (Viscount Sandon) has been accused by two right hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House of having unnecessarily entered into the history of the transactions of former Governments so far as the Eastern Question is concerned. I am not going to continue that story, because we have heard a good deal about it already on both sides; but I am bound to say, in justification of what fell from my noble Friend, that I think the charge he brought against the late Government was perfectly founded on fact, and that no one can remember the assumed or real indignation—assumed in some parts, and real, no doubt, in others—shown by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite when the horrors of Bulgaria were first prominently brought before the country, without feeling——

Mr. GLADSTONE: Where does the right hon. Gentleman say indignation was assumed?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I say assumed elsewhere, and real here; and this is what I mean to say in reference to that indignation. The greatest possible fault was then found with the Government, who had only been in Office for a short period when these atrocities occurred; and who, therefore, could not be held responsible for the conduct of Turkey, which had brought about that state of things; for such a state of things could not be brought about in a moment. We have heard to-night, and it has not been denied, that during the first 10 years of the Liberal tenure of Office after 1856, matters were reported to be improving in Turkey, and no one can suppose, simply because we passed into Office in 1874, that it was owing to anything we did, or neglected to do, that so soon afterwards these atrocities occurred. I am bound to say, therefore, that the only conclusion that I can form in regard to the faults then found by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen with the Government and with the Consuls were unjust; because they themselves, when in power, ought to have seen what was going on in Turkey. If any one thing struck me more forcibly than another, in connection with that injustice of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen, it was their treatment of the Ambassador at Constantinople (Sir Henry Elliot), whom we did not appoint but whom they appointed.

MR. GLADSTONE: You did not appoint him?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: We did not—the present Government did not.

MR. GLADSTONE: Who appointed him? Did we make him Ambassador?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Not Ambassador, but being at Constantinople, he became Ambassador; and it was Sir Henry Elliot against whom taunts and indignation were directed, in language such as, I believe, never had been addressed to an Ambassador of this country. I pass all that by, and now I will come to the subject immediately before us. I am bound to say, so far as the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, he has not been fortunate hitherto in the Motions he has brought forward, if we regard the success of his Party. We have had these Motions brought forward in different ways. We have had two sets of Resolutions at different times, most of which have been summarily withdrawn; and at last, when a question arose with regard to the employment of the Indian troops, upon which an issue as to Constitutional Law and other matters, might fairly have been raised in both Houses, a serious attack on the Government was made for the first time, so far as I am aware, by a Motion in this House of Parliament only—although the question at issue was certainly one which might have been debated on an actual Motion with great advantage in a House where most of the Constitutional Lawyers of the Kingdom have naturally their proper seats. I presume the noble Lord was so charmed with the success he achieved on that occasion—for he did actually succeed at that time, at all events, in inducing the House of Commons to come to a division—that he thought it wise to take the same course on the present occasion; although I am bound to say that, if ever there was a case in which a challenge ought to be given to the Government not simply in this House, where we are, of course, ready to meet it, but also in the other House, where the two noble Lords (Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury), whose conduct had been most violently assailed, would be able to defend themselves, that case is the present. Why such a Motion as that we are discussing should not have been brought forward in the House where these noble Lords sit passes my comprehension. I quite grant that in a matter of this grave character, the function of the Opposition is one of proper criticism, acute criticism, if they like; and I have great pleasure in tendering my humble testimony to the noble Lord who brought forward this Resolution (the Marquess of Hartington), that not only was it likely that the Opposition would bring such a matter forward, but that it was the proper duty of the Opposition to criticize all the actions of the Government in this case. I will go further, and say that no man could have brought the matter forward in a more frank, manly, and proper manner than the noble Lord. But having said this, I am bound to say that I must place the noble Lord in this dilemma—If legitimate criticism was the object of his speech, I grant that he has entirely succeeded, only he ought not to have brought forward this Motion. If, on the other hand, his Motion was meant as a direct challenge to the Government in this matter—a challenge which, if he obtained a majority, the noble Lord must know, would displace the Government at present in power—then, I think, his speech was utterly unworthy of the occasion. Now, I cannot help thinking that when he brought forward his Motion, the noble Lord did not seriously intend to make that attack on the Government which has been made to-night, unless, indeed, there has been that of which we have already heard something, and may, perhaps, hear still more, before the debate closes—namely, some secret understanding, or convention, or agreement, between the noble Lord and some other Member of his Party. I think I shall be borne out by every hon. Member in saying that not only the speech of the noble Lord, but the whole tone of the debate last evening, and the listlessness of the House from one end to the other, justified the assertion of the hon. Member for Bury St. Edmunds (Mr. Greene), that after all that was to be said, the debate could easily be concluded in two nights. To-night, however, a secret Convention has been laid on the Table. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), under that secret Convention, exercising the function which he is quite entitled to exercise, has come down and made a totally different speech from that of the noble Lord. He has made a speech which, at all events, in my opinion, would have warranted a Motion for turning the Government out of Office. But it is a totally different matter to get the House to support him. I do not know in what capacity the right hon. Gentleman came down to make that speech—whether as the Mentor and former Leader of the noble Lord, to teach him what he ought to have done last night; or, as his Rival for future place; or, whether he came as a humble Follower of the noble Lord, in support of the Resolution which he moved last night. At all events, judging from the speeches made to-night, and not long ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, the right hon. Member may be taken to wish—although I can fancy the noble Lord having great doubts on the point—that the Government should receive what he calls "a mild but effectual dismissal from Office." But, unfortunately, there are two objections to that course. In the first place, the large majority of this House are entirely opposed to such a course—I do not say the Conservative majority, but the large majority—and not only a majority of the House, but a majority of the country also. That is, indeed, admitted, although the right hon. Gentleman apparently cannot fathom the cause why the country on that occasion, as in many instances during the last few years, has chosen to differ from him. The second reason why the noble Lord, and many others, would regret if that Motion should succeed is that, whether rightly or wrongly, it is an accomplished fact that this Convention does exist. No one can deny it, and from the time that this Convention has been known to exist, hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, not only in the House, but in the country, also, have proclaimed on the house-tops that they could not understand how such a Convention could be possibly carried out. Well, as they have so loudly proclaimed their inability to devise any means for carrying out that Convention, I presume they will not be sorry that it is left for a short time to those who, although aware of the difficulties, do see a way of carrying it out with benefit to the East, to England, and to Turkey. Now, I feel bound to say that the only fault I have to find with the noble Lord is that his Motion has been hastily drawn and hastily put on the Paper. I think anyone can see it is not the work of one hand. You can almost discover the particular fingers that have based the drafting of each paragraph. One of the most important paragraphs of the whole Motion has been considered by the noble Marquess of so little account, that he actually forgot to say a single word about it. The Motion has been hastily placed on the Paper, because I remember the noble Lord saying, when he gave Notice of it, that he had some regrets at not having been able to see the Protocols of the Treaty of Berlin; but that he still thought he had ample information on which to draw up the Motion of which he gave Notice. Now, considering the gravity of the question, and the fact that the whole matter turns upon the proceedings of the Congress of Berlin, I am justified in saying that a Notice placed upon the Paper without any acquaintance with those Protocols has been hastily drawn up, and that if it had been drawn up after seeing the Protocols, we should have had a very different Motion. I am not going to follow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich into the whole of his criticisms on this Treaty. I am not going to do it for two reasons. In the first place, the right hon. Gentleman went into great detail on the matter which somewhat detracted from the effect of his speech. It would have had a better effect if only the broad features of the case had been placed before us. In the second place, I do not think I should be justified in taking up the time which the right hon. Gentleman was fully justified in taking up. I will lay the broad features of the question briefly before the House. The noble Lord has compared the Treaty of Berlin with the Treaty of Paris, and has said that the two principles involved in the Treaty of Paris—namely, the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire —have absolutely disappeared from the Treaty of Berlin. He said—"Why did you not prefer the proposals Russia made before the war to the Articles you have now agreed to?"

The answer to that question seems to me to be absolutely clear. When the proposals were made in the year 1877, Turkey was a strong military Power, and the same reason that induced the Government to refrain from joining in the Berlin Memorandum influenced them also in not pressing those proposals on Turkey at that time. Why? Because we should then have been following a course which the country said we had no right to follow—namely, that we should have been practically forced into a war for the purpose of coercing Turkey. The question came to this—What should we in our position do? We knew that at that moment Turkey would have no more listened to these proposals than she would listen to the proposals of the Berlin Memorandum. We believed that at that moment Turkey, if even the whole of Europe had gone against her, would not have been coerced without a terrible and bloody war. The event has shown that the Government were right; and if we are asked why we do now consent to press upon Turkey the terms that were proposed before the war took place, my answer is as clear as the day, that the circumstances have been altered by the war. But when the noble Lord says that the Treaty of Paris has been torn up by the Treaty of Berlin, I deny it. The very grave question that always lies beneath the Eastern difficulties arose. The question was, who was to rule at Constantinople, and how? Was the Sultan to be maintained there, or was someone to be put in his place? If the Sultan is to be kept there, is he to be kept as the Vassal and Slave of any Power of Europe; or is he, so far as Europe is concerned, to be practically an independent Sovereign? The result of the Treaty of Berlin, in my opinion, came to this—the Treaty of Berlin has provided the Sultan with a real frontier for his Kingdom, and it has also provided that he shall have military and political power sufficient, at all events, to maintain his authority abroad, and to protect the lives and property of his subjects at home. Those were the principles laid down by our Plenipotentiaries at the Congress. If they had not been so, and we had followed the Treaty of San Stefano, the Sultan would have been a Sovereign without power, and it would have been much better to have found a new way of dealing with Constantinople than to have left him in that way. Therefore, the noble Lord had no right to compare this with the Treaty of Paris. What was maintained in the Treaty of Paris is maintained in the Treaty of Berlin—namely, that the Sultan is to be maintained with a real frontier to his country, and with real power; and for that reason, and for that reason alone, the possession of the Straits is to be left practically untouched. Therefore, so far as this Treaty is concerned, the Treaty of Paris is maintained; because, though the effect of the war may have been to diminish the extent of his territory, yet it still leaves him practically Sovereign in his own country. I pass at once to the Anglo-Russian Convention. From all I have heard to-night, and notwithstanding all that has taken place in this House, I am bound to say that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have not appeared to appreciate the real state of the case. The first question is, what is the object to be gained? The next, would the Guarantee obtain that object, or, in other words, is the object to be gained worth the price which was to be paid for it? The view of Lord Salisbury, which is also the view of the Government, is that the Asiatic Tribes looked up to Turkey as a strong Power able to defend its own; but the power of the Sultan has been weakened by the late war, and if war broke out again what would be the result upon those Tribes? I believe they would be likely to withhold their allegiance and tend to gravitate towards the strong, while they abandoned the weak. In Eastern countries strength is an enormous power—it is strength that is looked up to; but England is also entitled to be looked up to as strong; it is necessary that in the present state of affairs she should appear as a strong Power, and Her Majesty's Government consider that if those Asiatic Tribes were to gravitate in any direction, they should gravitate towards England rather than towards Russia. We have enormous possessions in the Eastern part of the world; it is absolutely necessary that we should appear to have the power to protect them, and that the display of strength should rest with us and not with Russia. The noble Lord asked what was to be gained by the Convention? I believe that what has been gained is, practically, the prevention of future wars. The advance of Russia in Asia Minor has been stopped, and that will tend to strengthen our influence in the East. I say that by the Convention we have gained two things—first, the security of our Eastern Possessions, and, secondly, security for the good government of the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey. Both these points have been attacked in the Resolution of the noble Lord, who said that our responsibilities have been unnecessarily extended, and that we have entered into indefinite engagements, which we cannot practically carry out. I admit that all guarantees involve responsibility and danger, and that they should only be entered into under necessity; but, in the present case, the danger already exists—it has not been created by the Guarantee into which we have entered. If we have not a strong position, it might be dangerous, although necessary, to go to war. If one possessed estates, it might be necessary to go to law, and if one had a house, it might become necessary to defend it. But the danger of our position lay in the condition of things in which we found ourselves, and it is for that reason the Government have followed, as I consider, the wise course of looking forward and taking the necessary precautions, while the danger is still distant, to avoid that which, I believe, in future years, would otherwise be inevitable. It has been said that the Guarantee is seductive, because it does not cost anything at present. For that reason, it is the duty of the Government to explain to the House and the country what, in their belief, are the risks and dangers to which we are exposed, and they have been fully explained. I will explain them more fully, if the House wishes me to do so. It is said you are in a dilemma; you have undertaken to protect a country against aggression; you have undertaken to protect an abominably bad Government—or you have, at all events, undertaken to reform the internal administration of that country, which it is impossible that you should be able to do with a divided government and a divided responsibility. I deny that we have undertaken anything of the kind. It is quite true that we have undertaken to defend Turkey in Asia from the attacks of Russia, but it is on the express condition that Turkey should reform herself. We are not to reform her; but the reformation is to be carried out in a way to be agreed upon between the two Governments. We are to have a voice in the reformation; but I do not see why it is impossible that Turkey should reform herself. Why should Turkey, knowing the great gain our assistance would be for her, run the risk of losing that assistance simply by refusing our advice in the reform of her institutions? But hon. and right hon. Gentlemen go further, and say—"You have not simply guaranteed the Sultan's Dominions against external aggression, you have also guaranteed him against internal revolt." I should have thought that the greatest possible security against internal revolt would be, not the arms of England, but her advice pressed on the Porte to secure the good government of the Provinces. I read the other day, with astonishment, that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gladstone) had gone so far as to say that there was one thing which we had taken away—the natural punishment that would fall on the Porte for the misgovernment of its subjects. I have never been able to understand why Russia should be put forward as the vindicator of good government. Why did hon. and right hon. Gentleman, both in and out of the House, say that when Turkey undertook to introduce reforms it was impossible for her to do so? The right hon. Gentleman, at all events, said that by the Treaty of Berlin, Russia is not to carry out reforms in Bulgaria. That is so; but by the Treaty of San Stefano she was to do it, and the voices of hon. Members opposite were not raised against what was then intended. But if Russia could see that reforms were possible, why should not England? Is Russia a more civilizing Power than England? Is Russia more free? Religious liberty is one of the grand principles upon which we insist; does Russia grant religious liberty? Her Majesty's Government have been told that, by their course of action, they were giving bribes to place-hunters, to traders, to speculators, and the greatest bribe of all to philanthropists. But I would put the case in another form, and say, they have taken steps to insure fair play to everyone; and that, while, undoubtedly, persons must be employed, they have taken steps, as far as human means could go, to insure that in the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey there should be good government and security for life and property, so that English and European capital might flow in and render them what they had been in former years—some of the fairest in the world. But the right hon. Gentleman said—"Why are you afraid of Russia in Asia Minor? Why are you going to interfere in Asia Minor, and not in Asia Major? That is the direct road to India, and if you want to protect your Indian Provinces, why not go there?" Well, I have an opinion that the people of England would be sorry to see any part of Asia Minor in the hands of Russia. There was one sentence of the noble Lord to which I listened with pain, and which I cannot but think in his calmer moments he will regret having uttered. The noble Lord said—"As far as I can see, our interests in India are not in any way affected by the question of Asia Minor." I differ from him absolutely. At all events, in former times, battles were fought for the key of Asia, and there existed flourishing cities which were called by that name. The noble Lord went on to say—

> "It had been said that at some future day there might be a Euphrates Valley railway; but I fail to see that even if such a railway were constructed, and got into the hands of Russia, it would affect us much; because it must end at the Persian Gulf, where the Russians would find themselves confronted by a Fleet of British iron-clads."

Now, that being the doctrine of the noble Lord, and of the right hon. Gentleman who cheered him, I hope they will not flinch from it when they go the country. At all events, I will take it that they do not think our interests in India would be in any way affected if the Russians got hold of the Euphrates Valley.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I should like to know from what report the extract just read had been taken, as I wish it to be understood that I do not admit its literal accuracy.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: It is taken from the best authority. It appeared in *The Times* of this morning. The noble Lord can, of course, correct any words which he thinks to be wrong; but whether he hesitates to affirm the principle or not, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich cheered it a minute ago.

MR. GLADSTONE: I cheered a single phrase only.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I gather from the report which has just been read, and which is the best I could obtain of what was stated in the House, that, at any rate, the noble Lord would not go to war if Russia advanced as far as the Persian Gulf. The right hon. Gentleman said that not Asia Minor, but the other parts of Asia formed the road to India. There is not much help to be had from railways at the present time in that land of desert; but if the Russians came down from the North, the question of Persia's falling into their hands would arise. That is a very grave question; because, if anyone looks at the advances made by Russia in later times, he would see that, as a matter of detail, her practice was to go round first on one side of a district, then on the other, and afterwards to inclose the middle. How could we prevent Persia's falling into the hands of Russia, if the latter Power once obtained possession of the Euphrates Valley? I do not want to say more than is absolutely necessary against Russia; but I wish to point out that if she once got possession of the Euphrates Valley, we could do practically nothing to prevent her taking Persia. At present, Her Majesty's Indian Possessions are defended by a large chain of mountains, running from East to West, and it is my opinion that every care must be taken, as far as this country is concerned, to prevent the encroachment of Russia upon this boundary. The right hon. Gentleman asked, what are we going to do, and what is the change which we desire to make in the government of Asia Minor? I think so many things have already been shadowed forth in the Andrassy Note, and at the Constantinople Conference, that it will not be necessary to detail them again. What is wanted is not military display, nor enormous expenditure on works for the regeneration of Asia Minor; but security for property, security from invasion, rest from extortion, and rest from military service, and enforced labour—the great remedy is rest and security. These being guaranteed by the help of England, not only will English but European capital flow into the country in the course of a few years, and constitute a greater security than could be afforded by English arms or the English Navy for the good government, the safety, and the happiness of those Provinces in Asia Minor belonging to Turkey, which will then become thoroughly happy and prosperous. There are one or two points which have been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, to which I am obliged, for a moment, to allude. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken about Lord Salisbury's despatch, and what he called the dissolution of the Turkish Power. I have already referred to this, when I explained that Lord Salisbury meant that if the Turkish Power was weakened, the Asiatic Provinces would gravitate rather towards Russia than England. Again, he said that—"We have shadowed forth an alternative policy, and that the Convention means one policy, and the Treaty of Berlin another." I deny that altogether. I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that we were in this dilemma. By the Treaty of Berlin it had been decided that these Provinces should be governed according to the views of all the Powers, including, of course, England; whereas the Anglo-Turkish Convention said that they were to be governed according to our own views alone. That was the alternative proposition suggested by the right hon. Gentleman; but his view is a mistaken one, because, under the Treaty of Berlin, the Provinces are not to be governed by the other Powers at all. A clause in the Treaty of Berlin says—

> "The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out, without further delay, reforms—

not demanded by the other Powers, but—

> "according to the local requirements."

The Powers have no authority to initiate reforms; it is for the Turks to introduce reforms, and all that the Powers have to do is to see that they are carried out under the Anglo-Turkish Convention. On the other hand, Turkey has a distinct engagement with us to consult with us as to the reforms to be introduced. There is, therefore, no alternative proposition, and the other Powers have no right to interfere. The right hon. Gentleman also said a good deal about the binding power of Treaties. I have only to observe, on this point, that if, within the last 12 months, one country has stood up more than any other for the binding power of Treaties, that country is England. We said that we would not allow Russia, without our protest, to break the Treaty of Paris, by going to war with Turkey; and, again, when Russia concluded a Treaty with Turkey, we said that we would not allow that Treaty to be ratified without it was submitted to Europe. The right hon. Gentleman said Her Majesty's Government had broken their Treaty obligations by the Anglo-Turkish Convention; but that I altogether deny, and defy any hon. and learned Gentleman opposite to contradict me. There is no obligation in the Treaties, either of Paris or Berlin, that has been broken by the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The right hon. Gentleman said the acquisition of Cyprus was a breach of Treaty obligation. Had we annexed the Island in war, we should, doubtless, have broken the Treaty of 1856, the whole object of which was to maintain the Turkish Empire against all comers; but there was no provision in that Treaty which prohibited Turkey from making such an arrangement as we have entered into with her. I am not going too far in stating that if Turkey had said—"If you choose to buy Cyprus, we will sell it to you," there is nothing in the Treaty of Paris to prevent the purchase. There is, besides, no Article in the Treaty of Paris which prevents our assisting her in carrying out reforms, and there is none in the Treaty of Berlin. Therefore, when it is said that we have broken them, I am bound to reply that there is not the slightest foundation for the statement. The right hon. Gentleman said, that of all the crimes committed by Her Majesty's Government the worst was that of keeping Parliament in the dark. Curiously enough, that is a point about which the noble Lord who moved the Resolution never said a single word. He did not think it worth while to mention it in his speech, probably, because he did not consider it of vital importance. No doubt, the noble Lord remembered other Treaties of the greatest possible importance, which had been entered into and ratified without the knowledge of Parliament. It has been said, moreover, that we have entered into an engagement, by Treaty, which the country knew nothing about. If ever there was a case in which this country was placed under the strongest possible obligations, it was that of the

Tripartite Treaty. By that Treaty the high contracting parties were jointly and severally bound to maintain the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and the Anglo-Turkish Convention does not bind England to anything like those obligations. But it is said—"Aye, that is true; but the other Powers who were parties to it must combine before you can take action upon it." I, for one, do not take that view. It is quite true that the other Powers must join; but it is equally true that England is bound. She has signed the deed, and, if called upon, she cannot avoid paying the money. When the right hon. Gentleman, the other night, said that for the first time in history a Treaty of this kind had been entered into without the authority and knowledge of Parliament, he forgot the Treaty of 1856. That Treaty was made, it was signed, it was ratified, before Parliament knew one single word about it, and it binds this country to obligations ten times stronger than are incurred by the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1878. I want to know, then, how the right hon. Gentleman, or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, can say that this is the first time a Treaty has been made behind the back of Parliament, which binds the country to obligations of which Parliament knows nothing. I do not think I should be justified in taking up the time of the House longer, having, as I believe, answered every point made by the right hon. Gentleman in his long speech. If I have not met every point, I sincerely apologize to the right hon. Gentleman, for I meant to do so. In conclusion, I will ask—and I hope we shall have an answer—putting aside the policy of the Berlin Memorandum—which was one for the coercion and destruction of Turkey—what policy has been suggested by right hon. Gentlemen opposite? If they are aware, as they seem to be, of the advances of Russia, what steps would they have taken to counteract her influence? They have opposed every attempt made by Her Majesty's Government to do so. When the Government asked for the Vote of £6,000,000, it was opposed. The same course was taken when the Fleet entered the Dardanelles; on the calling out of the Reserves; and again, on the employment of the Indian Forces. There is not a single step which Her Majesty's Government have taken—and which are absolutely essential for the maintenance and security of peace, as proved by the fact that peace now exists—there is not one of those steps which they did not oppose. And I ask them, before they call on the House to condemn those steps, which I believe will secure, for a long time to come, the blessings of peace to this country and good government to the inhabitants of Asia Minor and the adjoining Provinces, to state what policy they would have adopted other than that carried out by Her Majesty's Government? I can only say, and I say it most sincerely, that, in my opinion, the country ought to be and is thankful for the blessings of peace. It ought also to be satisfied with the means by which that peace has been secured; and I, for one, most deeply regret that, after the Congress has taken place, some of the Powers which have remained in perfect and absolute friendship with this country should have been told by the House of Commons, or a section of it, that they had been used in such a manner by Her Majesty's Government as is calculated to stir up strife where there should be peace. I have been particularly sorry to hear language of a kind likely to lead to such a conclusion used by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Lowe.*)

MR. GLADSTONE wished the right hon. Gentleman to understand exactly in what it was he contradicted him. His interruption was for the purpose of explaining that what he said was that it rested with the Government to prove that their conduct with respect to the Treaty of San Stefano was consistent with good faith.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that before the adjournment was carried, there was one question to which he should like an answer from the Government. In the course of his speech, the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had referred to, and quoted from, documents which were not on the Table of the House. In the first place, he had entered into an explanation of what was the Agreement between this country and Russia, and what course was taken in the Conference with regard to that Agreement; but he had subsequently given a more full explanation of the nature and character of the document. The general Rule of the House was, he believed, that documents were not to be commented upon by Ministers unless they were laid upon the Table of the House. Into the general object of that Rule he need not now enter; but it must be perfectly obvious that it did not conduce to the fairness of debate that Ministers should be able to give their own explanations of Agreements, which it was not denied were in writing, while the documents in question were not equally open for reference to Members of the House generally. He would ask the Government, before the debate was concluded, whether, as an Agreement had been distinctly referred to, they were ready to lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. GLADSTONE wished to put another question to Her Majesty's Government, which it would be greatly to the convenience of the House to have answered. A good deal of discussion had taken place with reference to the signature and ratification of Treaties. The dates on which they took place ought to be brought into comparison with the dates of the discussions thereon in Parliament. In his opinion, it would be greatly for the convenience of the House if Her Majesty's Government would cause a table to be prepared and laid on the Table, showing the dates of the signature and ratification of the political Treaties of the last 30 or 40 years?

Major NOLAN objected to the debate being adjourned at that early hour. It was quite right that the leading spirits should take up the best part of the evening; but when it became late, he thought the minor Members, who, in many cases, represented very important constituencies, should be allowed to have their say. After the best speakers had finished, it was only fair that they should be allowed to speak; but he was not allowed even to put in an interjectional remark. The real point was that if the Treaty were carried out, his constituency would have to pay £1,000,000 for a war; and he, therefore, wished, on the part of his constituency, to protest against the Treaty.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the understanding was that the Committee on the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill should be resumed that evening on the close of this debate. But that was, of course, a matter for the House to decide. He rose for the purpose of answering the observations that had been made. In the first place, with regard to the question of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, there could be no objection to what he had asked for, and the Government would take care to have a table, showing the dates of the signatures and ratification of the Treaties prepared and laid before the House. With regard to what the noble Lord had said, undoubtedly the Rule of the House was that Ministers should not quote or make use of documents which were in their possession, but which were not known to the House. That Rule did not exactly apply to the present case, for no Paper had been made use of by the Government for the purpose of founding any argument upon it that was not in the possession of the House. But certain publications which had appeared in the newspapers had been made the subject of comment by the right hon. Gentleman opposite; and upon those publications, and the way in which they had been commented upon, his right hon. Friend, in reply to the right hon. Gentleman, had made some observations. He thought, therefore, that the Rule to which the noble Lord had referred did not apply in the present case.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in that case, supposed the publication in *The Globe* was now authentic; because, while the right hon. Gentleman was speaking, he watched very carefully what he said, and he alluded to an argument which had been founded upon a previous understanding between Russia and England, in what was called the Schouvaloff-Salisbury Agreement. He was a little surprised when the right hon. Gentleman, who had had considerable legal experience, began dealing with that document in a manner which he ventured to say was a little extraordinary. The Rule was stated by him to be exactly the same in that House with reference to written documents as at the Bar—namely, that if reference was made to a written document, the party so referring to it was bound to produce it. The Home Secretary set to work to explain the conduct of England with reference to Bessarabia, and, after explaining and defending the Agreement which England had come to, proceeded to argue upon the contents of that Agreement. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Agreement stipulated that—"We should be at full liberty to discuss the subject of Greece; but that, in that Agreement, we made an acknowledgment that we should not be bound to go to war." It was utterly impossible for any person more explicitly to state the effect of the document than the right hon. Gentleman had done. At the time, he (Sir William Harcourt) observed to his right hon. Friend beside him, that he wondered how far the Home Secretary was going in referring to this document, and his right hon. Friend read from his book the paragraphs of the document as they were referred to by the Home Secretary. It was thus clear that the Home Secretary stated at full length the contents of the document. But what was the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? He said—"You have got the document, and you all know its contents, and the Rule only applies to documents of which the Government are the possessors, and not the rest of the House." According to this statement of the Rule, the House was possessed of the document. But where? In *The Globe* newspaper. And to that document all sorts of epithets had been applied. It was called unauthorized, unauthentic, and inaccurate, because incomplete. Yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the Rule did not apply, because all the world was possessed of the document. In that case, the Government must take one of two courses—they must either lay *The Globe* newspaper on the Table of the House, or produce the document itself. If the Government would lay *The Globe* newspaper on the Table, after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, it would answer all purposes.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER wished to correct an inaccurate expression which had been used by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford. The hon. and learned Member said that the document which had been referred to had been described as inaccurate, because it was incomplete. He wished to remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that what he had stated was, that as an exposition of the policy of Her Majesty's Government the document in question was incomplete, and therefore inaccurate.

MR. BULWER said, that the Secretary of State for the Home Department had expressed a wish that the point raised by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich would be fully dealt with by the Lawyers of the House. He sincerely trusted that no such event would take place. After the exhibition they had had from the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), he earnestly hoped that the House would not be troubled by anything more from the Lawyers. The hon. and learned Member had endeavoured to throw legal dust in the eyes of the House, by telling them of a Rule of the House analogous to a rule of law to the effect that no Member of the House was at liberty to allude to a document unless it was laid on the Table.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that what he had stated was that a Member was not at liberty to state the contents of a document which he did not produce.

MR. BULWER accepted that correction; but the hon. and learned Member had forgotten to inform the House that it would have been the duty of the Speaker, if there was an analogy between the proceedings of the House and those of a Court of Law, to tell the right hon. Member for Greenwich, when he was alluding to the contents of that document, that he was not entitled to do so; for in a Court of Law neither the plaintiff nor the defendant were at liberty to refer to the contents of a written document which was not produced. But, in the present instance, the right hon. Member for Greenwich and the noble Lord were allowed to found an argument upon the existence of a document of a particular character, and then objection was taken because a right hon. Gentleman on the Ministerial side, when he attempted to answer those arguments, necessarily referred to that on which those arguments were founded—namely, the supposed contents of that same document. He trusted the House would not allow itself to be misled by any such reasoning on this occasion.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID remarked, that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Bulwer) was entirely mistaken. The hon. and learned Member for Oxford had very correctly said, that the Government had no right to refer to a document that was not before the House. Then the hon. and learned Member opposite retorted that the Speaker ought to have called the right hon. Member for Greenwich to Order, because he had referred to that document; but the hon. and learned Member forgot that that document was under the control of the Government, and not under that of the right hon. Member for Greenwich. The contention on his side was that if a document were under the control of the Government, they ought to produce it.

Mr. J. S. GATHORNE-HARDY observed, that hon. Members on his side quite understood the contention of hon. Gentlemen opposite. As hon. Gentlemen opposite had been informed, there were matters in connection with that document which foreign Governments objected to have produced. Therefore, those hon. Gentlemen wished to force the Government to lay upon the Table a document which was incomplete, and gave only a partial explanation of matters to which it referred. Reference had only been made to it in so far as was necessary to answer arguments on the other side founded upon it.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *Thursday.*

## CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—[*Lords*]—[Bill 204.]

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 26th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

New Clause (Notice of animal being affected with a contagious disease to be given to the police,)—(*Mr. Clare Read,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. SYNAN considered it impossible to go on with the Bill at such an hour—1 o'clock.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON understood it was the desire of the Committee to make progress with the Bill that night. He would remind his hon. Friends that they were drawing to the end of the Session, and every moment the Committee sat, so much the more prospect was there of carrying the Bill. He hoped, therefore, hon. Members would be prepared to go on.

Mr. SYNAN said, he had no objection to the Bill; but he thought a discussion might arise which would render it impossible to proceed at such an hour.

Mr. O'CONOR thought it most unreasonable to ask the Committee to take the Bill at such an hour. If the foreign debate had terminated at 12 o'clock they might have proceeded; but they certainly ought not to go on with so important a Bill at past 1 o'clock.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON hoped his hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) would not persevere with the clause under notice, and that he would accept one which he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had framed in lieu of it, and which, he thought, would meet all the desires of hon. Members, of giving notice of the existence of disease. If the Committee would allow him, he would read the clause he would propose, and which he would ask to have inserted after Clause 29. It was as follows:—

(Notice of disease to police.)

"(1.) Every person having in his possession or under his charge an animal affected with disease, shall, as far as practicable, keep that animal separate from animals not so affected, and shall, with all practicable speed, give notice of the fact of the animal being so affected to a constable of the police establishment for the police district, or area, county, borough, town, or place, wherein the animal so affected is.

"(2.) The constable to whom notice is given shall forthwith give information thereof to such person or authority as the Privy Council from time to time by General Order direct.

"(3.) The Privy Council from time to time may make such General Orders as they think fit for prescribing and regulating the notice to be given to or by any person or authority in case of any particular disease or in case of the illness of an animal, and for supplementing or varying for those purposes any of the provisions of this section."

Under the clause ample notice of disease would be given, which the Committee desired, and on Report, he would bring up an Amendment to Clause 54, which would make it penal under the Act not to give such notice.

Mr. CLARE READ said, he would withdraw his Amendment in favour of the clause brought up by his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury. But he desired to know why the clause did not deal with the cases of horses suffering from glanders?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, such cases would be dealt with by Orders from the Privy Council and not by a clause in the Bill. At present, the Privy Council had the power; and he believed his hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk would see that it would entirely alter the principle of the Bill, if any attempt was made under it to deal with such cases as he had referred to.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY wished to point out, if the clause was adopted, that the severe restrictions, to be followed by penalties if not complied with, could not be withdrawn at the will of the Privy Council. In all other respects, the Bill had been framed with great discretionary powers for the Privy Council, and it was understood, when the measure was introduced, that the severe restrictions were to be submitted to by farmers on condition that foreign cattle were slaughtered at the port of debarkation. But he believed if such an arrangement were agreed to, and such modification adopted by the Government, as indicated in the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury, after a year or two it would be found that the Bill had little effect in checking disease in the country. And if that was the case —and farmers had reason to believe that disease came, as before, through foreign cattle—he did not believe they would submit patiently to the restrictions imposed upon them. Therefore, he thought it would be much better, instead of inserting the clause proposed by the hon. Baronet, to leave the matter to the Privy Council, who could impose the regulations, and continue them if they were found effective, or withdraw them if they were of no avail. So much discretion having been conceded to the Privy Council previously, surely the Committee could trust them in this respect.

Clause—(*Mr. Clare Read,*)—by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson,*) —*brought up,* and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

MR. SYNAN said, it was very inconvenient to have to vote on a new clause, the words of which had not been exactly heard in the Committee. He did not know what the imperative command was which the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury had embodied in some words which were not quite audible; but he understood the provision was to bind farmers to give notice of the existence of contagious diseases among animals belonging to them without defining the diseases, and without exempting those who, through ignorance of the disease, did not give notice. It might very well occur that a man might be possessed of diseased animals and not know it, and unless it was provided that he should not be liable except for knowingly concealing the existence of disease, he would divide against the clause.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON reminded the hon. Member that the clause he proposed to add provided that every person having in his possession, or under his charge, an animal affected with disease, should, as far as practicable, report the same. Those words limited the clause very much. The fact of notice not having been given through ignorance would be a plea against dealing with anyone in the harsh manner suggested by the hon. Member.

MAJOR NOLAN said, no private Member could put an Amendment on the Paper without the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury saying he would consult the draftsman as to whether he could accept it. But here the Committee were asked to accept an Amendment which they had not seen before. He desired to know, before the proposal of the hon. Baronet was accepted, whether the offenders under it would be subject to the three months' imprisonment clause? On Report, it was arranged a new clause should be brought in, to give a man who had been twice convicted of a certain offence three months' imprisonment for the second offence. To so punish a man who might disobey this new clause would be to inflict a very heavy penalty.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, his new clause provided that which he believed the Committee had been anxious to obtain; but he would take care that the imprisonment clause did not apply to such cases.

MAJOR NOLAN considered that the clause came before the Committee in a very unbusiness-like manner, and he was not satisfied that a man would not be punished in the way he had intimated.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON assured the hon. and gallant Member that such offences would be dealt with by a clause which provided for fines being inflicted.

Major NOLAN was glad to have such a statement; but his impression was that the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) tried to introduce a clause punishing a man with three months' imprisonment for a second offence under the Act.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, what occurred was this. His hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) persuaded the Committee that if a second offence occurred within a given time under Clause 54, the offender should be sent to prison, having been fined in the first instance. He (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) promised the Committee, in accordance with what appeared to be their views, that, on Report, he would bring up an Amendment of the kind. He did not know whether he was in Order in referring at that time to his proposed Amendment on Clause 54, which he intended to submit to the Committee; but what he proposed to do was to give a month's imprisonment in the cases of second offences within 12 months, and it would be for the Committee to say whether they would accept that or not.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the very fact of a man not reporting the existence of disease through ignorance would be a good excuse to any tribunal before which he was brought.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, the Act of Parliament at present existing with reference to cattle disease did not make it imperative to report disease. Down to 1873 an Order of the Privy Council existed to the effect that every farmer should report existence of disease; but it was found impracticable to carry out that portion of the Orders in Council, and it was rescinded.

Mr. MURPHY thought some discretion should be given to the Privy Council in the matter. It would be found a very difficult thing to enact that penalties should be imposed for not reporting the existence of disease. As he read the proposed clause of the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury, he understood that every person having possession or charge of any animal affected with a contagious disease or an infectious disease should as far as practicable keep the animal separate. So far as his knowledge went, such a provision would be prejudicial in Ireland, where the foot-and-mouth disease existed in so mild a form that the owners of cattle mixed all together, so that they might all have the disease and have done with it. Under such circumstances, he thought the best plan to adopt would be to leave the matter in the discretion of the Privy Council, and let them make Orders tantamount to the ideas of the clause.

Mr. CLARE READ thought it very essential that this clause should form part of the Act.

Colonel MURE was quite certain the Committee would do well to support the Government proposal.

Major NOLAN protested against the clause, as he felt certain under it a man might be imprisoned for not giving notice of the existence of disease.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON reminded the Committee that what they were attempting to do by this Bill was to stamp out disease. They were attempting, also, by the Bill to deal with Ireland as a part of the United Kingdom, and it had been urged on the Committee that unless Ireland was prepared really to adopt some restrictions, there would be no security from disease for the English farmer. Therefore, under the circumstances, he would ask the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Murphy), whether the suggestion in the clause of which he spoke was not necessary to secure English farmers from disease. He believed the Irish Members were as anxious as the English were to make a final attempt to get rid of this disease, and he could not see the objection which the hon. Member feared would arise from the clause.

Mr. MURPHY did not object to a man being compelled to report cases of disease, and, of course, English cattle might be dealt with in that way if the House desired. But, if the Irish chose to keep animals together so as to inoculate them with a mild disease and have done with it, he thought they might be allowed to do so.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the advantages which Ireland possessed by having a milder form of foot-and-mouth disease were lost when the Irish cattle were sent to England. The fact of cattle being put together when any were diseased really meant the chance of a considerable importation of the disease into England. The very fact seemed an argument in favour of having separation in Ireland as well as in England, and he believed the Secretary to the Treasury would have the almost unanimous support of the Committee in what he proposed.

MR. O'CONOR said, the custom of putting cattle together when any were infected with disease was not peculiar to Ireland.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the notice of disease existing was needed so that the authorities might as soon as possible be informed of an outbreak.

MAJOR NOLAN said, the Irish Members did not object to the notice. What they objected to was the separation of cattle when one or more were diseased.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, that the practice to which reference had been made was not confined to Ireland; but, to his knowledge, was adopted by some of the chief cattle dealers in Scotland.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 105; Noes 6: Majority 99. — (Div. List, No. 246.)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE did not think that it would be of much use proceeding with the Schedules that night, as they certainly could not be finished.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was entirely in the hands of the Committee in the matter, and the hon. Baronet could take what course he pleased.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would be very glad to go on with the Amendments; but he must warn the hon. Baronet that there was no probability of the Schedules being finished that night. His Amendments to Schedule 3 referred to the tolls at the Metropolitan Cattle Market, and related to a portion of the Bill which had already been discussed. He wished first to ask whether, in pursuance of his promise, the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury had made any inquiries on the subject?

THE CHAIRMAN asked, whether the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) intended to propose the Amendments of which he had given Notice?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, Sir.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that he had taken steps to ascertain, so far as was possible, all the facts with regard to these tolls, and the various figures by which they were supported. He had before him a table, showing the receipts of the two markets of the City of London from 1856 to 1877. The foreign cattle market at Deptford was only established in 1871, and the figures relating to it were, therefore, only from that period to 1877. He would remind the Committee of the arrangement made at the time of the establishment of the Deptford Market—that, as far as the tolls and expenses were concerned, it should be taken together with the Islington Market. That arrangement was made, because it was supposed that a number of cattle for which provision had been made at Islington would be taken away to Deptford. The figures showed that for every year, with the exception of three, there had been a deficiency at the Islington Market. In 1874, 1875, and 1876, there were small surpluses; but in 1877 there was a deficiency of £9,987. The total loss on the construction amounted to £12,867, leaving a deficiency in the whole of £162,000. The mortgage for that sum of money was a first charge upon the tolls, and that deficiency had to be made up. With regard to Deptford Market, he found that in four years out of six, since 1871, there had been a considerable loss. In 1872, there was a loss of £1,906; in the next year, 1873, there was a loss of £11,051; and, in 1874, the loss amounted to £10,078. In 1875, there was a small gain of £633, and in 1876 a loss of £7,761; but in 1877, the gain amounted to £17,673. That gain was owing to animals having to be slaughtered at Deptford, on account of the foreign cattle plague. The total loss on the Deptford Market was £230,000, the interest on which sum amounted to £10,873. The sum of £230,000 was borrowed on the faith of these tolls, and, as in other instances, were a first charge upon them. The deficiency of expenditure over revenue was £8,998. Those figures proved conclusively that, with the tolls at their present rate, the markets were not remunerative; but he would remind the Committee that there was a power in the Privy Council to call for annual returns of the receipts and expenditure from the local authority—in that case, the City of London. That power could be used by the Privy Council, and so soon as any surplus was shown a revision of the tolls would be directed. So far as the City was concerned, he would say that they had always expressed their willingness to have the tolls revised as soon as the receipts exceeded the expenditure. That revision would be called for when it was shown that the expenditure had fallen below the receipts, and that was one of the advantages of having the tolls fixed by Provisional Order, for they could be varied and reduced so soon as it was evident the market paid. The figures showed how large was the existing deficiency, and proved that, except in 1877, when a large amount of cattle having to be slaughtered at Deptford for a moment raised the tolls, the receipts from the market were £9,987 below the expenditure. As Deptford up to the present was, therefore, anything but a paying concern, it would not be fair to reduce the tolls upon the faith of which large sums of money had been borrowed.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, that the Secretary to the Treasury having alluded to the effect of the Act of 1869, he would state that, to some extent, he agreed with him. The Act certainly contemplated that, in so far as Deptford Market took away cattle from Islington, some part of the expenses of the latter ought fairly to fall on Deptford. But he did not recollect that Deptford was to be charged with any loss on Islington Market which was not occasioned by diversion of trade to Deptford. He certainly did not think that the City were entitled to be put in a better position now than they were in 1869. In that year, Parliament would have said, if the City had made a loss on the Islington Market, they were sorry for it, but it was not their business to recoup the City. Therefore, the two markets could not be considered as so joined together that it was the business of Parliament to keep up high charges at Deptford in order to pay the loss at Islington. It was said that the profit upon Deptford last year was £17,000, against which it was claimed to set-off a loss at Islington of £9,000. He did not know how much of that loss was made up of the old loss at Islington, with which the House had nothing to do, or whether it was actually owing to animals going to Deptford rather than to Islington. His hon. Friend opposite had assumed that the loss was owing entirely to the diversion of the traffic. But assuming that to be correct, there was still the fact that there was a profit last year of £8,000. He did not know that the profit of one year was a sufficient basis upon which to reduce tolls at Deptford; but he should like to know from the Secretary to the Treasury when he said that there was a power to revise the charges, in whom that power rested? If there were any sort of power outside the City to revise the tolls, he would advise his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea to be content with the discussion, and to wait one or two years longer to see whether the profits derived from the market would make a strong case for applying to this outside authority.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON understood that the charges were levied at Deptford, under the Deptford Market Act, by means of a Provisional Order, and it only required attention to be drawn to the fact that the revenue exceeded the expenditure in order that the tolls should be reduced. [Mr. W. E. Forster: By whom?] He (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) was not for the moment prepared to say in whom the power rested; but it was derived under the Deptford Market Act. The 41st clause gave power to the Privy Council to obtain such information from the local authority as it might require. Under that clause, the Government would be enabled to ask for and obtain annual returns from the local authority under the Act; and it would be proper, directly the amount of receipts was in excess of the expenditure, to reduce the tolls. It had been, over and over again, stated by Mr. Rudkin to the Committee that the City was willing to reduce the tolls so soon as it was self-evident that the receipts were in excess of the working expenditure.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE observed, that, as this Schedule referred only to the Islington Market, he would not be in Order in discussing the case of Deptford at any length. He could find no provision in the Bill varying the provisions of the present law. So far as he could see, there was at the present moment a statutory obligation to impose tolls of a certain amount, and he could not find that there were any means whatever of modifying them. Still, as the case of Deptford was the stronger one, and the present Schedule referred only to Islington, he was disposed to withdraw his Amendment, and to raise it again on the Schedule affecting Deptford.

The First Schedule (*Enactments repealed*); and the Second Schedule (*Local Authorities in England*) *agreed to.*

The Third Schedule (*Pleuro-Pneumonia*).

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON moved to omit, and insert in lieu thereof, as the Third Schedule, the following:—

Pleuro-pneumonia.

"1. Cattle are not to be moved into, or out of, a place infected with pleuro-pneumonia, except where, as regards movement into such a place, the cattle are affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and except in such other cases as the Privy Council think fit from time to time by General Order to accept.

"2. In the cases so excepted by Order cattle may be moved into or out of an infected place on conditions prescribed by General or Special Order of Council, and not otherwise.

"3. Cattle may be moved into, in, or out of such parts of an area infected with pleuro-pneumonia as are not comprised in a place infected with pleuro-pneumonia, by licence of the local authority, granted on conditions prescribed by General Order of Council, and not otherwise.

"4. Nothing in this Schedule restricts movements of cattle in a place infected with pleuro-pneumonia.

"5. No market, fair, exhibition, or sale of cattle is to be held in an area infected with pleuro-pneumonia, except by licence of the Privy Council, granted for the particular market, fair, exhibition, or sale."

MR. SYNAN thought it impossible to conclude the discussion at that hour, and would move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Synan.*)

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that if the hon. Member was anxious to report Progress, he would not object; but he had perfectly made up his mind to leave the provisions as they now stood. He believed that the Amendment he had proposed would entirely meet the object which the hon. Member had in view. What he understood him to be anxious to obtain was that there should be distinct notice given in case of any fair or market being stopped by Order of the Privy Council. All that the local authorities had to do was to inform the Privy Council of a district being affected; and they would, under Clauses 18 and 22, have power to form an area, within which markets should be prohibited. It might so happen that in the area surrounding the infected place there might be a market, and it would be necessary for the Privy Council to say whether that market or fair should be stopped. Then it would be provided that any Notice or Order of the Privy Council was to be published by the local authority in the newspapers of the district, and he would go further than that. On Report, he would propose that if there should be any fair or market in the infected area, the Privy Council, when they marked out the area, should give notice what their intentions were as to the fair or market—whether it should be kept open or closed.

MR. SYNAN, interrupting, said, the explanation of the hon. Baronet would have no effect upon him, as, considering the questions could not be discussed then, he should persist in his Motion to report Progress.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

## EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL—[*Lords.*]

(*The Lord Advocate.*)

[BILL 156.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

MR. J. W. BARCLAY objected to the Bill being read a second time at such an hour. It was absolutely necessary that there should be some discussion on the important principles in it, and this discussion should take place on the second reading. He would move the adjourment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. J. W. Barclay.*)

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had suggested early in the evening that the discussion on the Bill should take place on going into Committee; and that being generally assented to by the Scotch Members, he had moved the second reading.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR hoped the hon. Member for Forfarshire would withdraw the Motion for adjournment, and allow the Bill to be read a second time.

Mr. ANDERSON said, it had been agreed by the Scotch Members that the Bill should be read a second time, and hence he hoped the Motion of the hon. Member would be withdrawn.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

## SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT (1875) AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 252.]

(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. P. A. Taylor, Mr. Whitwell.*)

### COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ISAAC moved the following new Clause:—

(Determination of offence in the case of reduced spirits.)

"In determining whether an offence has been committed under section six of the said Act by selling to the prejudice of the purchaser spirits reduced by the admixture with water, regard shall be had not only to the extent of such admixture, but also to the price at which the spirits so reduced are sold."

Clause *brought up*, and read the first time.

Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked the hon. Member for Nottingham to explain the effect of his clause.

Mr. ISAAC said, the clause would permit of the mixture of water with spirit. His object was to prevent, as far as possible, unnecessary prosecutions taking place under the Adulteration of Food Act.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH considered the Amendment a reasonable and proper one.

Mr. COURTNEY objected to the new clause, which struck at the root of the Adulteration Act. They had never allowed price to be pleaded as an excuse for selling an adulterated article. Take the case of coffee; if that was adulterated with chicory it had to be sold as a mixture, and it was no defence to plead that it was sold at a lower price as a justification for adulteration. In the case of this new clause, what was proposed was that spirit and water should be sold as spirits, and that the seller might allege that no injury had been done because the price was reduced.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the effect of the clause would be to prevent anyone saying they were damnified or injured by the mixing of water with spirits after notice, provided the price were reduced proportionally.

Mr. ANDERSON said, the Lord Chief Justice of England had already decided that where notice was given that water was mixed with the spirits, that prevented any charge being laid against the seller. Therefore, he saw no harm in admitting the clause so far as regarded spirits; but he should certainly oppose it in the case of milk.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, as the Lord Chief Justice had so decided, there was no need for the clause.

Mr. DILLWYN said, if a man asked for spirit, he ought to have it; but he would not if the clause were passed.

Mr. WHITWELL thought the clause a perfectly fair one.

Mr. COURTNEY said, the Lord Chief Justice had decided that spirits and water might be sold as such, and this was, of course, done every day; but publicans were not now permitted to sell a bottle of spirits which was diluted with water as spirits. But the effect of the clause would be to admit it, and, therefore, it struck at the very root of the Adulteration Act.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 29; Noes 8: Majority 21.—(Div. List, No. 247.)

**Mr. ANDERSON** said, in order to meet objections which had been made by hon. Members to the clause, he would, on Report, with the consent of the hon. Member for Nottingham (Mr. Isaac), introduce a slight change to the effect that the clause should apply where notice of such mixture had been given.

**Mr. ISAAC** said, he would agree to the Amendment.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

## WAYS AND MEANS.

### CONSOLIDATED FUND (NO. 4) BILL.

Resolution [July 29] *reported,* and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time.

### MARRIAGES (FIJI) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Bill to remove doubts as to the validity of certain Marriages solemnised in the islands of Fiji prior to their erection into a British Colony, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 285.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

### *Wednesday,* 31*st July,* 1878.

Their Lordships met for the despatch of Judicial Business.

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

### *Wednesday,* 31*st July,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—Parliamentary Reporting [No. 327]; Gold and Silver (Hall Marking) [No. 328]; Watch Cases Hall Marking.

Public Bills—*Ordered*—*First Reading*—Metropolitan Commons * [287].

*Second Reading*—Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) * [271]; Consolidated Fund (No. 4) *; Disqualification of Medical Relief Removal * [282].

*Committee*—Bishoprics [197], *debate adjourned.*

*Committee—Report*—Contagious Diseases (Animals) [204-286]; Prison (Officers' Superannuation) * [269]; Statute Law Revision (Ireland) * [122].

*Considered as amended*—British Museum (Transfer of Collection) * [236].

*Considered as amended—Third Reading*—Elders Widows' Fund * [226], and *passed.*

*Third Reading*—Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) [277]; Prisons Authorities Act (1874) Amendment * [246], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn*—Wormwood Scrubs Regulation * [243].

## *QUESTION.*

## THE WAR AND INDIA OFFICES.

### QUESTION.

**General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR** asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he intends to move that the entry in the Journal, dated 14th August, 1877, directing the Papers relating to the settlement of large Claims between the War and India Offices to be printed, and to receive a Sessional Number, 419, be cancelled; and, if so, when the often-promised Papers about the large and long-outstanding claims will be made known to Parliament?

**Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON,** in reply, said, he had endeavoured on Monday last to explain the state of things existing in reference to the Correspondence referred to. He then stated that in consequence of the Papers not being completed, it was not thought advisable to present a portion of them to the House. He had, however, presented one Paper with an explanation regarding the subject, and the hon. and gallant Baronet would find in the Appendix to the Report of the Public Accounts Committee a Treasury Minute explaining the whole state of the case as carried out and adopted by the India Office and the War Office, with the sanction of the Treasury.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE (ESTABLISHMENT) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

[BILL 277.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

MR. PLIMSOLL, in moving that the Bill be read a third time that day three months, said, he wished to explain his reason for doing so, and for the vote he had given in favour of the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) the other day. The present was not the first time by several that a measure of this kind had been brought before the House to make provision for a younger Member of the Royal Family. On all previous occasions since he had obtained a seat in that House he had gladly voted with the majority for acceding to Her Majesty's wish; but more than once he had had to defend his vote before a portion of his constituents, who preferred, in the abstract, a Republican form of Government to any other. On those occasions he had contended that, so long as we had a Monarchical Government existing in England, it was fitting the dignity of the nation, as well as the Sovereign, that the Royal State should be maintained in suitable splendour. He had also pointed to Her Majesty's personal character, Her quick and ready sympathy with suffering at all times, as was manifested years ago in the case of the Hartley catastrophe, when she sent a telegram to ascertain the extent of the calamity, and more recently in the case of the Pontypridd miners. But the instances of Her Majesty's great kindness of heart, which he felt deeply and gratefully, were too numerous to refer to in detail. He further said that, under a Constitutional Monarchy like that in this country, in his humble opinion, their property and their lives were more safe than they would be under a Republican form of Government—that, at all events, they were saved by it from long turmoils, the interruptions to industry, the stagnation of trade, and the great and immoral expenditure, which the people of the United States, for example, were subjected to on the expiration of every Presidential term of office. In short, he said that the Monarchical form of Government had all the advantages of a Republican form without any of its disadvantages, and with those reasons he had hitherto succeeded in satisfying at least a majority of his constituents. But the latter and the essential point of his contention was all changed. They were now told on high authority that it was within the Prerogative of the Crown, and not inconsistent with the Constitution, for the Monarch to pledge the resources and the lives of the people to an unlimited extent, not only without the consent of the nation, but even without its knowledge—as in the case of the recent Convention with Turkey. If these portentous claims were Constitutional and within the Prerogative, they were not living under the Constitution which three short months ago he supposed they were; and, in his humble opinion, the Constitution would have to be altered, and the Prerogative curtailed, and that right speedily, as he felt quite sure that the nation would not suffer their substance and their lives to be bargained away by any individual, however illustrious, good, or great. He would never give a vote of any kind in support, directly or indirectly, of the Monarchy until these portentous claims were authoritatively and finally swept away, and the people's consent, by a vote of their Representatives in Parliament, was made an essential condition and precedent to the ratification of all important Treaties. To vote for the third reading of this Bill would undoubtedly tend to support an institution for which those perilous claims were made—claims which, compared with those of Charles I., were trivial; and he should consider himself as betraying his constituents and the people were he to give his vote for the Bill. Her Majesty had no more warmly-attached and loyal subject than himself, or a more enthusiastic admirer of Her many good and gracious acts of kindness. The vote which he gave on Thursday last, and the course which he felt it his duty to take that day, cost him a great effort and gave him great pain. The claims put forward under the name of Prerogative had compelled him to chose between seeming loyalty to the Queen and fidelity to the people, and feeling, in his case, gave way to principle. *Salus populi suprema lex.* He could give no more sincere proof of his attachment to Her person and Throne than the step he had taken; for he believed that these amazing and portentous claims were fraught with danger alike to Her Majesty, to Her successors, and to the people.

MR. BURT, in seconding the Motion, said, he fully agreed in much that had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll). There was nothing which had struck him more forcibly in connection with this Bill than the great haste with which it had been pushed through its various stages. It was introduced at a very late period of the Session, and scarcely any time had been lost in pressing it forward, as though the fate of the Empire depended upon its speedy passage through Parliament. He made no complaint against the Government on this ground. It was true, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated on the occasion of the introduction of the Bill, that he had strictly followed precedent in this matter; but the precedent he (Mr. Burt) regarded as a very bad one; because, whatever the intentions of the Government in making so much haste might be, the result was to prevent due expression of opinion by means of Petitions, or by means of public meetings outside that House. He could not see why the Bill should be pressed forward with such extraordinary speed. He did not think it one of the kind of measures that was likely to meet with great obstruction in the other House of Parliament. There was a very large section of the community among whom there was a growing feeling and objection against these repeated appeals for allowances to Members of the Royal Family. Already a considerable number of Petitions had been presented to the House of Commons against this particular grant. About two years ago, he presented an enormous Petition against any further grants to Members of the Royal Family until full information was afforded on the subject. It bore no less than 103,000 signatures, and he had to call upon the assistance of his hon. Friend the Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) to bring it up to the Table of the House. It asked, as nearly all those Petitions did, for fuller information. It did not positively object to grants of this kind; but it asserted that before they were made, a clear case ought to be made out and the fullest possible information given. Now, he wished to know why this information was not given? Speaking for himself only, he might say there were many pertinent questions put to him on this subject which he could not exactly answer, and he did not know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer would answer them or not. He had been asked whether such a grant was absolutely necessary? Whether, with the present income of the Duke of Connaught, which was somewhere about £15,000 a-year, he could not afford to marry without the addition asked; and, whether, if this additional sum was necessary, Her Majesty the Queen could not afford to help him? Now, these were, in his opinion, very plain and very proper questions; they might be deemed blunt and uncourtier-like, but he did not think they were altogether without pertinence to the subject under the consideration of the House. He, for his own part, should like to have fuller information on the matter. He had listened very attentively to what had been said on the subject by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in moving the original Resolution upon it, and, so far as he understood the right hon. Gentleman, he had not even attempted to make out a case of necessity for the grant. It had been admitted that there were no precedents for it until the present reign. There was a precedent in the case of the Duke of Edinburgh; but those who objected to that grant were perfectly justified in still persisting in their opposition to all grants of the kind. Now, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had dwelt on the amiability and accomplishments of the Royal personages who were about to be united in wedlock, and these compliments he (Mr. Burt) was sure were sincere. He had no reason to doubt that they were well-merited; but he did not see that, beyond being very satisfactory as information to the House and to the country, they had a very direct bearing on the question. If the Royal Duke and his intended bride had been less accomplished and less amiable than they were, he presumed that this demand would still have been made; and even in these degenerate days, and with all the vices that abounded, he should incline to think there was a very large number of amiable and accomplished people who would like very well to be married and have £10,000 a-year added to their incomes; and, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to provide all these persons with that amount, he would find a very heavy strain on his resources, great as they were. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had, indeed, contended that a sort of bargain had been made, or, at least, that an understanding had been come to, at the commencement of the present Reign, to the effect that grants of the kind should be made when Members of the Royal Family attained their majority, or were about to be married. Now, if this could be clearly proved, it would at once remove many of his objections. He should still think the system objectionable; but he should not think it becoming or honourable, if such an agreement really had been come to at the commencement of the present Reign, to throw obstacles in the way, and to speak on a delicate question of that sort as he was now doing. But he asserted that there was not a particle of proof brought forward to show that there had ever been any such understanding. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had put the matter on another ground. In the eloquent speech he had delivered upon the subject a few days ago, the right hon. Gentleman had said if they looked at the scale of expenditure which prevailed among the wealthier classes of society and at the large incomes enjoyed, not only by the members of the aristocracy, but by others who had made their way in the world by their own efforts, they would regard what was proposed in this case as a reasonable provision. He (Mr. Burt) would not say that these were considerations which should have no weight; but he thought it was placing the matter on very questionable ground. If a man had made a fortune, and he spent that fortune in show and splendour, they might consider it very foolish, but beyond a mild criticism, no one else had anything to do with the matter; but if an appeal were made to that House and to the country on the ground of that expenditure, they had a right to inquire whether it was worth while to pay the money in that way. But he would not go further in this direction. He would only say that, while it was quite true they had very wealthy people in this country, and from the cheers with which the remark of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) had been received, he was glad to find that there were many Members of that House to whom £15,000 or £25,000 a-year seemed a very moderate sum—apart from all this, while we had undoubtedly a great deal of wealth in the country, they should remember that in many respects the country was a very poor one; while there were many who had large incomes, there was a great number who could scarcely get a bare subsistence, and many others who were now appealing to the Boards of Guardians for relief. But those who were poor had no jealousy or envy of the rich; there was not that passion among them for social equality that was to be found in most other parts of the world; but they must not be surprised if a man who worked hard for 15*s.* or £1 a-week should look at a subject of this sort from a somewhat different standpoint from that of the man who enjoyed an income of £15,000 to £25,000 a-year. He was obliged to the House for listening to him so attentively, because he could not but feel that he had uttered sentiments that were somewhat distasteful to a considerable number of Members on both sides of the House.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Plimsoll.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. EARP said, he desired to state the reasons which compelled him reluctantly to give his vote against the Bill. He shared the opinion of the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) that one was bound on such an occasion as the present to throw sentiment aside. He looked upon the question entirely from an economical point of view, and he should vote against the Bill because he desired to save the people of this country from every penny of unnecessary taxation. If it could be shown that the financial condition of the country was such as to warrant those minute items of expenditure, he, for one, would not hesitate to vote for the Bill. When they considered the altered state of things in this country, as compared with 10 years ago, the House would agree with him that it was their duty, as Representatives of the people, to consider carefully every item of expenditure, however small. During the Administration of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), they had an annual increase of expenditure, which rose during the latter part of his tenure of Office to about £1,000,000 per annum. But during that period there was almost boundless prosperity in the country; no classes were suffering, all industries were flourishing, and people were not too minute in their criticisms of expenditure. Since, however, the accession of the present Government an entirely different state of things had obtained, and the expenditure had risen, not at the rate of £1,000,000, but at the rate of £2,000,000, £3,000,000, and £4,000,000 per annum; and at the present moment it had reached the high total of £80,000,000 per year. He could understand that if the income of the people was commensurate with so large an expenditure, the House would not hesitate to vote freely the amount which was now asked for. But it was contrary to all true principles of government and finance to go on increasing expenditure at a time when the resources and the income of the people were gradually diminishing, and that they were diminishing no one would deny. Hon. Members opposite knew that the agricultural interest was suffering; that the farmers were continually appealing to them to save them from some of their burdens; that farm after farm was being placed in the hands of the landowners; and that many of the poor, overburdened farmers were unable to pay their rents. Further, no one could deny that the classes more immediately affected by trade were suffering to a great extent all through the community. For some years past it had been hoped that the number of paupers was diminishing, and that the cost of each individual pauper was also declining; but in the last two years it had become evident that the tide was turning in the contrary direction, and the country had to face a prospect of increased and increasing pauperism. The struggling middle classes were also suffering severely; and, although it might sound strange, the wealthy classes had been the poorest in the community, because they had not been able to find a means for using their money. For a long time past nothing had been so cheap as money; and, therefore, it was the duty of every Member of that House to look carefully at every item of the expenditure, with a view to putting a check upon it. It could not be denied that if the expenditure went on at its present rate, without corresponding prosperity to meet it, national bankruptcy would become inevitable. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No, no.] The receipts obtained by the Chancellor of the Exchequer were no criterion of the real value of the income of the community at large, because the right hon. Gentleman had only to issue his mandate and the money was forthcoming; but if they dug down deep enough, an extensive substratum of poverty would be found to exist in the country. He should, therefore, feel it his bounden duty, until the wide gap between the resources and the expenditure of the country was bridged over, to oppose every item of extra expenditure that was brought before the House.

MR. NEWDEGATE reminded hon. Members opposite that it was not likely that he, who largely shared the opinions of his old Friend, the late Colonel Sibthorpe, should be inclined to vote for anything that he deemed unduly extravagant, even in support of the Royal Family; because, at the time when the marriage of Her Majesty was contemplated, there was no Radical, no Liberal, no Minister found with the courage to express the opinion that the income intended for His late Royal Highness was too large by half. That task was performed by his late Friend, Colonel Sibthorpe, and he (Mr. Newdegate) assented to the proposal. He was far from blaming hon. Members opposite, who spoke for the working classes, for taking this opportunity to represent to Her Majesty the distress which prevailed in the country. He reminded them, however, that the State Expenditure of the American Government exceeded, in many respects, that of the United Kingdom. He had himself, for many years, represented the feelings of a large body of the working population; for, although he was a county Member, he was senior Member for Birmingham, and he had striven to represent the working classes in the House, and claimed to have some knowledge of their feelings. He believed that the working classes were too reasonable to suppose that it would be possible to graduate allowances to the Royal Family according to the commercial condition of the country. They knew it would be impossible for Her Majesty to discharge her duties if She had a fluctuating income; and the same reasoning applied to Members of the Royal Family.

While he was no exaggerated Royalist, perhaps, no man was more determined in his defence of Parliamentary and Constitutional elements of the Government of this country. He believed that the working classes made allowances for the necessity of maintaining the high position of the Royal Family. He did not think they were the least jealous of that position; but, on the contrary, that they took a pride in it. The feelings which at times had arisen against the aristocracy were not directed against the Crown, because it was fortunate that for more than 200 years the Head of the Royal Family, seated on the Throne by the choice of the people and by law, had identified himself with the people in their anxiety, labours, successes, and prosperity. Instead of being idlers, the Members of the Royal Family filled the position of Commander-in-Chief of the Army, and other positions of great responsibility; and when a connection was formed between the aristocracy and the Royal Family, it was formed with a nobleman who, at that moment, was about to resume the responsibility of the government of one of our greatest Colonies. The Duke of Connaught himself, for whose provision, on his marriage, this grant was intended, was believed to have rendered himself one of the most efficient officers in Her Majesty's Service; so much so that it was hoped that, at some future day, he might fill the position of Commander-in-Chief. He believed the working classes felt that the Royal Family worked with them—that they did not shrink from labour, but accepted every post of labour consistent with their position; and, therefore, the working classes considered them fellows in their labours, and desired, by every means, to maintain them in the position which, as being connected with the Sovereign, they deemed to be so important to the country at large.

Mr. MACDONALD, while professing loyalty to the Crown, and high respect for its Wearer, opposed this grant, because he believed Her Majesty had, in the Civil List and otherwise, a sufficient sum to maintain Her Family, without coming to Parliament time after time for grants in order to enable them to live. In his opinion, it was degrading to the Royal Family to be obliged to come there and solicit sums of money from the taxpayers of the country on the marriage or majority of one of their number. His experience of the working classes might not be equal to that of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate); but, so far as he knew the feelings of the working classes, they were totally different from that which had been represented by the hon. Member. There was no question which was so freely and thoroughly discussed by the working classes as that of the continual demands which were made upon the country to maintain Members of the Royal Family apart from the heavy Civil List of Her Majesty. He hoped this would be the last grant of the kind, for he believed they were sapping the foundations of the Throne. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that there was a compact between the Crown and Parliament at the beginning of this Reign. He should like to know, when, where, and by whom this compact was made? They ought also to be told the value of the Crown Lands given up at the time—all the items to boot. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) said the other day that it was much better to come time after time for these grants than to have to ask for Votes to pay debts. No one in that House could have a higher respect for the right hon. Gentleman, yet it seemed to him (Mr. Macdonald) that there was not a whit of difference between coming to get money to pay debts before they were contracted and coming to get money after the debts were contracted. He ventured to say that if application were made to Parliament to pay the debts of any Member of the Royal Family, it would cause a tumult in the country which they would not cease to hear of for a long time. In a gush of Irish loyalty—coming as it did from the Home Rule Members from that country—that quite delighted him, they were told the other night by an hon. Member from Ireland that they ought to agree to the grant because the Duke of Connaught gave freely whenever he was applied to for any object. He expected next to hear a claim made on his behalf because he was a good joker, or a prince of smokers, or an enemy to the Sunday Closing Bill, or a drinker of potheen. All these arguments were frivolous—it was the principle of it that was wrong. The time for proposing this grant was inopportune in the highest degree, as the condition of the working classes was, in many parts of the country, very bad. He ventured to say that thousands and tens of thousands were struggling to eke out a subsistence on less than 2*d.* a-day per head for each member of their families, and in such circumstances to ask for £10,000 a-year for a Member of the Royal Family was out of place. America had been mentioned. He knew something of America, and he did not believe that the Civil servants there were paid such high salaries as were paid in this country. It was simply nonsense to say so.

COLONEL NORTH said, he had been long enough a Member of that House to have been present on every occasion when Her Majesty had been graciously pleased to ask that House to enable Her to provide for her Royal children, either when they came of age or on entering upon matrimonial life, and he recollected that on all these occasions there were some half-dozen Members who considered it their duty to oppose the Vote, and thus prevent their brother Members doing that which would have been most grateful to their feelings—namely, to return an unanimous Address to the Gracious Message of Her Majesty. On the present occasion the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) had thought it his duty not only to oppose the Vote, but to move an Amendment which, in his humble opinion, was very little short of an affront to the Queen. The object of the Amendment was simply to adjourn the consideration of the Bill *sine die.*

MR. PLIMSOLL said, he knew of no other means to oppose the Bill than that which he had adopted, and he certainly meant no offence to the Queen.

COLONEL NORTH said, that he entirely dissented from the opinions of the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald). He certainly might have some acquaintance with the working classes of the country; but he (Colonel North) believed there was no class, from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest, who were not delighted to avail themselves of opportunities like the present, to evince to Her Majesty and the Royal Family the love and affection in which they were held by the whole country. He hoped this might not be made an exception to the rule; but that the House would return an almost unanimous response to the Gracious Message in which Her Majesty had asked the House to provide for one of her sons, who was most deserving the respect and confidence of the country.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, that it could not be denied that the Queen had at the commencement of Her Reign made over to the State a much greater income than that bestowed in Parliament, including therewith the present claim. The fact of the compact made between the Sovereign and Parliament at the beginning of the Reign was clear. An Act was passed which vested all the hereditary estates of the Crown in Parliament. That Act was the 1 & 2 *Vict.* c. 2, and the Preamble covered the entire case, on which this application was justified. By the Act Her Majesty unreservedly placed all the Crown property in trust for the nation, in return for grants by Parliament to support the honour and dignity of the Crown, accepting only what was needful for the time. He was not in the habit of dilating upon a case which must be taken to be proved; and, therefore, he would ask hon. Members, after what he had shown them, to withdraw all opposition to this Bill.

MR. E. JENKINS said, he should not have advised this opposition to the third reading if he had been consulted on the matter, and he complained that the Amendment had been brought forward in the manner in which it had been done. He wished to explain why he thought it was his duty to vote with his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) on Thursday last. There was some misunderstanding on the subject, and he thought the motives which had been imputed to them by the hon. and gallant Member for Oxfordshire (Colonel North)—such as a desire to insult the Sovereign — were little calculated to enhance the character of Parliamentary discussions. On former occasions, Leaders on both sides notorious for their loyalty had, in the most open and candid manner, discussed these Votes. Why, then, should hostility to the Crown be imputed to those Members who did the same thing now? He heard the other day of a Tory, and a man of position, saying that all those who opposed this Vote were Republicans, and ought to be hung. When one found such notions entertained at the present day by the Tory Party, who were straining the Prerogatives of the Crown to the utmost extreme, one almost felt that he was wearing his head at the will of the Chief Adviser of the Crown. Coming to the serious question before the House, he hoped neither it nor the Government would overlook the real significance of this debate. He did not think anything had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) to afford the Crown the least justification for a feeling of resentment. The question before them was, whether grants of public money were not being repeatedly asked without a due and clear statement of the necessity for them? The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the Royal Family had a less revenue now than in King William IV.'s Reign; but that was incorrect. There was some excitement in the country, and they could not ignore the fact, and those who knew the working classes could say that it was deeply and largely entertained. They must discuss the question as a matter of business between the Crown and the people, and the feeling abroad was this—that the amount granted for the expenditure of the Crown was not wholly expended, and that it would be quite possible for the Crown, out of the revenues that were at this moment being saved and put away, to provide sufficient for the Royal Family. He did not say this was his opinion; but he only pointed out that the manner in which these grants were asked for, without presenting the state of accounts between the Crown and the people, led to these suspicions outside. The Government maintained silence, and the Crown refused information, and so they were placed in the unfortunate position of having to oppose what, otherwise, they would cheerfully and unanimously grant. He would be glad if it were shown that the grant to the Prince of Wales, who had so much of the burdens of the State thrown upon his shoulders, ought to be enhanced to maintain the dignity of his position. He could conceive nothing more injurious or destructive of the true dignity of the Crown than the argument which had been put forward, that it was necessary that the Royal Princes should be placed in a position to hold their own alongside of wealthy Peers. In this country, we looked to the Crown to set an example of simplicity of life, and it was not for the House of Commons to give to Royal Princes a means of maintaining an unhealthy magnificence. The hon. Member for Derby had spoken of the exercise of the Prerogative, and he said he would not be a party to any more of these Votes for the Royal Family, so long as the Prerogative was exercised as it had been lately. That statement was illogical, but a significant one, and it was not unimportant to be considered by the Government. It could not be surprising that the people should discuss these matters. The Government had found worthy occupation for Members of the Royal Family, and nothing would be more popular than the appointment lately made to the Governorship of the Dominion of Canada. If these appointments could be more frequently made, there would be less necessity for resorting to Parliament for these grants of money.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he would not detain the House for more than a few minutes. He regretted that his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) had thought it necessary to move this Amendment, and he also regretted the way in which the hon. and gallant Member for Oxfordshire (Colonel North) had spoken of the Amendment. There could be no doubt that any hon. Gentleman who had an objection to this grant was perfectly at liberty to raise it, and past Parliamentary history showed that similar objections had often been raised by Gentlemen whose good taste and loyalty could not be questioned. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) had spoken of his knowledge of the feelings of the working classes on this subject, and the hon. Members for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) and Morpeth (Mr. Burt) had also spoken of their knowledge of those feelings. He thought it was possible to have too much of hon. Members speaking of their knowledge of the feelings of the working classes. Those classes were undoubtedly the great mass of the people; but it had always struck him—without endeavouring to cast any reflection upon any hon. Member on either side—that there could scarcely be any greater presumption than in a man getting up and saying that he spoke on behalf of the working classes. Representing, as he did, a constituency numbering some 20,000 or 30,000 electors, an enormous majority of whom were working men, he did not pretend for a moment to speak as the exponent of the feelings of the working classes on this question; but, as it was quite possible that this question might be raised at his next meeting with his constituents, he would not allow the subject to pass without expressing his views with regard to it, which he believed would meet with the approval of his constituents. His experience went to show that there was a strong feeling in the country among all classes—and quite as much among the working classes as any other—that, upon the whole, our ancient Monarchy was an institution which should be kept up—that there was no desire to change it for Republicanism—or for what he believed to be a far greater danger—Imperialism. With that feeling there was also another feeling which naturally belonged to a generous and sensible people—namely, that if we were to have a Monarch, that Monarch should be maintained in a position suitable to his rank. It would not be at all difficult to convince his constituents, although they might have heard something to the contrary, that the Civil List, or the allowance to the Queen and the Members of the Royal Family was small, as regarded its weight upon the people, compared with that which was allowed to the Monarchs of other great countries; that it was small as compared with that of former Kings and Queens of this country, with the exception of the particular case of William IV.; and that it was small in comparison with the wealth of, and the scale of living, in this country. The present distress that existed had been alluded to. The House was quite aware of it, and of the necessity of economy; but surely his hon. Friend could not suppose that this sum which they were voting could have the most infinitesimal effect upon the means of individual taxpayers? It would be playing with words and facts to say that the present commercial depression was a reason why the sum now asked for should not be granted, if there were other reasons for granting it. With regard to the arrangement that had been come to when Her Most Gracious Majesty came to the Throne, some 40 years ago, he was not sure whether he should give it his assent if it were now to be proposed for the first time; for he doubted whether the best thing to do was to be constantly coming to Parliament for grants for the younger children of the Royal Family, and he was not perfectly sure whether he should agree with his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich upon the point. At the same time, the agreement had been entered into, and in upholding it he believed that hon. Members would have the support of their constituents. Judging from the analogy of past Reigns, he thought that if it were not intended that an additional grant should be made when the members of the Royal Family married, the original grant to them should be larger. It, therefore, appeared to him, that as honest men they were bound to fulfil the contract that had been entered into with Her Majesty at the commencement of Her Reign; and, therefore, he should support the third reading of the Bill.

MR. SERJEANT SPINKS, speaking as the Representative of a very large working-class constituency, which had as much love for economy as any constituency of the Kingdom, and would deprecate most strongly any improper or extravagant expenditure, asserted with confidence; that during the many years he had been acquainted with them he had never heard from any of the Conservative working men of Oldham a single objection to these grants being made for the support of the Royal Family. Though these might be times of some distress to many of them, he was satisfied that they would most cheerfully contribute their mite to the support of the Royal Family, for which they entertained the most loyal and affectionate feelings; and therefore he should vote for the third reading of the Bill, believing that in doing so he should be best representing their feelings and his own.

MR. RATHBONE desired to state why he voted most cordially for the Bill. The hon. Member for Dundee had said that he looked to the Queen and Her Family for examples of careful and frugal life, and it was because they had not looked in vain to the Queen for that example that he was quite prepared to support this grant. He thought it was mainly due to the admirable example of a correct and virtuous life and of a frugal household which the Queen and Prince Consort had set, that this country owed its exemption from a great amount of demoralization and excess of luxury, and all those other evils that arose from an exuberant prosperity. Beyond that, the nation owed a deep debt of gratitude to the Queen for the Constitutional way in which She had carried on Her Government.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he understood that the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll), and the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt), repudiated having spoken as especially representing working men. They considered that they represented the opinions of the general community as much as other hon. Members, and this question concerned the whole community. For himself, he should have been satisfied to let the matter rest where it stood after the able speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke); but as it had seemed good to the hon. Member for Derby again to raise the question, it would be cowardly in him not to give a vote upon it, and he should, therefore, support the Motion for the rejection of the Bill. These were not pleasant subjects for the House to deal with; but public duty must be paramount, and personal feelings put aside, when questions of this kind came up. It was admitted that there were no precedents for these grants until the present Reign—therefore, the question was entirely one of expediency. Was it well for the public that these grants of public money should be made? He was surprised that the hon. and gallant Member for Oxfordshire (Colonel North) should get up and say that when a Member of that House deemed it his duty to object to a grant of public money, he was offering an affront to the Queen. Those who would vote for the Amendment were just as loyal as the hon. and gallant Member himself. Loyalty did not consist in voting large sums of money whenever the Crown asked for them. Loyalty consisted in voting money in a wise manner, and in passing legislation which would make the people happy and contented; for it was upon the contentment and happiness of the people that the real security of the Crown depended. He objected to this Vote on the very simple ground that no public money should be voted except for public services. He did not know what public services the Duke of Connaught had yet rendered, although he might yet do many in the career that lay before him. Some seven years ago, Parliament had been called upon to vote him £15,000 per annum for his maintenance because he had been good enough to come of age; and they were now asked to vote him £10,000 a-year in addition, because he was going to be good enough to marry. It must not be supposed that those who objected to this Vote objected to the splendour of the Crown being maintained. The right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) was fighting the air when he made that enthusiastic speech just now in favour of voting £10,000 a-year for this Royal Prince. Nobody was attacking the Monarchy; all that they said was that they believed enough money had been voted to maintain the splendour of the Crown, and they believed it the more because the Government refused to give the House information about it when it was asked for by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke). He did not wish it to be supposed that he opposed the Vote on exactly the same ground as the hon. Member for Derby. He did not believe that the working men were in a ferment on this question. They were not sufficiently good politicians to work themselves up into a ferment on this subject. In fact, he had been astonished and grieved at the manner in which they had sat quiet in the face of the mad and mischievous expenditure of the present Government, and he should be glad to see the extra turn of the screw given that would bring about a radical re-action, and cause this senseless waste of money to be put a stop to. He had no sympathy with hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who went about the country to Liberal meetings—it might be at Bradford—and talked very largely about retrenchment of the Revenue, and then came to that House and made enthusiastic speeches in favour of voting £10,000 a-year to a young man because he was going to get married. This system might extend to the children and grandchildren of the Sovereign, and their children and their children's children would have to vote enormous sums for this purpose. Why could not the opponents of the grant have one or two Tories to vote with them on this occasion? The hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Mellor) was, he believed, the only economical Tory in the Kingdom. There was a time when the Tories could look at this matter in a different light from that in which they now viewed it. Did the House remember how, when a Vote was proposed by a Liberal Government for the late Prince Albert, the whole Tory Party came down almost to a man and voted to cut down the sum voted to that Prince? There was nothing said then about it being an affront to the Throne. He thought that the argument of which the right hon. Member for Bradford thought so little—namely, the distressed state of trade and commerce in this country—had something to do with the question, and he (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) would not be a party at such a period to voting such a grant as was now asked for.

MR. MUNTZ said, he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give the House some precedent besides the Vote for the Duke of Edinburgh. Up to that time the rule had been only to make provision for the Heir Apparent. If the House was to make provision for, and encourage, the marriage of all the younger children of Royalty, it would be bound to provide for the children of those marriages; and that was the difficulty pointed out nearly a century ago, when the discussion took place as to the marriage of a younger son of the Monarch. If this grant were made, they would have to make another for the next son of Her Majesty, and so they would go on *ad infinitum*, and it was impossible to see where it would end. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give some precedent to justify this Vote.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I have been unwilling to interpose earlier in this debate, because I feel most entirely that this is a question upon which it is perfectly right and legitimate that the House should freely express its opinion; and I would go further, and say that I think it is desirable that the House should do so, and that it should not be allowed to go forth to the people that we have made a proposal of this sort, and, as it were, huddled it through without any consideration or discussion, and that we voted away the money of the people without fairly considering what the grounds were upon which the proposal is made. Now, we had, the other day, a full discussion on the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and the general grounds upon which we made this proposal were then explained. Today, we have had the matter raised again, and several objections have been raised to the proposal which has been made. Objections were taken to it on grounds which were not in the mind of the hon. Member for Chelsea, and on grounds on which, I venture to think, this House would hardly be disposed to proceed. I hardly think that the House will be disposed to act on the ground which was taken by the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) when he moved the rejection of the Bill—namely, that he considered that the Prerogative of the Crown was being advanced further than formerly. I do not think the House would consider that a ground to justify opposition to such a proposal as this; and I observe that the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), while sharing the jealousy of what he regarded as a stretch of the Prerogative of the Crown, fairly stated that that was no cogent reason for objecting to this Vote. Then the hon. Member for Newark (Mr. Earp) introduced a new topic into the consideration of the question—namely, the general financial condition of the country, and the supposed extravagance of the present Government. That, of course, is a very important question, and it is one which might, at the proper time, be made the subject of discussion; but I hardly think that counts as a matter which can be relied upon as a reason for objecting to this Vote. The truth is that, in considering this subject, we ought really to look to the nature of the contract which has been made with the Crown, and to the reasonableness and suitability of this proposal in connection with that contract. The hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) asked—"What is this contract of which we hear, and where is the evidence? When, where, and by whom was it made, and where is it recorded?" The hon. Member's questions were answered by the hon. Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna), who stated that the contract was to be found in the Preamble of the Act passed at the commencement of the Reign of Her present Majesty, in which it was recorded that Her Majesty, being entitled to certain hereditary estates and revenues, had placed them unreservedly at the disposal of the public; and that, in return for that surrender, She was granted an annual sum of £385,000, to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund, for the support of the Royal Household. But the question was, what was the nature of the bargain which was made when that sum of £385,000 per annum was allotted to Her Majesty? Was it intended that the sum should cover all future expenses with regard to the Royal Family, and that after that time no further allowance should be made for their support? In former times, the Civil List was based on a different arrangement from that which now prevails. In the early days of the Civil List there were large hereditary revenues declared to be in possession of the Crown, and Votes were made to support the Civil List, and out of that Civil List the Sovereign made certain payments. The Judges and Ambassadors were paid, and other charges met out of it, which have since been taken off the hands of the Sovereign and placed upon the Votes of Parliament. Under these circumstances, the annuities and pensions which were granted, either to the Royal Family or to other persons, fell upon the Civil List; and, from time to time, the Parliament made grants in aid of the Civil List, in order to enable the Crown to keep up those pensions and annuities. Under that system, certain grants were made which it is unnecessary for us to go into, because matters are now on a different footing, and we had much better fix our attention on what has taken place during the present Reign. It was, as we were reminded the other day, under the Reign of William IV. that the old system was revised, and the revision was complete at the beginning of the Reign of Her present Majesty. Did that exclude further applications for grants? Why, within two or three years after the settlement, the first application was made for a grant of an annuity to the Prince Consort. According to the theory of the hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and others, that was altogether a wrong application. ["No!"] Either the original £385,000 given to the Queen in exchange for the hereditary revenues at the beginning of the Reign was intended to support the household, dignity, and state of Her Majesty under all the circumstances of Her Reign, or it was not. If it was a bargain, once and for all, and was never to be altered, there was no justification for an application for a grant on Her Majesty's marriage; but if it was otherwise, the circumstances changing, the grant was proposed in accordance with what was understood to be a reasonable arrangement. I think, if the hon. Baronet will look back to the circumstances under which the Queen's Civil List was settled, he will find that references being made to the fact that a lower establishment was proposed for Her Majesty lower than Her Predecessor, notice was taken that She was in a different position, because She was at that time unmarried. When the marriage took place, the proposal was made by the Government of the day to settle an annuity of £50,000 a-year on the Queen's husband. The principle was not challenged. It was admitted that there ought to be some addition, but the question arose whether the addition proposed was or was not excessive. On that there were differences of opinion, and some statesmen of great note, and amongst others Sir Robert Peel, took a leading part in recommending a smaller grant. I will merely call the attention of the House to a passage in Sir Robert Peel's speech at the time, which is as follows:—

> "He thought that £30,000 during the life of Her Majesty, by way of a privy purse, would be a just and a liberal grant. He thought, also, that £30,000 to Prince Albert, in case of his surviving Her Majesty, and there being no issue, would be a just and liberal provision. But he thought, that if Prince Albert survived Her Majesty, and that there were heirs to the Crown, the grant ought to be £50,000; but then he also said, that if Prince Albert were the father of a numerous family, and expenses thus fell upon the Prince, he for one would vote that which would be becoming to the father of the Royal family."—[3 *Hansard*, li. 627.]

And, in a subsequent speech, Sir Robert Peel said—

> "I cordially supported the proposition of my hon. and gallant Friend for reducing the grant to Prince Albert from £50,000 to £30,000; not, however, from any mistrust, or a want of confidence in Prince Albert, but because, on looking at the whole of the circumstances of the case, I thought £30,000 the proper sum to be allowed. I stated, then, that £30,000 was a sufficient sum to give to Prince Albert in the event of the death of Her Majesty, an event which I, in common with all Her Majesty's subjects,

should deeply deplore—an event which I do not and will not anticipate—and I still am of the opinion that such a sum is a reasonable allowance to make in case Prince Albert should survive Her Majesty. I went, however, further than this, and I said, that, in case Prince Albert should become the father of a family, then I thought £30,000 would be an inadequate allowance, and that I had no doubt, in such a case, the House would be ready to consider the propriety of voting an addition to the £30,000."—[*Ibid.*, 1106.]

Nothing can be clearer from that passage, and from the general tone of the debate that then took place, than that the House, at the time it arrived at the settlement at the beginning of Her Majesty's Reign, took into consideration the whole state of the case, and that the £385,000 per annum they granted was not intended to cover the whole expenses of the Royal Family, and that it thought that it was reasonable that additional grants, rendered necessary by the changes in that Family, should be made from time to time. If that is once admitted, it cannot be said that the grant now asked for is of an extravagant or of an unreasonable character. The present case is one precisely similar to that of the grant to the Duke of Edinburgh, and the reasons which prevailed then apply equally now. It is unnecessary to argue over and over again these points. I simply wish to point out that the arrangement made in the beginning of the Reign was one much in favour of the public, because the sum granted to Her Majesty was a fixed sum, and the revenues which she surrendered were increasing revenues. The Crown Lands now alone produce more than £385,000, and other branches of the hereditary revenue would have also increased considerably if they had not in some cases, for the advantage of the public, been surrendered and done away with. In these circumstances, I think we are asking what is fair and reasonable; and it is, I am sure, inconsistent with and contrary to the feelings of the large majority of the country that it should be objected to. I quite admit to the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt) that to persons who live on a very small income any of these sums appear to be large; but when you take into consideration the circumstances of those for whom they are granted—the society in which they live, the position they are expected to maintain, and the duties they are expected to perform—I do not think the sums asked for are unreasonable. I must take exception to the very extraordinary doctrine which has been laid down by the hon. Member (Mr. Macdonald), that there is no difference between asking for money for debts which have been contracted, and asking for money in order to make reasonable allowances which will render it unnecessary for these persons to contract debts. There is all the difference in the world; and if no better reason than that could be offered, there would be no difficulty in disposing of the matter. I trust that the House will consent to read the Bill a third time.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should not have taken part in the debate had it not been for the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman had given no direct answer to the question put by the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), who had asked him, with reference to a statement made by him the other day, that the provision made for the Queen was less than that made for the late Sovereign William IV., the grounds upon which he had made that statement? The Chancellor of the Exchequer had, however, alluded to the matter in passing, and had said that the provision was less. Now, Mr. Goulburn, who had been Chancellor of the Exchequer, had, in the debate with regard to the Prince Consort's grant, compared the two Civil Lists, and he pointed out that from the Civil List of William IV. there must be deducted pensions amounting to £75,000, and £10,000 secret service money. If to the present Civil List of £385,000 were added the £50,000 then proposed, it would increase the Queen's Civil List £10,000 beyond that of the late King and Queen. But Mr. Goulburn further said there was another £10,000 which the Queen gained by a diminution of charges on the Civil List, and that made the Queen's Civil List £20,000 in excess, which was exactly the amount by which it was proposed to reduce the grant asked for for Prince Albert. There were revenues in the present Reign which did not exist in the late Reign, in addition to the Crown Lands. The Duchy of Lancaster, which was hardly worth anything at the commencement of Her Majesty's Reign, had reached the annual value of £73,000 two years ago.

That one fact alone disposed of all the arguments which had been founded by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) upon the doctrine that the present Civil List was less than that of the late Reign. It was impossible to go into the matter of savings in the Civil List without being misunderstood; and he should, therefore, only say that Lord Brougham called attention to the matter in 1850, in the House of Lords, and he would recommend hon. Members to read the protest which that noble Lord then placed upon record. Every request for information with regard to those savings had been refused; and, whatever might be the proper interpretation of the Civil List Act, as to those savings going to the public or to the Crown, it seemed to be provided by that Act that they should not go to the Crown without the knowledge of Parliament. What he asked was, that not only should the House have placed before it an account of the increase of the Duchy of Lancaster revenues, but that it should have Returns, year by year, of the savings by which the privy purse was increased. Not only had the Crown thus largely increased income, but, by Acts passed in the present Reign, it was empowered to invest its savings in landed property; and here again secrecy had been maintained, and Parliament was not enabled to obtain any account of the amount of these estates. There was an absolute refusal of any information on these subjects. A few years ago these applications for grants always rested upon the question of precedents. The application in the case of the Duke of Edinburgh was based mainly upon the ground of precedent; but in the present instance the right hon. Member for Greenwich had thrown over that ground, and he now relied upon the precedent that he had himself created upon that occasion. It, therefore, became necessary to discuss this grant as a matter of expediency or necessity, and not of pure precedent; and thus it was more than ever important that the House should have laid before it the present position of the relations of the Crown and the public the state of the Civil List, and Returns showing what the expenditure was. The contract which it was said was made at the beginning of the present Reign was not worth very much; for the words used in the Civil List Act, as to the surrender of the Crown Lands, had been constantly used from the time of Queen Anne downwards. Everyone knew that the Crown Lands were State Lands. They had been confiscated over and over again; and if the Crown resumed possession of them to-morrow, it could not deal with them as it could with its private estates at Osborne or Balmoral. They were practically Parliamentary and national estates. If the Civil List Act were looked upon as a contract, it would seem to exclude these applications for grants; but he thought it was fair to assume that in the minds of those who made the arrangement there was the intention of coming to Parliament at a future time for further grants. But there was no intention of coming for such a grant as this, because, there being no precedent for it, if such an intention had existed, it would have been stated; and upon that ground he felt bound to oppose this grant. There was certain to be opposition to any future grant which might be proposed; because the House had been, over and over again, refused, and was still denied, the information which was absolutely necessary in order to enable it to form its opinion upon the character of the grant.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE said, the gifts made for educational and charitable purposes in Ireland by the Duke of Connaught contrasted most favourably with those of the absentee proprietors, amounting, in some cases, to five times as much.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 151; Noes 13: Majority 138.—(Div. List, No. 248.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

## CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 204.]

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 30th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SCHEDULE 3.—PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.

MR. SYNAN said, that the Government had declared that they would transfer to another part of the Bill, with which it was more properly consistent, the Proviso giving power to the Privy Council to prohibit the holding of fairs and markets. He should like the Secretary to the Treasury to explain to the Committee the manner in which he proposed to set the matter right. It was right that the Privy Council should have the power to prohibit the holding of fairs and markets in any particular area. The Privy Council would be much better able to decide on the circumstances of each particular case than the House could do by any general rules. In some cases it would be advisable to stop fairs and markets, and in others not. Under these circumstances, he begged to withdraw the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON wished to say a few words to the Committee with regard to these Schedules. The intention was to give the Privy Council power to declare an area, which was the word used, instead of a district, and had taken the place of a district in the Bill—the Privy Council was to have power to determine whether fairs and markets in an area should be closed by reason of the amount of disease existing therein. It was quite possible that the Privy Council might deem it necessary to prohibit the holding of fairs and markets in an area, although the disease might not be so prevalent in the larger district as it was in some smaller district contained in it. Although he believed the Bill was perfectly explicit, yet it was possible that the local authorities and magistrates might find some conflict between the words of the Schedule and the governing words of Clause 18. He was instructed, by those who had prepared the Bill, that it would be better to amend Clause 18, and the other clauses dealing with foot-and-mouth disease, which was to be brought up on Report, so that it might be distinctly shown on the face of the clauses that when an area was described as infected the Privy Council had power to close fairs and markets therein and prevent an exhibition of animals in that district. What he proposed to do was to omit both Schedules 3 and 4, and that part of the 5th Schedule dealing with fairs and markets, and to insert the provisions in Clauses 18 and 22 when brought up on Report. The words would run to this effect—

> "The Privy Council, on making any Order declaring any area affected with pleuro-pneumonia or extending the limits thereof, shall consider whether it is necessary or expedient to prohibit the holding in that area of any fairs or markets for the sale of any animal, and shall either prohibit the holding of such fairs and markets or permit them to be held on any condition it may think fit."

That clause would make it clear that the prohibition rested with the Privy Council, and would do away with any uncertainty, from the conflict of words in the 18th clause and the Schedule, whether the prohibition rested with the Privy Council or the local authority. At the same time, it would have the effect of causing an area in which fairs and markets had been stopped to be published. The Committee would, therefore, see that the clause would effect the objects in view, and give the Privy Council power to deal with the markets and fairs in an area as necessity might arise.

MR. W. E. FORSTER would suggest that the Schedule should not be struck out until the new clause was inserted in the Bill. If the alteration were made, then the Bill would be left without any regulations at all as to fairs and markets, and so it would remain unless the addition to the 18th clause were made. There could be no objection to leaving the Schedule as it stood, to be struck out, if necessary, on Report.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he proposed to strike out Schedules 3 and 4, and to move the insertion of a new Schedule, embodying the Amendments he had mentioned at the end.

MR. W. E. FORSTER inquired whether he rightly understood the hon. Gentleman to mean that he intended to strike out Schedule 4, and to bring up a new Schedule?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: Yes.

Schedules 3 and 4 *struck out.*

SCHEDULE 5.—FOREIGN ANIMALS.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he proposed to carry out the alteration he had promised the Committee with regard to quarantine. He moved the following Amendments to the Schedule:—

Page 44, line 24, leave out "for dairy or breeding purposes or;" page 44, line 25, after "exhibition," insert "or for other exceptional purposes;" page 45, line 1, leave out from "station" to "thereon," in line 20, and insert "except on conditions prescribed by general or special Order of Council."

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY observed that, as he understood the alterations, they would practically have the effect of preventing store cattle from being brought into the country.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that the Amendments would not prevent animals intended for exhibition or for scientific purposes coming in; but all other store animals were prohibited from coming in except after quarantine inspection and supervision.

Mr. CLARE READ quite understood how store cattle would be affected by the Bill. They could be imported from America and other places from which the Privy Council permitted fat cattle to be landed without slaughter, without other restrictions than the usual 12 hours' quarantine and inspection on landing. But store cattle coming from infected countries would be prohibited entering the country alive, except under the conditions laid down.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that when the Bill was before the Committee on a former occasion objection was taken on the ground that store animals, which were the most likely to introduce disease, were not efficiently excluded. He gathered that it was the almost unanimous opinion of the Committee that the regulations for the admission of store animals after a quarantine of 56 days would prove so restrictive as to be practically useless. Therefore, he had thought it better to limit the power of introduction of store animals and confine it to those intended for exceptional or scientific purposes, leaving a discretion in the Privy Council to decide the application of any person who might desire to import store animals, and to impose such conditions as it thought fit. He believed that the provisions as they now stood would not exclude animals brought over for exhibition or scientific purposes; but would, by their restrictive action, prevent the introduction of animals brought over for dairy and store purposes, which were understood to be the most liable to bring over disease.

Mr. CLARE READ said, that as the Bill was originally drawn there was a long quarantine imposed on all store animals. But there was nothing now in it to prevent a grazier going to Liverpool and buying 20 half-fat animals from America and placing them on his farm.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY observed, that it was easy enough to legislate with regard to store cattle; but it was often utterly impossible to distinguish between fat and store cattle. He did not see why, if fat cattle from foreign countries could be bought and taken inland, store cattle also should not be treated in the same way.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON remarked, that the clause restricting the importation of store beasts would not apply except in the case of the scheduled countries.

Mr. SYNAN said, that all countries had now been placed on a level, and power given to the Privy Council to admit both store and fat cattle from any particular foreign country. In his opinion, the Amendments under consideration were a necessary part of the abolition of quarantine.

Amendments *agreed to.*

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON moved, in page 45, to leave out after line 30, to end of Schedule, and insert as new paragraph—

IV.—Other Foreign Countries.

"In relation to foreign animals, other than those brought from the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, if, and as long as, from time to time, the Privy Council are satisfied, with respect to any foreign country, that the laws thereof relating to the importation and exportation of animals, and to the prevention of the introduction or spreading of disease, and the general sanitary condition of animals therein are such as to afford reasonable security against the importation therefrom of diseased animals, then, from time to time, the Privy Council by general or special Order, may allow animals, or any specified kind of animals, brought from that country, to be landed, without being subject, under the provisions of this Schedule to slaughter or to quarantine, and may for that purpose alter or add to those provisions, as the case may require; but every such Order shall forthwith, after the making thereof, if Parliament is then sitting, and, if not, then forthwith after the next meeting of Parliament, be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

He said, that he need not detain the Committee, after the long discussions that had taken place, by going at length into this clause. The Amendment was proposed by the Government in order to carry out the changes which they had consented to make in the Bill. He now asked the Committee to adopt the paragraph in the Schedule, as one which would give the Privy Council power to decide whether foreign countries were in such a condition as to permit the introduction of animals from them into this country. In the belief that the paragraph would carry out the views of the Committee as expressed on former occasions, he asked that it might be adopted.

MR. CHARLEY inquired why America was deprived of the privilege of free importation permitted her under the Bill as amended in the House of Lords?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that it was after considerable discussion that the Government was convinced that it would be most satisfactory to prevent the least possibility of doubt with regard to the Most Favoured Nation Clause. Although the Government was quite satisfied that its proposals raised no question as to the infraction of that clause, yet it was quite prepared to meet the views of others, and place the matter beyond question. He would point out to his hon. and learned Friend that it was impossible to deal broadly with the exception taken as to the Most Favoured Nation Clause, and yet to put America in an exceptional position. So long as the Government considered that the Most Favoured Nation Clause was not interfered with, there was some reason for allowing the freedom granted to America; but when a change was made, and all possibility of doubt removed as to that clause, it was obviously impossible to exclude America from the operation of the Bill. Perhaps he might also point out that the very condition that led the Government to omit America from the Bill would influence the Privy Council in acting in the direction desired by the hon. and learned Member. It was quite impossible to make an exception in the case of America if they wished to maintain this clause.

MR. MUNDELLA said, it would be impossible, after the discussion on the Most Favoured Nation Clause, to make America an exception to the rule. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Charley) himself spoke in favour of the Resolution which he (Mr. Mundella) moved on the subject, and yet he now wanted to make America and Canada exceptions to the general rule. He thought all had been done in reference to the Bill which ought to be done. All the substantial points which the Opposition contended for had been attained; and he believed very serious results would follow if any distinction were made between America and other places. After all, America was the most Protectionist country England had to do with. We had Favoured Nation Treaties with most Continental nations; and yet America, above all others, was the most exclusive against the admission of our manufactures. The hon. and learned Member for Salford said that, with respect to its produce, we should give America an exceptional advantage over all nations; but he (Mr. Mundella) said it could not be done. He should be glad to see all cattle coming in free — he should like, if possible, that some should have an advantage over others; but he could not support the doctrine of the hon. and learned Member.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN, as one who had been described as an active opponent of the Bill, was bound to say, with the introduction of this amended clause by the Secretary to the Treasury, he thought the ground for any further opposition had been cut away. For his part, and on the part of those whom he represented, he accepted the concession as a very liberal one on the part of the Government; and believing it would satisfy all reasonable demands—as that was probably the last opportunity he should have of speaking on the Bill—he ventured to say the opposition to it, such as it had been, was fully justified by results. There was no doubt the discussion which had been initiated on that side of the House—and which he, to a certain extent, had endeavoured to carry on—had had the effect of materially changing the character of the Bill. The House would remember that, when first brought forward, the Bill contained clauses by which all foreign fat cattle would have been slaughtered. By the first amended clause numerous exceptions were made, and now all countries were admitted in the same position. It was true there would be a kind of protection against disease under which it would be required to be shown that reasonable precautions had been taken against disease, and under which, at the same time, the discretion allowed to the

Privy Council was so wide, and the direction of that discretion so clearly defined, that he did not think it would be possible for any Privy Council, without pressing the law in a most unfair and improper way, to exclude any country in which the conditions were such as justified the exportation of cattle. Under these circumstances, it appeared to him that if there was to be any change whatever in the law affecting foreign cattle, it could not have been a change less likely to be injurious than that which would ultimately find its place under that Bill. With regard to the regulations of the home trade, he thought it would be admitted, by hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the Bill had been very materially improved in Committee, and much larger powers given to the Privy Council, in order to prevent disease in the home trade. Under these circumstances, he must say, although he regretted on many occasions having had to address the House during the progress of the Bill, he did not think the opposition had been altogether unnecessary.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY desired to raise his protest against the surrender by the Government of nearly everything he considered valuable in the Bill as introduced. Under the Bill as first drawn, in order to prevent disease at home foreign cattle from European countries were to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation. Farmers undertook, or they were understood to be prepared, to submit to very considerable restrictions at home for the purpose of dealing with disease, provided that they had security against the continued importation of disease from abroad. But it seemed to him that the clause now about to be introduced would do away with nearly the whole of this security; because they had it upon the best authority they could have in that House—that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster)—that the new system, in its practical results, would be very little different from the old. He (Mr. J. W. Barclay) asked, whether it was fair, or to be expected, that farmers would submit to increased restrictions and regulations at home without having additional security against the importation of disease from abroad, as they were led to expect under the Bill? He admitted that he did not think the restrictions with regard to home traffic were sufficient, and he tried to make them so. But although they were not sufficient to prevent disease, they would cause farmers a considerable amount of annoyance and trouble. Instead of the measure being an improvement over the existing system of legislation, so far as farmers were concerned, he thought they were placed at a disadvantage. As to the restrictions necessary to cope with home disease, great powers were given to the Privy Council. The House had not had the courage to decree imperative restrictions under the Bill; and he did not see how they could expect the Privy Council to have the courage which the House had not got. For these reasons, he thought the Bill fell very short of the expectations formed of it when introduced into the House; and, so far as he might be a judge, it was no material improvement on the existing system.

Mr. RYLANDS did not rise to defend the Bill from the criticisms of his hon. Friend who had just sat down, nor did he say it was as good a measure as he could have wished to see passed by the House. But he must say he thought the Bill had been very much improved during its passage through Committee. Hon. Gentlemen on the Conservative Benches took this view—believing that there should be every possible restriction on the importation of foreign animals, in order to avoid any risk whatever of spreading disease, they were of opinion that great impediments must be placed in the way of importing food from other countries. On the other side of the question he, and those who acted with him, considered that every possible facility should be given to the importation into this country of foreign food; and they contended that England could afford to run a little risk, with the view of securing a large supply of foreign meat. He was disposed to believe that, with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, there were no such circumstances attending its spread in England as would at all justify the very extreme measures which had been taken under the existing Act by the Privy Council, and which might be taken under the paragraph they were now considering. At present, the regulations under which animals were imported from abroad were these. If any one beast was found to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease, then the whole of those which came in the vessel with the one had to be slaughtered. It was shown, in evidence before the House of Lords Committee, that the effect of that regulation of the Privy Council was to impose very heavy losses upon the importers of foreign animals, and, as he thought, entirely without sufficient justification. He would take but two cases from the Returns which had been made by the Privy Council. It appeared that, in 1877, we imported from Denmark 1,680 animals, and but 11 were found to be diseased. And yet, because these 11 were infected, the whole of the others—healthy beasts—had been slaughtered. Take the case of the Netherlands, as the second instance he would give. In the same year 1,458 diseased animals came from that country, and, in consequence, 133,723 were slaughtered. It appeared to him that what was wanted to be impressed upon the Privy Council was this—that the object of the Bill was not to interfere with the importation of food, but that the arrangements as to foreign imports should be such as to secure reasonable and fair protection to importers as well as to others; but certainly not, on account of a few cases of foot-and-mouth disease, to slaughter all the animals which were healthy, simply because they came in the same ship with the infected ones.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, as he took part in the debate which took place on the subject on a previous occasion, he did not think he need now say more than one or two sentences. The clause proposed by the Secretary to the Treasury contained instructions to the Privy Council as to how they were to use their discretion. He considered the clause would be a great improvement to the Bill. There was great objection, properly raised, to the words which stood in the Bill previously; but those now substituted for them were much more reasonable, and made a considerable difference. All that was wanted was security against the importation of diseased animals. No one wanted anything but that. We did not care whether other countries got disease or not, comparatively, if we did not get that disease into England. He could not say he really thought we had much ground to object to the new clause as it stood. He thought his hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), and those Gentlemen who were acting with him, had no reason to object to it; because if they got reasonable security against the importation of disease, he was sure they did not want more. Therefore, he could not help feeling that, after a good deal of talk, they had arrived at a very fair arrangement in the matter. There was only one proposal that he had to make, and that was in line 8, where it said "the Privy Council, by general or special Order, may." He would move to strike out the word "may," and substitute "shall." He could not imagine that there could be any objection to that Amendment. While the Act would instruct the Privy Council that they were to keep animals out of the country unless there was reasonable security against the importation of disease, there was no one but what would be so much in favour, not merely of free trade, but of trade generally, as to admit that if reasonable security was provided then there ought to be no discretion, but a necessity, to admit animals. He, therefore, moved that the word "may" should be struck out and the word "shall" substituted.

COLONEL MURE agreed with the observations and proposal of his right hon. Friend below him (Mr. W. E. Forster). But he desired to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, what was the object of introducing, in line 8, the words "or any specified kind of animals?" because, if the country was free from disease, all kinds of cattle would be admitted.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the reason for the words was a good one. There might be a reason for admitting cattle, which would not apply to sheep.

MR. GREGORY thought the word "may" had better remain in the clause. If "shall" was inserted, there might be a difficulty in putting a construction on the words "or any specified kind of animals."

MR. NEWDEGATE said, the principle of the Bill was that all cattle being imported should be slaughtered, save those coming from a country which was free from disease. Therefore, he thought the word "shall," slight as the change might appear, would be inconsistent with the principle of the Bill, and inconsistent with the discretion which it was intended to give to the Privy Council. Therefore, he thought the Secretary to the Treasury would do far better to adhere to the words of the clause as he presented it.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON confessed he did not see the alarm which some hon. Gentlemen fancied they observed in this word. He said that for this reason. In his clause discretion was absolutely reserved to the Privy Council. Well, all the alteration which the word suggested by the right hon. Gentleman would do was to see when that discretion had been exercised; and the Privy Council were satisfied that all the protection required by that clause was secured, then they should admit the animals. By allowing the word "may" to remain, he admitted that the Privy Council might be absolutely satisfied as to every security from disease; and yet, from mere capriciousness, they might exercise that further discretion which the word would give them, and not admit animals as the House wished. He, of course, must say that he did not believe the Privy Council would so act; he believed they would absolutely construe the word "may" to mean that they should admit cattle if they were satisfied. Therefore, he did not attach the same importance to the alteration as some hon. Gentlemen who had spoken. He believed it was said by some lawyers that if the word "shall" was introduced, the Privy Council would be obliged to admit animals. But he would point out to the Committee that the Privy Council must be satisfied as to security from disease before they admitted animals, so that such an argument would not apply. He did not for a moment attach any importance to this alteration. In the first place, he believed the word "may" would necessarily be interpreted as meaning "must" under the clause; and, therefore, to change it into "shall," would only have the advantage of getting rid of what he believed was a possibility of the Privy Council acting against their own conviction.

Amendment (*Mr. W. E. Forster*) *agreed to.*

New Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Mr. PELL moved, in page 45, at end of Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson's new paragraph, to add, "together with a statement of the reasons of the Privy Council for making the Order." The hon. Gentleman said, his Amendment was one to which he attached considerable importance, and he hoped the Committee would assent to it. While the Privy Council were laying their Orders before Parliament, they might easily give their reasons for making them. And there was a precedent for what he proposed. Two years ago he succeeded, in Committee on the Education Act (1870) Amendment Bill, in obtaining the insertion of a clause for the dissolution of school boards. But the House also provided that, in cases where such dissolution took place, the Privy Council should report to Parliament the reasons for their assenting to such a course being pursued. Having so good a precedent for his present Amendment, he did not think he was proposing too much when he brought it forward. He was sure his proposal would satisfy the country generally, and that it would make the working of the Act easier and more acceptable to the people.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER hoped the hon. Member would not persist with his Amendment. The hon. Member had quoted, as a precedent for the course which he asked the Committee to adopt, the famous debate of some two years ago with reference to the dissolution of school boards. That proposal was made when the House was much farther from completing the Bill than was the case on the present occasion; and he hoped that at this period of the Session a similar debate would not be raised. If it was, the Committee might rely upon it that very great delay would arise in the passing of the Bill. He thought the object of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire would be gained by the instructions given to the Privy Council, who would have to be satisfied that the laws of foreign countries, and the sanitary condition of their cattle, were such as to justify them in relaxing the restrictions. The Privy Council could only come to decisions on evidence laid before them; and he thought the House should have faith in their judgment, and be content with a Report of the decisions at which they had arrived.

Mr. MUNDELLA hoped the Committee was not to be called upon to enter on a discussion similar to that which arose on the school board regulations, which had been referred to. He could not see that anything could reasonably be required beyond a Report from the Privy Council that they were satisfied, after inquiring into all the circumstances, as to the efficiency of the laws and the sanitary condition of the cattle, and, therefore, recommended a relaxation of the restrictions which had existed in reference to the exportation of cattle from those countries. The hon. Member could not surely wish to raise a debate in both Houses of Parliament on each and every occasion when the Privy Council, in the exercise of the discretion vested in them, determined that the restrictions imposed upon particular countries might be relaxed.

MR. GREGORY could scarcely think that the hon. Member for South Leicestershire wished to have laid on the Table in every case not only the Report of the Privy Council, but the whole of the evidence on which such Report was based. In many cases the evidence would be very voluminous, and the cost of its production great. The Privy Council would be compelled, by their instructions, not to make any Orders until they had carefully examined all the evidence brought before them; and he thought their discretion to make proper and sufficient Orders might be relied upon.

MR. EVANS hoped that, as the Committee were now rapidly approaching the end of the Bill, his hon. Friend would not persist with his Amendment.

MR. PELL said, he did not think the reasons which had been urged against his Amendment were sufficiently strong to induce, or to justify, him in giving way. He laid great stress upon the Privy Council having to regard the laws regulating the exportation of cattle from foreign countries, and also the general sanitary condition of the cattle in those countries; but, surely, it would be better for this country to know whenever there was any change in the laws of any foreign country with respect to the exportation of cattle which would give us at home greater security against the importation of disease. This was almost the only point in the Bill upon which he had received numerous letters from breeders in this country, who were interested in the extremely valuable high-bred stock which was to be found in the English counties; and they all agreed with him in thinking that the proposal he had put upon the Paper was an extremely modest and moderate one. He must admit that he had not received much support at present in the Committee, and he did not know whether that ought to influence him to change his views. He hoped some Member of the Committee would be able to give better reasons against his proposals than he had yet heard.

MR. SYNAN said, that while he approved the proposal of the hon. Member, and should vote for it if it was pressed to a division, he thought it would be unwise to provoke a long discussion on the point; and suggested, for the sake of the Bill as a whole, the withdrawal of the Amendment, which would evidently not receive the support of the Committee.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the object of the clause as it stood, and of the notice to be given to Parliament, was, that in every instance where a change was made notice should be given to Parliament of the fact, in order that Parliament might, in its discretion, take notice of the change proposed. A case might arise in which an hon. Member might have private information as to the laws or sanitary condition of a country which induced him to disagree with the decision of the Privy Council; and in any such case it would be competent for such Member to call the attention of Parliament to the subject, and to insist upon the production of the evidence on which the decision of the Privy Council was based. He thought his hon. Friend would see that by this means he could attain the object at which his Amendment was aimed.

COLONEL KINGSCOTE thought the hon. Baronet had adduced a strong argument in favour of the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire. He thought much time and trouble would be saved if the evidence was laid on the Table in the first instance in each case, instead of compelling hon. Members to take the trouble of moving for it.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that on a previous occasion when this proposal was made he urged that it would be useless to lay these Orders on the Table of the House, because of the difficulty that private Members of the House always found in obtaining opportunities of calling attention to matters of the kind. All that was asked on the present occasion was, that that which was usually given in the Reports of the Veterinary Department should be set forth in the Order which was laid on the Table of the House. The Committee had determined to trust, in a certain degree, to the discretion of the Privy Council; but by requiring the Orders to be laid on the Table, it was clearly meant that the House should consider them. He thought the proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire was a perfectly reasonable one; inasmuch as he thought the Reports of the Veterinary Department would be more advantageously laid on the Table of the House while Parliament was sitting and could take cognizance of them, than that their publication should be delayed until the end of the year, when Parliament was not sitting.

Mr. CLARE READ thought it unlikely that any foreign country would protest against being allowed to export their cattle to England. It seemed, however, to be the will of the Privy Council, and of a majority in the Committee, that only the decisions, and not the reasons, should be reported to the House; and, therefore, although he agreed as to the wisdom of his hon. Friend's proposal, he should advise its withdrawal.

Mr. PELL said that, under the circumstances, he should ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. CLARE READ, who had the following Amendment on the Paper:—In page 45, at end of Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson's new paragraph, add—

"Provided always, That the Privy Council shall by Order provide that vessels used or employed for the importation of foreign animals from the countries exempted for the time being from the provisions of this Schedule as to slaughter and quarantine, shall not during the three months immediately preceding such use or employment, be used or employed for the importation of animals from any other foreign countries not so exempted; and shall prescribe the ports or parts of ports, not being ports or parts of ports at which animals from other foreign countries are landed, whereat animals from countries so exempted may be landed.

"The Privy Council shall also, from time to time by Order, designate the particular markets to which alone cattle from countries so exempted may be sent, and shall make provision for marking such cattle, and all other cattle exhibited in the same market, by clipping the hair from the end of the tail, and any person exhibiting cattle so marked in any other market, fair, exhibition, or sale, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act,"

said, he would not move the first portion of his Amendment, as he was assured the Privy Council would issue some such regulations as he proposed; but he would move that which related to slaughter-markets. His contention was that all foreign cattle coming from the most healthy countries, after undergoing the miseries and privations of a long sea voyage and railway journey, and falling into the lines of great cattle traffic, were liable to contract disease, and should be always regarded with a certain amount of suspicion. He, therefore, contended that if admitted inland these foreign cattle should only go to specified markets, and that they and all the other cattle exhibited in such markets should be marked distinctly, and should not be allowed to be shown in any other market or fair. These cattle should be taken direct to the slaughter-house of the buyer, or if not sold kept in the lairs of the market until the next market day. He knew that this would place a restriction on the movement of more home than foreign cattle; but he did not believe any great harm would result to the owners from such a restriction. Before the Committee of last year he had recommended such a plan for the Metropolitan Market; and Mr. Caird also supported this idea of slaughter-markets. The Committee had recommended that the stock shown in the Islington Market should be killed within the confines of the Metropolis; but the Government had not introduced that recommendation into their Bill. More danger resulted in driving fat cattle from market to market than with so treating store stock. Exertions and privations that would be nothing to a slim, active, young fellow, would be irksome and dangerous to a corpulent old gentleman; so store stock could stand the fatigue of travelling and the exposure in markets better than fat cattle which had been pampered and sheltered from the weather. Moreover, as these foreign cattle came for slaughter, the sooner they were killed the better, and the animals saved the misery, and the community the loss of meat, which resulted from hawking them about from one market to another. There was also this additional danger in allowing fat stock from such great centres as London to be re-marketed. If there was an ill-doing or diseased cow in the Metropolitan or suburban dairies she was sure to be sent to Islington, where the most wretched animal was sure to find a ready buyer. Under his suggestion the Brighton butcher could come to London and buy any cattle he required, and take them to his own slaughter-house; and, although hon. Members laughed at the method of marking which he proposed, he could say the words were taken from an Order in Council, and it was the common practice in the London market. As every market in future would be inspected, he saw no difficulty in carrying out his proposal; but if the Privy Council would intimate their intention to in any way carry out the suggestion, he would willingly withdraw his Resolution in favour of any words which the Secretary to the Treasury, either now or when the Bill was reported, might propose.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that before his hon. Friend put his proposal on the Paper he had himself considered the point very carefully—in fact, when the Bill was being prepared he endeavoured to draw clauses which would have dealt with what he might call this bonding warehouse system with regard to foreign cattle. At first sight there was a great deal to fascinate him in the idea of giving to the Privy Council power to select certain markets throughout the country to which great freedom might be given in reference to the importation of foreign cattle; but there were a great many things that hinged upon the question. If a market in the heart of the country was selected, they must get over the difficulty of conveying the cattle thither in special trucks; and there were so many other difficulties of detail which presented themselves, that very early in the attempt he had to abandon the undertaking. He could not, therefore, think it possible, at any rate at present, to carry out the suggestion of his hon. Friend.

MR. PELL said, he could not see the difficulties which had presented themselves to the mind of the Secretary to the Treasury; but, on the whole, he thought it would be as well not to press the Amendment. At the same time, if it had been adopted, he should have thought a better mode of marking beasts could have been adopted than that of depriving them of their whisks.

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reference to the speech of the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), reminded the Committee that Mr. Caird's suggestion was made when the proposal in the Bill was for compulsory slaughter at the port of debarkation. He admitted that to fix particular markets for the sale of imported cattle would be to benefit those markets; but he thought it would not be to the advantage of trade generally, in that it would be an unreasonable interference with the freedom of trade. He thought it would be admitted that American and Spanish cattle were probably more healthy than our own; and why on earth should the owners of such animals be compelled to send them to particular markets? He concurred with what had been said by the Secretary to the Treasury, as to the almost insuperable difficulties that would present themselves in the event of an attempt being made to carry out the suggestion of the hon. Member for South Norfolk.

Amendment *negatived.*

Schedule, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Schedules 6 and 7 *agreed to.*

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON moved the following new Third Schedule:—

Pleuro-pneumonia.

"1. Cattle are not to be moved into or out of a place infected with pleuro-pneumonia, except where, as regards movement into such a place, the cattle are affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and except in such other cases as the Privy Council think fit from time to time by general Order to except.

"2. In the cases so excepted by Order, cattle may be moved into or out of an infected place, on conditions prescribed by general or special Order of Council, and not otherwise.

"3. Cattle may be moved into, in or out of such parts of an area infected with pleuro-pneumonia as are not comprised in a place infected with pleuro-pneumonia, by licence of the local authority, granted on conditions prescribed by general Order of Council, and not otherwise.

"4. Nothing in this Schedule restricts movement of cattle in a place infected with pleuro-pneumonia.

"5. No market, fair, exhibition, or sale of cattle is to be held in an area infected with pleuro-pneumonia, except by licence of the Privy Council, granted for the particular market, fair, exhibition, or sale."

In moving the Schedule he would only remark that, in accordance with what he had previously stated to the Committee, he reserved to himself the power on the Report to eliminate from it sub-section 5, in order to bring it into the form which he then described.

Schedule read a second time, and *added* to the Bill.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that what he had just stated in reference to the last Schedule would apply equally to the new Schedule, which he now begged to move—

Foot-and-Mouth Disease.

"1. Animals are not to be moved into or out of a place infected with foot-and-mouth disease, except where, as regards movement into such a place, the animals are affected with foot-and-mouth disease, and except in such other cases as the Privy Council think fit from time to time by general Order to accept.

"2. In the cases so excepted by Order, animals may be moved into or out of an infected place, on conditions prescribed by general or special Order of Council, and not otherwise.

"3. Animals may be moved into, in or out of such parts of an area infected with foot-and-mouth disease, as are not comprised in a place infected with foot-and-mouth disease, by licence of the local authority, granted on conditions prescribed by Order of Council, and not otherwise.

"4. Nothing in this Schedule restricts movement of animals in a place infected with foot-and-mouth disease.

"5. No market, fair, exhibition, or sale of animals is to be held in an area infected with foot-and-mouth disease, except by licence of the Privy Council granted for the particular market, fair, exhibition, or sale."

Schedule read a second time, and *added* to the Bill.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked, that they had now reached, he was happy to say, the last Amendment to the Bill in Committee, and in moving that Amendment he would only make this general observation—that although many hon. Members might still be opposed to the measure, yet their special objections to it had been met by the Amendments which had been made in it. The Amendment he had to move was the introduction of a new Schedule with regard to the tolls levied at the foreign cattle market at Deptford. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that on the previous night he moved, and afterwards withdrew, an Amendment to the Schedule with regard to the home market at Islington, which was under the control of the Corporation. The case of the two markets, however, was really inseparably connected, because the Corporation would insist upon mixing up the two accounts. He showed, on a former occasion, that the Corporation of London had been given a most singular monopoly of the markets in the Metropolis. They had not only a monopoly of existing markets, but no other person, or body, or local authority, could erect any market within a radius of seven miles; and, therefore, the Corporation were peculiarly bound to Parliament to carry out the enormous powers which it had given them in a reasonable way. Well, the tolls which the City levied in these cattle markets were not considered reasonable by those who were engaged in the trade. Nor did he think they were reasonable in the interests of the consumer, for they did operate as a tax upon meat, and thus pressed upon the consumer. The evidence which was given before the Select Committee of that House which sat last year was very strong in that direction. He would not take up the time of the Committee by referring to it at any length. It was shown that the Corporation were raising an enormous revenue. Those representing the City were asked whether the charges were inserted only as a maximum, and whether it was contemplated that they might be altered? They replied—"Quite so. The Corporation recognize it as the principle on which they conduct the markets. They do not desire to realize a large revenue from their markets; and when they are paid their outlay and interest they contemplate that the tolls should be reduced as the necessities require." The hon. Baronet who had charge of the Bill had said that he thought there already existed a power to alter the tolls. There was at present no such power. He saw that the hon. Baronet nodded assent; and the Committee might take it, therefore, that there was no power under the existing law to reduce these tolls. That being the case, and as they were Parliamentary tolls, he thought he could show that there was fair ground for their reduction. The City authorities contended that the case had not yet arisen which they contemplated in their reply to the question put by the Select Committee. They said that they had not yet been recouped for their outlay, or paid a fair interest for their money. He was aware that their accounts showed that to be the case; but he disputed the soundness of these accounts. They mixed up the case of the Islington Market with that of the Deptford Market, and there had been a very large loss on the former caused by enormous street improvements which the City had made in connection with that Market. If he wanted to go into this matter at length, he might also point out that there was a great deal to be said as to the character of the City administration of the Markets. He thought he could show that the Corporation did not make that use of the Islington Market which they might, or get the return which they might from the tolls which they at present levied. But however that might be, he had before shown that the revenue which they were now getting from their Deptford Market was of a most enormous character. The City said that during the last few years there had been a loss on the whole; but he asked the Committee to put entirely out of sight the case of a few years. They were dealing with matters as they stood, and were likely to be in the future. There was no reason to suppose that the use made of the Deptford Market was likely to fall off. On the contrary, there was every reason to suppose that it was likely to increase. There was no probability that the cattle coming from such countries as Germany, Schleswig-Holstein, and the Netherlands, would be permitted to go through the country. He had before shown that the tolls which were at present levied at Deptford Market gave the Corporation a revenue so large that last year it amounted to £40,000; and he worked out for the Committee the expenses of the Corporation then, and showed that upon that revenue there must have been a profit of £29,000. The City had prepared an answer to that statement, in which they tried to show that their clear profit in the year was only £17,000. But even £17,000 was a very large sum indeed if there was reason to suppose that it was likely to last in years to come. They had not yet got from the Corporation any statement as to what was the nature of their expenses; but he thought that he had made a very fair estimate of those expenses in the figures which he had placed before the Committee. But however that might be, he called the attention of the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury to this point. He was not urging that the hon. Baronet should put the Schedule of tolls which he was about to move into the Act of Parliament, if he found any other way of meeting the case. He stated, on the previous night, that if the hon. Gentleman liked to propose that the Committee should give him power to reduce the existing tolls, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should be satisfied with that power, and should not ask the Committee to divide upon the question of statutory tolls being placed in the Bill. He begged to move the following Schedule, to follow Schedule 2:—

Schedule 3.

Maximum Charges for Wharfage, and Market Charges at the Deptford Cattle Market.

| | | *s.* | *d.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beasts, per head | .. .. | 2 | 6 |
| Calves ,, | .. .. | 1 | 0 |
| Sheep ,, | .. .. | 0 | 4 |
| Pigs ,, | .. .. | 0 | 4 |

Lairages.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beasts, per head per night | | 0 | 3 |
| Calves ,, | ,, .. | 0 | 2 |
| Sheep ,, | ,, .. | 0 | 0¾ |
| Pigs ,, | ,, .. | 0 | 1 |

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he stated to the Committee on the previous night, after going carefully into this matter, the grounds which led him to believe that the time, at all events, had not arrived when the alteration in the tolls proposed by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea ought to be adopted. He admitted, however, that he was in error when he stated that he thought a power already existed for the alteration of the tolls; and what he would suggest to the Committee would be, that on the Report he should introduce into Clause 37 of the Bill, a clause which dealt with bye-laws of the local authorities by the Privy Council, a power to the following effect:—

"The local authorities shall make a yearly Return to the Privy Council of their receipts and expenditure respecting the markets;"—

that, he would remark, was already done—

> "and the Privy Council on being satisfied, on inquiry, that the tolls may properly be reduced, regard being had to the expense of the markets and any charges secured on the tolls, and to the other circumstances of the case, may require the local authority to submit for approval a new Schedule of tolls; and, on their failure to do so, may prescribe a new Schedule by Order in Council."

That would give the Privy Council all needful power in this matter, and enable them to carry out what he knew the City authorities themselves were anxious to do—namely, that a profit should not be made by them out of the introduction of foreign animals into the country, but that their tolls should practically be so adjusted as really to make their income meet their expenditure. He was not satisfied that such was the case now, or that the reduction would at once take place; but the introduction of such a power as he had suggested into the Bill would get over the difficulty which had been pointed out by the hon. Baronet, and protect the public against large tolls in any case where the circumstances of the case permitted of their being reduced.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER thought that the Secretary to the Treasury had very fairly met the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) did not think it would be quite fair to reduce the charges, from the experience of last year. No doubt, last year showed a very considerable profit; but he was inclined to hope that it might prove to have been an exceptional year, and that it might not be necessary to slaughter so many animals in future years as had been slaughtered last year. The Gentlemen who represented the City could not object to this proposal, as it simply enabled them to be thoroughly heard before the Privy Council; and, in the event of the Privy Council being convinced that they were making a profit, they might take steps to bring down the charges to the point at which it was originally intended they should stand—namely, of not allowing a profit to be made, but of yielding a fair return as interest on the money that had been expended.

Mr. CHARLEY said, he understood the existing tolls to have been fixed by the Privy Council, and the Amendment of the hon. Baronet would be quite contrary to the principle of free trade, and destroy the elasticity which ought to exist in the adjustment of the expenditure and the income of the market. He would just mention one fact in connection with the market, and that was, that since its opening, to the 1st of January last, the amount of expenditure over income had been no less than £80,890.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: I accept the Amendment suggested by the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury.

Mr. Alderman COTTON could assure the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), that anything which the Government thought ought to be done in the interests of the public would be carried out by the Corporation.

Sir ANDREW LUSK denied that the City of London had practically any monopoly of the markets. ["Oh!"] It was so. They had no more monopoly of the markets than that which they possessed with regard to the maintenance of the streets. It was simply a municipal arrangement for the benefit of the entire community, and it conferred no benefit upon any individual. The arrangement which had now been come to was a sensible and good one, and he entirly approved of it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On Question, "That the Bill, as amended, be reported to the House?"

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that before the Bill was reported to the House he should like on his own behalf—and he thought he might say also on behalf of the Government—to thank the Committee for the way in which they had assisted the Government in passing this measure. Its importance fully justified the care and attention which the Committee had bestowed upon it. He believed that the result of their labours would be that the Bill would be found to form a substantial addition to the legislation of the country for protecting them from the diseases which had so long devastated their flocks and herds; and, as such, it would realize the expectations that he himself had formed of it—namely, that, instead of being restrictive as against the trade on which this country was so dependent, it would increase rather than otherwise that trade by the protection which was given against disease.

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 286.]

## BISHOPRICS BILL.—[*Lords.*]

(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[BILL 197.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

MR. J. COWEN, in rising to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable, so long as the Episcopal Church continues to be established by law, to increase the number of Bishops,"

said, the Bill before the House proposed to deal with the internal arrangements of the Established Church. He was not a member of that Church. He did not believe in all the 200 or 300 propositions contained in the Thirty-nine Articles. The rule of a Church by a Hierarchy of Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests, was, in his judgment, despotic in principle and unwise in policy. English Episcopacy in the past had been a persecuting body; and to-day its spirit was narrow, illiberal, and exclusive. Its Representatives in the other House of the Legislature had only been conspicuous there for their hostility alike to political freedom and commercial and social progress. He knew that these principles were not shared by many Members of that House. He was not arguing in their defence. He was merely stating them to show how inconsistent the law was, which required a person entertaining such views to give an opinion upon the mode of management of a Church to which both on points of rule and doctrine he was so strongly opposed. That was the penalty imposed upon Churchmen for maintaining the connection between their communion and the State. If they took State pay, they must submit to State control. The two were reciprocal —object and measure. If they surrendered the power and the prestige that sprang from a Government alliance, they would be freed from such interference; but as long as they retained it, the doctrines and government of their Church would be subjected to the criticism, and, to some extent, the control of Jews as well as of Christians, of adherents of the Presbyterian, the Papal, and the Greek faiths, as well as of Episcopalians. They must endure the comments of all manner of Dissenters, from the orthodox and evangelical Methodist to the latitudinarian Rationalist. He felt the incongruity of such a position so much, that he would have abstained from interfering in the discussion had it not been that the district in which he lived was directly affected by the Bill. It did not propose to increase the number of Bishops in the House of Lords, it was true; but the Bishops created by the measure might be, and in some cases would become, Members of the other House of the Legislature. It was only right that the House of Commons should have an opportunity of passing in review a project that proposed another mode of making fresh Peers. But while admitting the force of that demand, the absurdity of calling on a man holding his opinions to pass judgment on the internal affairs of the Church was so palpable, that had it not been that the Bill proposed to fasten a Bishop on the borough he represented, he would have been content to give a silent opposition to it. His first objection to the proposal was that there was no popular demand for it. The number of Petitions that had been presented in its favour, the number of meetings that had been held in its support, were insignificant. Through the ordinary avenues and agencies by which Parliament was made acquainted with the drift and strength of public opinion, no expression of feeling in its favour had been manifested. The only persons, as far as he knew, who had concerned themselves for the Bill were women, clergymen, and that small but intelligent section of laymen who took an æsthetic and architectural interest in ecclesiastical matters. The Government complained, and not without reason, of the backward state of Public Business. The Session began three weeks sooner than usual, and it was likely to continue a fortnight longer than was customary. There were still 30 Bills and Resolutions on the Order Book promoted by the Ministry. Some of them were only formal, but others were of first importance. A Bill that was recommended in the Queen's Speech—that for codifying the Criminal Law, and which, he cheerfully allowed, reflected credit on the Administration, and redounded to the honour of the hon. and learned Gentlemen who had introduced it—that Bill, which he believed would, if carried, more intimately affect the ordinary life of the common people of this country than any that had been passed of recent years, had been abandoned in consequence of the want of time to discuss it. Another measure that the Government were pledged in honour to promote—the principle of which had been discussed in that House for 30 or 40 years, and which proposed to give representative government to the counties—had been relegated to the limbo of Parliamentary innocents. Other proposals submitted by the President of the Local Government Board, not of great importance, but still useful, had been dropped after their course in the House had been considerably advanced. The reason for these abandonments was that the Ministry had not sufficient time at their disposal to discuss them. Yet they were called upon to debate a Bill to-day which there had been no expression of a desire for on the part of the public. He did not presume to advise Ministers how they should use the limited time at their disposal before Parliament rose. It would be an offence on his part to give advice on such a subject; but he believed he was speaking within his right as a Member of Parliament, when he said he thought it would be wiser for them to devote the remaining days of the Session to the promotion of measures that were really wanted, and not to the promotion of Bills like the present, which interested only a fraction of the public. And a fraction of the fraction alone were anxious for the enactment. The Bill proposed to establish a Bishopric in Northumberland. There was once a Bishopric in that county—that of Lindisfarne. It existed in the mists of history. Pleasant memories, however, of the lives and labours of the Lindisfarne Prelates had descended even to the present time. Those men were really pastors of their flocks. They interested themselves in the material and moral, as well as in the spiritual, welfare of those amongst whom their lot was cast. They were the guides, philosophers, and friends of their neighbours and parishioners. But they lived before the time when Bishops had begun to raise their mitred fronts in Courts and Parliaments. There was not one attribute in common between the ancient and apostolic Bishops and the modern Ecclesiastical creations. No one, he believed, would object to an increase of such Bishops as there once lived at Lindisfarne; but what they did resent was the increase of such State officials as the Bill before them sought to establish. There had been repeated attempts to found a Bishopric in Newcastle. Edward VI. proposed to start a See there. Queen Elizabeth revived the project; and that stout old Presbyter, John Knox himself, was once thought of as a Prelate. When the Bishopric of Ripon was founded in 1836, and that of Manchester was created in 1847, the idea of a Bishopric in Newcastle was once more mooted. In 1851, and again in 1854, the scheme was submitted to the other House of the Legislature, and discussed in clerical gatherings by Dr. Philpotts and others. Up to this time, however, the scheme had never resolved itself into practical shape. He recalled these facts for the purpose of observing that all the projects for establishing a Bishopric had been made by Monarchs, or ministers, or clerical bodies outside and away from Northumberland; by men, indeed, who were ignorant of the modes of thought and feeling of the population for whom they aspired to legislate. He had a fair knowledge of the history of Newcastle, and he could not call to his recollection a single occasion when an effort of any importance had been made outside the Clergy in favour of the establishment of a Bishopric, except that commenced by his old Friend, the late Sir John Fife, some 23 years ago. A proposition to petition in favour of a Bishopric was made by that gentleman; but it was drowned in a sea of good-natured banter and derision. They required many things in Newcastle. They wanted a purer atmosphere and a higher culture—they wished to be freed from the material contaminations consequent on their rough and energetic industries, and to have put before the people a more artistic and elevated ideal of life—but they did not want a Bishopric. They did not want planted down in their midst an institution that would tend to weaken the springs of intellectual independence, and cast a fetter over thought. [" No, no!"] Well, they had a Bishopric at Durham, and that was near enough. It was somewhat remarkable that, although the Church of England had for generations drawn a larger measure of wealth from the Diocese of Durham—considering its size and considering its population—than from any district of like extent in the country, yet that Body never had, and had not now, any strong hold on the affections and convictions of the people of the North. It was difficult to measure the strength of different religious Bodies in the country. Statistics were at best misleading, and yet they were the only means by which an approximate estimate of the position of the Churches could be formed. When the Census was taken in 1851, an attempt was made to enumerate the strength of all the sects in the country. On a given Sunday in March of that year, all the people who were found attending churches or chapels were counted, and the numbers recorded in the Census Papers. It was hoped that by such means some approximation could be formed of the relative strength of the competing Bodies. On the day in question, there were found attending the places of worship in connection with the Church of England, in the county of Northumberland, 37,000 persons; in the county of Durham, 29,000 persons—in all 66,000. On the same day there were attending the Dissenting chapels in Northumberland, 65,000 persons; and in Durham, 50,000—making a total of 115,000. In the two counties, there was an attendance in the Catholic churches of 15,000. In round numbers, therefore, on the day named, while there were only 66,000 persons attending the Church of England in the Diocese of Durham, there were 130,000 attending the Nonconformist and Catholic chapels; or, to put it in another way, the attendance in the Church was a little more than one-half what it was at the other places of worship. But these figures did not represent correctly the relative strength of the various Bodies. Knowing that the attendance was to be counted on that day, efforts were made by all parties, no doubt, to have as large a number present as could be obtained. To the Church the children of the National Schools, Sunday Schools, the inmates of hospitals and asylums, and the poor people from the workhouses were all drummed up with a view of augmenting those to be counted. If reasonable deductions were made for such exceptional worshippers, and only independent men and women were reckoned, it would be found that the comparison between the Church and Dissent was more favourable to Nonconformity than those figures at first sight showed. Other information was supplied by the Census in that year, which he would quote from. It had been estimated by clerical experts that no district was sufficiently supplied with church accommodation that did not provide sittings for at least 50 per cent of the population. Some people contended that instead of being 50 per cent of seats, there ought to be 75. But Dr. Chalmers—whose authority, he believed, would be accepted by all parties—split the difference, and said if the churches had seats for 60 per cent of the population, that that would be enough. Now, at the Census in 1851, the proportion of sittings to population provided by the Church in Durham was 17 per cent; in Northumberland, 18 per cent; and in Newcastle, 11 per cent; while the proportion of sittings to population provided by the Nonconformists in Durham was 28 per cent; in Northumberland, 30 per cent; and in Newcastle, 22 per cent. This Return showed that the Dissenters and the Catholics not only attended places of worship in greater numbers than the members of the Established Church, but they provided, at that time, twice as many sittings. Hon. Gentlemen would, no doubt, contend that this information had reference to a time that was long since past. To use a well-known phrase, much had happened since then. The population and wealth had both increased. Not only the character of the community, but the aspect of the country, had changed. He was free to admit that the Church of England had made great and honourable efforts during the last quarter of a century. They did not possess now similar official Returns to those they had in 1851; but he was able to quote, from a publication issued with the sanction and under the patronage of the Bishop and Clergy of Durham, figures that would show what had been recently done in that district by Churchmen for the propagation of their faith. During the episcopate of Dr. Baring, there had been expended in building new churches, £267,723; in restoring and enlarging old churches, £119,313; in establishing burial grounds, £12,825; in building schools in connection with the Church, £109,378. In all, there had been raised by Churchmen in the Diocese of Durham, between 1863 and 1876, no less than £509,239. He quoted these figures to the honour of that sect. He knew that in the North of England cynical and censorious people were accustomed to explain this large expenditure by declaring that it was the result of the abnormal prosperity of the coal and iron trade a few years ago. Coalowners and ironmasters had amassed wealth rapidly, and it had become a sort of fashion with them either to build new churches or to improve old ones. Men who were not distinguished for their personal piety strove to make up for individual deficiencies by providing better church accommodation for their less affluent neighbours. That he knew was the reason given by some hypercritical persons for this large expenditure. But he dismissed such an atrabilious way of accounting for what had been done; and he held that it reflected the highest credit on the liberality of the Church in the North of England that, during the last 13 or 14 years, they had collected for it an annual sum of something like £36,300. If he was to draw any deduction from these figures, it would be this—the liberality that Churchmen had shown went to prove that when the necessity arose they were not only willing but capable of providing for religious ordinances amongst themselves. It was a common argument with the opponents of Voluntaryism that the Church could not sustain itself without State help. He thought the fact that the Church in the Diocese of Durham could find men sufficiently liberal to contribute yearly such a handsome sum as upwards of £36,300 for religious and ecclesiastical purposes was a conclusive answer to this objection. He was astonished that members of the Church of England—who were continually complaining of the thraldom under which the Church had to live—did not throw themselves on the liberality of their partizans, and sever their connection with the State at once and for ever. What had been done in Durham was a proof that if Churchmen so desired, they could easily sustain their Body without extraneous aid. But if the Church had increased in numbers and in influence during the last 25 years, Dissent and Catholicism had not stood still. If it was difficult to get accurate statistics as to the state of the Established Church, it was much more difficult to get dependable figures showing the position of the various Nonconforming Bodies. There was not one organization, but several; and it was not easy to collect statistics showing their progress over a given period and area. But, from the information he had been able to obtain, he was justified in saying that in the two counties of Durham and Northumberland the Dissenters and the Catholics had, during the last quarter of a century, not only expended as large a sum in building chapels and schools as the Church had done, but they had absolutely expended one-half as much again. The consequence was that the position of the different Bodies to-day was not altered for the better, so far as the Church was concerned. On the contrary, Dissent and Catholicism had increased, not only as fast and as much as the Church, but they had progressed fully one-half more. That was so far as the erection of churches, of schools, and the attendance at them were concerned. It might be taken, therefore, that the position of the different sects had not substantially altered since 1851, and what alteration had been made had not been to the advantage of the Established Church in the North of England. There were, in that district, a number of old English Catholics. They were not a numerous body, but they were an influential one. They were the representatives and descendants of the men who espoused the cause of the Stuarts under the leadership of the ill-fated Lord Derwentwater, Lord Widdrington, and General Forster. There had been a large immigration of Irish workmen to the North of England during the last 25 years. Wherever there were mines and factories their Irish fellow-countrymen came, and the Catholic Church had made great and important strides over the period to which he was referring. They now constituted a powerful and energetic Body. The Nonconformists were numerous; but probably not so numerous, proportionately, as they were in some other counties of England. The two most growing Bodies were the Methodists and the Presbyterians. All persons concerned in mining operations were under a lasting debt of gratitude to the Methodists for the energy and devotion with which they had carried not only religious, but secular instruction to the distant pit villages and obscure manufacturing districts. When the Church was revelling in indolence and wealth, the poor Methodists were engaged in this work of Christian enlightenment. The Church of England had recently attempted to follow in their footsteps; but they only followed at a considerable distance in the rear. Episcopacy had never been popular in the Northern part of the Island. Some might remember the incident of Jenny Geddes throwing a three-legged stool at the head of a Church of England clergyman when he attempted to use the English Prayer Book in an Edinburgh kirk. This good lady gave forcible, though not very polite, expression to the popular feeling against Prelacy at that time. She typified and accentuated the Scotch dislike to Episcopacy. The feeling that existed 200 years ago lives to this day, only its expression may have been moderated. Large numbers of Scotchmen had come across to Northumberland and Durham, and brought with them their intelligence, their personal energy, and enterprize, and, at the same time, their religious convictions and their form of worship. The Presbyterian Church was now a powerful organization in these two counties. They might put it as they liked—they might explain it as they chose — but Episcopacy was an Ecclesiastical Autocracy. Presbyterianism was Ecclesiastical Constitutionalism, or Republicanism. The latter form of Church government was much more adapted to the breezy, independent, and democratic atmosphere of Tyneside than the former. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would tell them, in reply, that the statistics that he had adduced, and the arguments he had drawn from them, instead of making against the Bill, made in its favour. They would contend that if the Church occupied comparatively such an inferior position, instead of being an argument against making more Bishops, it was an argument in favour of creating them. He knew that he would be encountered by that mode of reasoning, and he would reply to it by anticipation. It was a settled principle of political economy that the supply should be regulated by the demand. What he maintained was that there was no demand for another Bishop in the North of England; and there was, therefore, no need to supply one. Hon. Gentlemen resented the application of the principle of political economy to Ecclesiastical questions. They held that if there was no demand for churches, or for Bishops, the demand should be created, and the State should be called in to assist its creation. He considered that such a procedure was unjust, and for this reason—the Government of this country was the Representative, or supposed Representative, of the entire people. There were upwards of 30,000,000 of inhabitants in these Islands. Some were Jews, and some Christians—some Protestants, and some Catholics. There were men of all faiths, and men of no faith. The Government derived its strength and its authority from men of these varied religions; and he contended that it was unfair to use the power that the united Body gave for the purpose of propagating the doctrines of one sect. Let hon. Gentlemen realize their position by considering how they would feel if they were Dissenters from the Established Church. Suppose the doctrines of the Church were Unitarian, or suppose they were Papal, how would conscientious Episcopalians like to have the power of the State used for the purpose of propagating Unitarian beliefs or Catholic beliefs, from both of which they strongly dissented? They should act upon the Scriptural injunction, and do unto others as they would like to be done by. He held it was no part of the duty of a Government to proselytize in favour of either one form of religious worship or the other. The Government had no right to undertake the work of religious revivalists. He was met on that ground by being assured that the Church was a very cosmopolitan Body. Men holding the doctrines of Dr. Colenso, or the doctrines of Dr. Pusey, could be equally accepted as members. No doubt this was true, and that the Church of England called everything fish that came to its net. It was organized in a way calculated to gain support from all quarters. It had a Papal Ritual, a Calvinistic Creed, an Arminian Clergy, and an Erastian form of Church government. Such a composite organization, he would be told, might be sustained without any serious injury to the conscience of anyone. Acting up to this idea, whenever Churchmen attempted to find arguments in favour of fresh Bishops, they invariably reckoned up the population, and based their demand on the fact of its increase. In the case to which he was specially directing the attention of the House, for example, the population of the county of Northumberland was 400,000, and that of the county of Durham 700,000—in all about 1,100,000. This was nearly double what it was a few years ago. There was no part of the country that had increased more rapidly in population than the county of Durham. The argument of the supporters of the Bill was, that if one Bishop was required when the population was half what it was now, two Bishops were required at the present time. He did not allow the force of that mode of reasoning. It went upon the assumption that the increase of population had gone entirely in favour of the Church. This was not the fact. As he had shown, the adherents of the Church were not as numerous as the adherents of the other Bodies. He repudiated entirely the idea that the religion of the nation and the religion of the State were one and the same. The religion of the nation was Christianity—the religion of the State was Episcopacy. The Episcopalians, therefore, were not warranted, in calculating the necessity for a new Bishop, in holding that the increase in population had gone to swell their numbers only. During the last two generations, the population of England had doubled; but the increase in the numbers of beneficed clergymen in the Established Church had only been at the rate of 15 per cent. He repeated that while the population had doubled, the provision made by the Church had only been at the rate he had just named. Even in providing places of worship, the Church had not kept pace with the population. In 1725, the proportion of churches to population in England was one to every 760 persons. In 1851, there was one church to every 1,273 people. In 1875 there was one church for 1,497 people. In other words, while the income of the Church had steadily increased, and the population had largely augmented, its relative hold on the people had steadily decreased, even during the last quarter of a century. They were told by early Ecclesiastical writers that when the Emperor Constantine proclaimed territorial jurisdiction for the Bishops, a weird and wistful voice was heard declaring through the stately chambers and corridors of the Byzantine Palace—"This day poison is poured into the Church; this day poison is poured into the Church." No one knew from whence the strange warning came, and no answer was vouchsafed to it. A reply, however, might now be sent through the long vista of years, and the experience of the Church of England might be cited as proving the truthfulness of the prediction that was uttered 1,500 years ago on the banks of the Bosphorus. The bane of the Church of England—the canker that was eating its heart away—was its wealth and its poverty. At one and the same time it was the richest and the poorest Church in Christendom. They had huge heaps of money scraped up in favoured places, and the persons that possessed it lived in splendour and luxury, while all around them were poverty, desolation and often want. The revenue of the Church was £7,300,000 a-year. Of this £530,000—more than half a million—was distributed amongst 172 men. These were the Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and other Church and Cathedral dignitaries. The average annual income of the older Bishops was £6,000 a-year—or, to put the figures more correctly, it should be said that it was £5,600 a-year in cash, and £400 a-year for the rent of the palaces and castles that they lived in. This was the average; but some had incomes much in excess of it. The Archbishop of Canterbury had an annual income of £15,000 a-year and two Palaces. In some Privy Council Order it was shown that His Grace had nearly 500 acres of land for pleasure ground. He could not recognize any resemblance between a Bishop with two palaces, an income of £15,000 a-year, and pleasure grounds 500 acres in extent, and the humble fishermen of Galilee, whose principles he professed to teach, and whose lives he aspired to emulate. He invited the House to contrast the incomes of these high authorities of the Church with the salaries of the working Clergy. There were some 13,300 beneficed clergymen in the Church of England, and their average incomes were £270 a-year. The average income of the clergymen in the county of Durham was about £350 or £360 a-year. But these figures did not correctly describe the incomes of the Clergy. Several of them had incomes amounting to £1,000, £2,000, and £3,000 a-year, and others had much less than the average amount named. A few years ago there were in England 297 clergymen receiving under £50 a-year; 1,629 receiving under £100 a-year; 1,602 receiving under £150 a-year; and 4,882 receiving under £200 a-year. This state of matters, which he could not do otherwise than describe as disgraceful to the Church, had been somewhat improved of late by the action of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Things were not so bad now as they formerly were—but still, even in 1873, there were 1,163 ministers in the Church of England receiving only £100 a-year, and there were 3,189 receiving between £150 and £200 a-year. The average incomes of the curates was about £80 a-year—very little better than an ordinary mechanic or miner in prosperous times. There were societies in existence for the purpose of collecting funds for educating curates' children, and for supplying them with increased incomes and clothes. Every year he received circulars from bodies of this description, asking for contributions for these purposes, and soliciting, also, cast-off wearing apparel for the poor curates of the Church of England. The Bishop of Manchester, speaking recently, declared that there were curates in the Established Church that got flesh meat for their dinners as seldom as the agricultural labourers of Wiltshire and Dorsetshire. He had seen statements in the clerical papers to the effect that some of the poor ministers were unable to provide firing in the cold wintry weather. This condition of things was derogatory to the Church of England. They might explain it, or apologize for it, or excuse it as they chose; but the broad fact still remained, that while one section of the Church received incomes superior to that of the Prime Minister of England, the men who did the work were subsisting on salaries totally inadequate to maintain them in ordinary decency. If, instead of proposing to increase the number of Bishops, the earnest members of the Church of England would set about a re-distribution of the vast funds which that Corporation possessed, they would accomplish both for their Church and country a much more useful and honourable work. It was useless to expect that the Church would ever have any hold on the affections of the people while these gross anomalies existed. It might wield a certain weight in special circles; but it could never touch either the hearts or sympathies of the nation while its resources were so unequally and so inequitably dispensed. The people asked for more light, more mental liberty. They required a better appreciation of their responsibilities as men and as citizens. They wanted a broader diffusion of the principles, and a more faithful practice of the spirit and the teaching of the Founder of Christianity, and it was proposed to give them more Bishops, more sleek and oily parsons—more of a superficial and artificial Ecclesiasticism. They should have an Institution—call it a Church if they liked—not of priests, but of, and from, and for the people, into which any man, however poor, and however ignorant he might be, could enter and take a heart to be purified, an intellect to be enlightened, and a spirit to be elevated. They wanted a Church in which there was absolute intellectual freedom, and complete Christian equality, which would be a place of refuge for the weary, of shelter for the poor, of solace for the sick, of help for the desolate, and of tribuneship for the oppressed —not a ring of Parsons and Bishops rolling in wealth, and "swaggering in the foretop of the State."

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable, so long as the Episcopal Church continues to be established by law, to increase the number of Bishops,"—(*Mr. Joseph Cowen,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he would not enter into any discussion in detail with respect to the points raised by the hon. Member for Newcastle; because he had, only two years ago, fully expounded the question on the occasion when the Bill then introduced was passed.

The case was a very simple one. The sole object of the Bill was to enable the Church of England to do her duty as long as she was by law established. He thought it was hardly generous or wise to prevent her doing so, as would happen if the Bill were defeated. The real fact of the matter was, there was more need of Bishops. The work of the various Dioceses had, in consequence of the increase of population in certain parts of the country, vastly grown ; the Bishops were over-taxed in their energies, and it was necessary that other Bishoprics should be appointed. He had had letters from Bishops, pointing out the need of further machinery being provided for Church purposes, some of which were even of a painful nature. There was no more hard-working class of men than the Bishops. He asked in no sectarian spirit whether, for instance, the labours of the Bishop of Manchester had not conduced greatly to the benefit, moral, spiritual, and even material, of the Diocese over which he presided? He had received a letter from the Bishop of Durham, in which he said that the churches in the Diocese of Durham had increased since 1857 from 171 to 342, or 70 per cent; while the number of Clergy in the same time had risen from 222 to 531. He could not believe that the House would refuse the power which the members of the Church now asked. The case had been pressed on the Government two years ago, when the House passed the second reading of the Bill by a very large majority. The Bill was designed to accomplish Christian, and not sectarian work. He appealed not simply to the Christian feeling of the House, but to its candour and generosity, to deal fairly by the Church, and give its members the power of carrying on its work which was not refused to every other religious Body.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, no doubt, there were many reasons why some hon. Members might wish to avoid entering upon the details of this question. But the House had a certain duty to perform to its constituents outside, and they were bound not to allow such a measure as this to pass without fairly discussing it. Hon. Members opposite might feel pained because on this side of the House those who were not members of the Church of England entered upon the discussion of the measure. That state of things, however, was due to the anomalous position in which the Church was placed in relation to the House of Commons, and he could not sit in that House without vindicating its rights to interfere in any discussion. What, he asked, was the object of the Bill? It was enough to startle a man, and would startle any Christian. It would startle St. Paul, he was sure, could he walk into the House and open the Bill, for what did the Bill contain? It stated that Her Majesty, by Order in Council, might found new Bishoprics. He asserted that it was not in accordance with the consistency of the position of the House that they should be asked to give their sanction to such a proposal. That state of things could not exist in the Church of England for a very long period, and it was by no means honourable to Christianity that four Bishops should appear on the floor of the House and ask to be raised to Bishoprics? He objected to the Bill, among other reasons, because the Bishops already in existence were not doing their duty. Some of them, in fact, were openly defying the Privy Council; and whilst they received State pay, they taught doctrines utterly at variance with the requirements of the law. As an instance, he cited the case of the Bishop of Bombay, who, at a recent meeting held at Oxford, spoke in favour of the Churches of Christendom being re-united. In other words, he expressed himself in favour of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church being brought together. That alone was sufficient to cause him to resist the Bill.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL admitted that additional Bishops were required in the Church of England, and said, he would have voted for the Bill if it merely enabled persons to contribute voluntarily towards their support; but he objected to taking the overpay of the existing Bishops for the establishment of new ones. He should, therefore, vote against the Bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, this was the third or fourth time since he occupied a seat in the House on which he had listened to discussions upon Ecclesiastical matters; but, as he was a Roman Catholic, hitherto he had abstained from any part in the debates. However, he could not now forgive himself for having been so long silent; for it was an anomalous and hardly a creditable circumstance that the truly domestic affairs of any religious community in this country should be brought before that House, to be determined by the votes of Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians, and men of every shade of religious belief. The time had arrived when, in justice to the conscientious feelings of the members of the Established Church, these matters should be withdrawn from the decision of that overworked and overtaxed Assembly. The position which he, as a Roman Catholic Member of the House of Commons, was placed in was a rather peculiar one, and it really was not easy to decide what course he ought to take. How could he abstain from voting upon this matter without giving up his functions as a Member of Parliament; and how could he give a vote upon it unless he was in a position to decide what was sound Protestantism and what was not sound Protestantism? He must respectfully tell members of the Church of England that, before they asked for such measures as these, they ought to emancipate the Church of England from State control, and that their first step should be to obtain for the Church of England home rule and self-government by restoring Convocation, and making that body a reality. He spoke as a Catholic who wished to see the Protestants of this country enjoying in Church matters that full liberty of conduct which he claimed for his own communion. Would it not add to their dignity if they were to free themselves once for all from the meddling interference of that House? This was the first time that he had ever spoken upon this subject; but he thought it was only fair that he should state his views.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) had stated that this was the first time he had ever spoken upon this subject; and he could only say that he hoped his hon. and learned Friend would not favour the House again upon it with such a speech as he had just now made. For his own part, he must confess that this was one of the rare occasions that he found himself out of sympathy with the views of his hon. and learned Friend. He had had occasion to converse with Roman Catholics in Ireland frequently upon this subject, and he thought that an entirely different view was held in Ireland to that entertained by his hon. and learned Friend. Prior to the year 1829, Catholics did not make it a part of their creed that they were to endeavour to destroy the Established Church of this country. The establishment of a State Church was one of the strongest doctrines of the Catholic religion. ["No, no!"] Hon. Members might say "No, no;" but he thought it was an established fact nevertheless. In every country in Europe where it was possible there was a Roman Catholic Church supported by the State. In this country there was a Protestant Church established by the State. He quite agreed that his hon. and learned Friend was quite entitled to object to Protestantism in this country; but he did not think he ought to interfere in Protestant matters. He had always voted, and always should vote, in favour of measures of this kind. They all knew perfectly well that in the regulations of the affairs of life it was essential to have some superior authority; and if they took the modern appointments of Bishops in the Church of England, could anyone say that the recent creation of Bishops in the North of England, especially in the case of the See of Manchester, that the creation of those additional Bishoprics had not been productive of unmixed good? He did not think it was an honest line of argument on the part of hon. Members to pretend to point out blots in the government of the Church of England, and to profess a desire to see them removed, when the real object was to do away with the Established Church altogether.

MR. RICHARD: I have no desire to interfere in the controversy between the hon. and learned Member for Louth and the hon. Member for Galway, as to the sentiments and obligations of Roman Catholics on this matter, though certainly I should have thought that the hon. and learned Member for Louth was the better authority of the two on such questions. I can assure hon. Gentlemen opposite that it is extremely distasteful to me to have to discuss questions of this nature in the House of Commons; for I feel that it is very difficult to do so without saying something that may be offensive to many whose character I greatly respect, and whose religious susceptibilities I would not willingly wound. But it is not our fault that matters of this kind are thrown down for discussion on the floor of this House. I think I can understand and sympathize with the repugnance which many members of the Church of England must feel on such occasions. For the members of any Church to have the most sacred matters pertaining to its doctrine, discipline, and internal economy and administration, dealt with and decided by persons of all kinds of religious opinions and of no religious opinions at all, is a thing totally at variance with my notions of what a Christian community should be; and I am astonished that the humiliation of it does not become intolerable to the serious members of the Church of England. In a former Session, when the first of these modern Episcopal creations were proposed to the House, I ventured to state my views in opposition to the Bill at considerable length. It is not necessary that I should repeat in full the arguments I then used. I retain all the objections I then expressed to this kind of legislation. I have no wish, by my consent, to take part in the creation of any more of these politico-ecclesiastical officials, whose existence, in my judgment, is not an advantage to either Church or State. As Nonconformists, we object that any class of men should be authorized by the State to perform ecclesiastical and spiritual functions. And we object, further, that these Bills proceed on the assumption that the whole population of this country are members of the Church of England. That is always taken for granted. We are told that in such and such a district there are so many hundreds of thousands of souls who, in effect, are without Episcopal supervision, totally ignoring the fact that there are millions of people in this country who have renounced their allegiance to the Church of England, who do not require, and will not accept, Episcopal supervision. It is not very easy to understand who wants more Bishops. There are a few rich people who are willing to subscribe their money for this purpose; because, perhaps, they consider that a Hierarchical religion is more aristocratic and respectable. But there is no evidence that there is any general desire among the members of the Church of England itself for a multiplication of these officials. Nay, indeed, there is a great deal of evidence to the contrary. If we may take the papers and periodicals which represent the various shades of opinion in that Church as any test, we may confidently say that the prevailing feeling is, not a desire for more Bishops, but utter distrust and dislike of those who already exist. Some attempt has been made to galvanize public opinion on this subject. I do not know whether the House is aware of it, but there is a Society in existence for the propagation of Bishops. It is called a "Society for Promoting the Increase of the Episcopate." It is constituted under very high patronage. Among its Vice Presidents there are two Dukes, three Earls, ten Bishops, and two Lords. But it does not seem to inspire much enthusiasm, for, in the year 1874—that is the last Report I have seen, which I now hold in my hand—the total amount of its subscriptions was only £112 1*s.* 6*d.*, and of that £50 was subscribed by the Duke of Buccleuch. So that, measured by pecuniary contributions, the entire amount of interest felt by the members of the Church of England throughout the Kingdom in the increase of Bishops amounted to £62 1*s.* 6*d.* *plus* £50 worth of interest felt by His Grace of Buccleuch. And how is this interest expressed by Petitions? I have looked at the list of Petitions presented this Session, and up to the 9th of July I find that they numbered 73, signed by 1,545 persons, most of them from clerical bodies; but not only are the persons very few who are in favour of an increase of the Episcopate, but those who do favour it do not wish to see it extended on the lines of this Bill. The Society to which I have referred, three or four years ago, addressed a series of questions on this subject to all the rural deaneries in England and Wales. The first question was, whether more Bishops were necessary and desirable? the second, how they should be paid? and the third, whether the Bishops of the new Sees should have seats in Parliament? I believe there are about 750 rural deaneries in England and Wales. Of these, 460 had replied in 1875. On the first question, there was considerable unanimity; on the second, there was much difference of opinion; on the third, whether the new Bishops should have seats in the House of Lords?—the result was this. Out of 450 rural deaneries, 360 were opposed to the Bishops of the Sees that should be created having seats in the House of Lords, by rotation or otherwise; 54 were in favour of a rotation clause; and only three returned an answer in favour of the new Bishops being in Parliament. But this Bill disregards the voice of the Clergy on the matter, and does provide that the new Bishops should have seats in the House of Lords in their turn. I believe there is also great dissatisfaction among the members of the Church of England as to the way in which these Bishops are created. The Church itself has no voice in the matter. That cannot be helped, of course, while the Church is connected with the State. But it is certain that many feel bitterly the anomaly that such a power should be virtually lodged in a House constituted as this is, and it cannot be constituted otherwise; for, so long as it is a Representative Assembly, it must represent all classes and creeds and opinions. For my part, I hope the Church of England will attain the liberty enjoyed by all other religious Bodies. I believe that the humblest Dissenting or Methodist Church in the Kingdom would resent any magisterial or political interference in the appointment of its ministers and the regulation of its affairs as an insult and an ignominy. Let the Church of England, then, have the same liberty and the same power as these possess. But she can have this only on one condition—that of renouncing her exclusive privilege as a Church protected and patronized by the State.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, he did not think it was a desirable thing for the Episcopal Church to ask that House to interfere with its affairs; but as long as the Church was connected with the State, it must submit to what the House of Commons did.

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

### METROPOLITAN COMMONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, Bill to extend to Metropolitan Commons certain provisions of "The Commons Act, 1876," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE, and Mr. FAWCETT.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 287.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six of the clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday, 1st August, 1878.*

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment)* (180); Commons Regulation (Expenses)* (181); Elders Widows' Fund* (182).

*Second Reading* — Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) (176); Highways (177).

*Committee—Report*—Naval Discipline Amendment* (175); Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland)* (174).

*Report*—Debtors Acts Amendment* (163).

## H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE.

### THE QUEEN'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

THE LORD STEWARD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl BEAUCHAMP) *reported* Her Majesty's Answer to the Address of Thursday last, as follows:—

"VICTORIA R.

"Your loyal and dutiful Address affords me sincere pleasure.

"It is most gratifying to me to be assured that you join in my feelings with regard to the intended marriage of the Duke of Connaught, and I trust that with God's blessing this event may prove an additional source of happiness to my family and also to my people."

## THE MINISTRY—THE MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, I am at all times reluctant to trouble your Lordships with any statement regarding myself, but I think it necessary to ask the attention of your Lordships to a few observations which I think it my duty to make in reference to some words which are reported to have fallen from the noble Earl the Prime Minister on Monday night last. I should have taken an earlier opportunity of making these observations, but that I have been absent from London. I may at once say that the passage in the noble Earl's speech to which I wish to draw attention refers both to my noble Friend Lord Derby—who is not now in his place—and to myself; but what I have now to say relates simply to myself, though I have no doubt that if my noble Friend had been present he would have taken much the same objection to the words as I do. Now, my Lords, on Monday evening the noble Earl at the head of the Government is reported to have said—I take the report from *The Times* newspaper—which I have compared with the reports of the other newspapers, and I find them to agree substantially, though there is a slight difference of expression—

> "As long as those two noblemen"—

meaning the Earl of Derby and myself—

> "remained in the Cabinet, we adhered to the policy which they had accepted, and on which we understood they were prepared to act; we adhered to the policy which, when the time came, they shrank from the responsibility of carrying into effect."

Now, I think that these words, with whatever intention they were used, are calculated to give a very false impression. I admit they are somewhat ambiguous; but if the noble Earl means by these words that we, as Members of a common Cabinet, after travelling for some time on the same road at length finally diverged on questions which had arisen—if he meant that, despite some Cabinet differences and some divergence of opinion, we held together within the lines of a common policy, and at length separated when a greater and irreconcilable difference arose—of course, I will not object to his words, though I think that meaning might have been expressed a little more considerately, if not a little more courteously. Or, again, if the noble Earl means by these words that it is a matter of argument whether the policy of 1878 is identical with the policy of 1877, I have nothing to say on that ground. There are Blue Books, and speeches, and despatches, to which all have access, and by which every man may judge for himself whether there is that identity or not. But if the noble Earl means—I am speaking for myself now—that I, having agreed to particular measures of policy—having agreed to some one thing—when the moment of difficulty, anxiety, and danger arrived, flinched from that to which I had pledged myself—if he means that, with a clear perception of the end and of the means in view, to which I had pledged myself as a Member of the Cabinet, I, when the moment arrived, shrunk from the responsibility which that act and those measures involved—then I must, with all courtesy, but in the strongest language I can command, and Parliamentary usage allows, give the statement an absolute and unqualified contradiction. I must go a step further, and affirm that whilst I was in the Cabinet, never directly or indirectly—never as regards matter of detail or policy—never as regards any particular measure or a general conclusion—I never, so far as I am aware, advocated or consented to any course of action, and then recoiled from the responsibility of giving effect to that action. When, on the 25th of January, I troubled your Lordships with the reasons of my resignation, I stated them to be the divergence of opinion that had unfortunately arisen in the Cabinet, and which was shown by the fact that I had twice tendered my resignation. The moving of the Fleet into the Dardanelles, the Vote of Credit, followed by the calling out of the Reserves, constituted the reasons which induced me to resign the Office I held. Obviously, as I stated at the time, they were not part of the general policy to which I, or the other Members of the Cabinet, had, in the early days of our discussions, pledged ourselves. My Lords, those were comparatively new resolutions; and when those resolutions were arrived at, I stated that I could not be a party to them. I think it is a pity that if the noble Earl held the view which the words spoken by him on Monday night would seem to indicate, my statement of the 25th was not then contradicted. It seems to me strange, and rather hard on me personally, that this matter should be brought up by a side-wind, and that, in a discussion of a totally different matter, this imputation—for I consider it as grave an imputation as can be made—should be cast upon me. My Lords, I can conceive no imputation graver to a public man than to be told that he was a party to one particular thing in the Cabinet, and that, subsequently, when the moment of danger and anxiety arrived, he retired from the Government and fled from the resolutions for fear of the responsibility attached to giving it effect. It would be unworthy—it would be base—it would be cowardly—it would be dishonest—it would be, not merely an act of irresolution, but it would be an untruth both in act and in word. My Lords, I cannot suppose that the noble Earl has any wish to go into questions of Cabinet discussions and Cabinet confidences. I have avoided them, and I have no wish to enter upon them now, unless the noble Earl himself desires it, in which case I shall be happy to meet him. All I wish is personally to clear my character and position from words which I think were very inconsiderately cast out. If the noble Earl denies—as I hope he may—that he attaches to those words the meaning which, I think, 99 out of every 100 men would attach to them, I am perfectly satisfied, and have no more to say. If, on the other hand, the interpretation of them is such as I have given to them, then I have but one course—a duty I owe to myself—in the plainest, most distinct, and simplest words, to give the statement the most unqualified and absolute contradiction.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: My Lords, any remarks which I have to make on the statement of the noble Earl will be founded on information which is in your Lordships' possession and founded on facts known to all. There will be no necessity for me to enter on a narrative of Cabinet conversations and Cabinet proceedings. I have endeavoured—and I trust successfully—at all times not to enter on ground of so doubtful a character, and I shall, if possible, keep to the same determination. As I understand—so far as I could understand the noble Earl—he complains that I stated he had supported a certain policy in the Cabinet, and that when, from the necessity of affairs, the Cabinet was called on to carry that policy into effect, he declined to carry into action the opinions he had sanctioned. That I believe to be his complaint. Your Lordships are perfectly aware of what was the declared policy of the Cabinet during the two years when these considerable events occurred. That policy was described in a despatch which is on your Lordships' Table, and, therefore, I am not betraying Cabinet secrets in referring to it. The Government of Her Majesty declined to enter into the controversy between Russia and Turkey unless British interests were endangered. That was the avowed policy of the Cabinet, and they acted on it. Among the British interests enumerated, was any alteration in the possessors of Constantinople. Any change in that respect, it was declared, would involve British interests of the highest importance, which we could not view with indifference. Everyone understood what the policy of the English Government was. If Constantinople was endangered, British interests were involved in such a contingency, and the course to be pursued in such a contingency would be to guard them. Well, when the collapse of the Turkish defence after Plevna occurred, and when, shortly after that, the Army of Russia was arriving at the gates of Constantinople, the time had come when, in the opinion of the Cabinet, we should carry into effect a policy which had been so long avowed—a contingency which had entered into our calculations had arisen, one of the British interests involved in that policy was endangered—and the Cabinet determined to act on that policy. It was not by calling out the Reserves we first acted. My Lords, the Reserves, if I remember right, were not called out for a considerable period —I think for many weeks—after the noble Earl resigned. The recommendation we made in the circumstances was the natural one, if our policy was to be carried into effect. It was to order Her Majesty's Fleet to enter the waters of Constantinople. That was, and had been, our policy in defending British interests involved in the possible capture of Constantinople. That had been our policy for a long time; and, therefore, it had been sanctioned when the noble Earl was our Colleague. When the time came, we felt it our duty to carry that policy into effect. The noble Earl felt it was inconsistent with his views to act with us, and he quitted the Cabinet. That was the simple statement which I think I was justified in making the other night.

## ADMIRALTY AND WAR OFFICE (RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS) BILL.

(*The Viscount Cranbrook.*)

(NO. 176.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

VISCOUNT BURY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that his noble Friend now at the head of the Indian Office, and who was lately at the War Office (Viscount Cranbrook), had taken the question of Promotion and Retirement into his consideration. The result was that the present Bill was introduced into the House of Commons, and it dealt both with the War and the Admiralty Departments. In the House of Commons no alteration of any moment was made in it. The Bill dealt with the compulsory retirement of officers. It had been acknowledged in the House of Commons, and he thought it would be acknowledged in their Lordships' House, that it provided liberal compensation for those who should compulsorily retire—as liberal as was consistent with a due regard to public economy and the interests of the Public Service. As the matter had been fully debated in "another place," he would content himself with simply moving the second reading.

*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Viscount Bury.*)

Lord TRURO was very glad that there was to be a reduction in the expenses of the War Department; but he would like to know if that reduction was to be accompanied by an increase in delay? He did not merely refer to the delay which took place in regard to the Regular Army, but to that in reference to the Volunteer Service. Everyone must admit that these officers should be adequately remunerated, and while he rejoiced that steps had been taken in the direction of reform, he hoped that a diminution in the staff would not result in further delays.

Viscount CARDWELL said, he did not know that any improvement could be effected in the principle of the Bill, which he hoped would be read a second time.

Lord HAMMOND said, that the effect of this measure, as he understood it, would be a considerable reduction in the existing staff of clerks, and probably an increase in the number of copyists and writers. He was not sufficiently acquainted with the nature of the business transacted in these Offices, or with the principle on which it was conducted, to be able to form an opinion as to the expediency of the proposed changes. After what had recently occurred, he did not think anyone would recommend the introduction into the Foreign Office—with which he was acquainted—of a lower class of clerks. He was not prepared to discuss the general principles of the Bill; but he was glad to take that opportunity of calling their Lordships' attention to the case of copyists and writers in the Public Service. They must be all more or less educated, they must be regular and punctual in attendance, orderly and industrious in their conduct, and decently attired, and being thus qualified, could they be considered to be sufficiently paid by the pittance of 10*d.* an hour, earning thus about 5*s.* a-day, or less than the earnings of an ordinary mechanic? They had nothing to look forward to; they had no assured tenure of office, for they might be discharged any day; they had no expectation of improved position or increased pay; they had no provision to look to if incapacitated by sickness or by age—in short, they had no encouragement whatever for fidelity or industry. He trusted that their Lordships would agree with him that the class of public servants to whom he alluded might with justice be more liberally dealt with, more especially as without them the Public Service in many Offices, under the present system, would be brought to a standstill.

Viscount CRANBROOK stated, that what had been said about writers did not apply to the War Office. As to the complaint about delay, he thought the War Office had more cases to deal with than any other Department. There must be some delay, because they had to deal with men all over the world. There was no real delay in working the Department. It was worked with efficiency and regularity. Every case had to be thoroughly inquired into. Everybody connected with it had to be consulted. He hoped their Lordships would give a second reading to the Bill, which was intended to improve the Department and diminish the expenses.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

## HIGHWAYS BILL—(No. 177.)

(*The Viscount Cranbrook.*)

### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Viscount CRANBROOK, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, stated that the main point almost of the Bill was that whereas, when Highway Boards existed, the district rates were only applied now to the salaries of the officers and disturnpiked roads, it was proposed that they should be applied to the maintenance of all the roads—that there should not be separate parochial rates for parochial roads, but that the district rates should be applied to the whole district with one exception. There was never any proper audit provided for under the Highway Act. The Poor Law auditor under this Bill would have power to examine the highway accounts. The highway authorities, in case they put the roads under Highway Boards, were counselled by the Bill to make the districts coterminous with sanitary districts. If the Highway Boards neglected their duty, the Local Government Board could interfere. There were two Acts existing—the 24 & 25, and 28 & 29 *Vict.*—with respect to locomotives on the roads, and in this Bill there was some provision for altering the conditions mentioned in those Acts, especially in regard to the use of a flag and the size of the locomotive. It provided that the locomotive should be so constructed as to consume its own smoke. That provision was not compulsory with regard to the consumption of all the smoke, as that was practically impossible. There was power for the local authorities to make bye-laws restricting the locomotives to a certain number of hours in which they could be employed on the roads, and he thought it would be a very advantageous thing to know the hours during which the locomotives would not be on the roads, for many horses were much disturbed by them. The Bill did not lay down any great principle, but rather contained a number of Amendments, to which he would invite their Lordships' attention in Committee.

*Moved*, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Viscount Cranbrook.*)

THE EARL OF REDESDALE said, he had no objection to the Bill; but mentioned that at the beginning of this Session he moved for a Return of all complaints to public officers in connection with the co-extension of districts, arising from the union of parishes belonging to the different counties. No Return was made, and he presumed that no complaints had been received.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

## ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE HAMPSHIRE RIFLE VOLUNTEERS.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD TRURO asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether it was true that a Lieutenant Colonel commanding an administrative battalion of Rifle Volunteers in the Southern district called on his Adjutant to sign a false return in the latter end of 1877; that the Adjutant refused; that the case was reported, and decision given, after a delay of five months; that the Adjutant was held justified, but told he was to be transferred; whether that transfer had taken place; and whether the Lieutenant Colonel still retained his command? The decision of the Committee of the War Office, to which the matter had been referred, was that the Adjutant was to be sustained—whatever that might mean—he supposed it was a new military term—but was to be transferred to another regiment—that was to say, the Adjutant was declared to be right, but in the face of the whole regiment was to be removed to another corps. It seemed to him that the Adjutant had acted honourably in refusing to put his hand to a Return to the War Office which contained a false statement. When the Volunteer Force asked for a Royal Commission to inquire into how these things were dealt with it was refused, and a Departmental Committee was appointed. The Committee was composed of three officers—whose military antecedents showed that they would not be unduly prejudiced in favour of the Volunteers—and of two others, who, in a matter of this kind, were not likely to prove too stubborn.

VISCOUNT BURY was understood to ask who these two Gentlemen were?

LORD TRURO said, he referred to the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War and the Financial Secretary to the Department. His complaint against the Departmental Committee was that it did not satisfy Volunteer requirements. The Volunteer Force should be represented on the Committee by men who were thoroughly imbued by the sense of what the men required. As it was, the Volunteer Force thought it was not of such a character as to tend to the development of the Service, or the interests of those composing it. To go back to the subject of his Question. As this Adjutant had been removed to another corps and the Lieutenant Colonel allowed to retain his position, one of two things was clear —either the Lieutenant Colonel was not justified in requiring the Adjutant's signature, or the Adjutant had refused to comply with the order of his commanding officer; but if the Adjutant was right, it passed his comprehension why he should be transferred to another regiment, which was a great indignity to him. He would repeat that the Departmental Committee would not satisfy those requirements which the Volunteer Corps thought to be essentially necessary for a proper development of the interests of the Service; and if it should so turn out that their recommendations were not satisfactory, he should think it his duty to urge for the appointment of a Royal Commission, for the purpose of effecting a complete revision of the conditions on which the Service was administered.

VISCOUNT BURY, replying for the Government, said, he was aware that a considerable degree of indulgence was always extended to noble Lords desirous of bringing subjects before their Lordships' House; but he protested that the noble Lord opposite, having asked his Question—whether it was true that a certain Adjutant had been required by his commanding officer to sign a false Return?—had no right to go off into the entirely irrelevant question of the constitution of a Departmental Committee. He spoke of two Members of that Committee as being distinguished for their pliancy; and when he (Viscount Bury) asked for their names, the noble Lord replied—"The Financial Secretary of the War Office and yourself." He was obliged to the noble Lord for his opinion, but would not at that moment take any further notice of his observation. If the noble Lord chose at some other time to bring the matter before the House, he should be prepared to defend both the Committee and himself against the charge of pliancy, or any other charge.

LORD TRURO said, he did not use the word "pliancy." What he said was that the Members of the Committee referred to were not "too stubborn."

VISCOUNT BURY assured the noble Lord that he would be found sufficiently stubborn for all the purposes of those who appointed him to the Committee. Now, in reference to the Question that had been asked, he knew quite well who were the officers to whom the noble Lord referred. They were Adjutant Cope, of the 2nd Hants Administrative Battalion of Rifle Volunteers, and Lieutenant Colonel Gordon, the Commander of the battalion. The two gentlemen had both served in Her Majesty's Regular Army, and might, therefore, be presumed to know what was required of them in their military capacities. The statement of the noble Lord was incorrect in almost every particular. It was true that there had been a quarrel between the two officers, and that it had been pursued by each with considerable acrimony. Neither was entirely in the right, and both had received a certain amount of blame from the War Office. The dispute took a long time to decide; and the only point upon which the noble Lord was correct was that the Adjutant was removed from the battalion. The Adjutant was never asked by his commanding officer to sign a false Return. What happened was this. The Return of efficients made at the end of 1877 was sent in to the War Office in the ordinary way; but it was accompanied by a note from the commanding officer, pointing out that the Adjutant had not included him in the list of efficients. The Adjutant also sent a letter explaining that he had declined to include his commanding officer on the ground that he had not made himself efficient. Therefore, the War Office wrote to Colonel Gordon, asking him if he had attended the requisite number of drills; and what followed arose out of the different constructions placed by the parties on the Volunteer Regulations. By those Regulations, it was laid down that the attendances of a colonel or field officer or non-combatant officer, not being honorary, might include drills of any kind. After an investigation, the War Office decided that the commanding officer ought to have been returned as efficient, and it wrote an authorization to the War Office to that effect. But the Adjutant again refused, stating that he did not believe that Colonel Gordon had attended the requisite number of drills. The War Office replied that, having decided that the commanding officer was efficient, it must require the Adjutant to include him in the Return; but they added that if it hurt his conscience so to do, he might add a rider saying that he inserted the name not on his own responsibility but by authority of the War Office. These were the circumstances up to that point; and it would have been much better if the noble Lord had taken the trouble to ascertain them, instead of coming down to the House and making a flaming speech about an Adjutant having been asked to violate his conscience by making a false Return. But further, notwithstanding that the War Office had a second time commanded the Return to be made, the Adjutant still refused, whereupon the Correspondence was sent down to General Sir John Garvock, commanding the Southern district, with instructions to investigate the whole circumstances. He did so, and examined a number of witnesses on both sides; and in the end he decided that Colonel Gordon had made himself efficient, and ought to be returned as such. Still, the Adjutant remained stubborn; but eventually, after a peremptory order, he did make the Return, accompanying it with a note that it was not done on his own responsibility but by authority of the War Office. In adding that explanation the Adjutant was, no doubt, perfectly right; but he was certainly wrong in putting himself in opposition to the War Office and the other authorities who had communicated with him on the subject. Had the matter stopped there, the conduct of the Adjutant might have been attributed to undue zeal; but he went further, by stating in company that his commanding officer had been guilty of falsehood in declaring himself efficient. That, of course, did not beget a very good feeling between the two officers; and, eventually, they got off speaking terms. At last, the Adjutant so far forgot himself as to refuse to salute his commanding officer in the street, or, indeed, to take any notice of him whatever. What was the War Office to do under such circumstances? Feeling that it was impossible they could serve together in the same regiment, the War Office took the earliest opportunity of transferring the Adjutant to another regiment. That was the full account of what had occurred; and the noble Lord knew quite well that if the same thing happened in the Regular Service the offender would have been tried by court martial, and probably cashiered. The leniency shown in the present case he did not consider altogether wise; but it certainly cut away the suggestion of the noble Lord that there had been any harshness of treatment in the case of the Adjutant. He was sorry the noble Lord should have made himself the mouth-piece of *ex parte*, instead of inquiring for himself into the circumstances, or of communicating with the War Office—it was very difficult to obtain any information but from the War Office—upon the subject.

Lord TRURO said, the positive statement was made to him that the Colonel of the regiment asked the Adjutant to sign a Return which he—the Adjutant—considered to be false. He (Lord Truro) had no account whatever of the War Office having sent down instructions for the investigation of the matter on the spot, and certainly no information that the Adjutant had refused to obey orders or had been guilty of breaches of discipline towards his superior officer. It seemed to him that the War Office was ignoring its own regulations.

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND rose to Order. The noble Lord had already addressed the House, and, as there was no Motion before it, was not justified in doing so a second time.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, if the noble Lord had submitted a Motion he would, according to the practice o the House, be entitled to reply. Therefore, without their Lordships' indulgence, he could not speak a second time

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday*, 1*st August*, 1878.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report* — East India (Public Works) [No. 333].

Public Bills — *Second Reading* — Marriages (Fiji) * [285].

*Committee—Report*—Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) [271]; Consolidated Fund (No. 4) *; Arranmore Polling District (Ireland) * [270].

*Considered as amended*—Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) [157].

*Third Reading*—Prison (Officers' Superannuation) * [269]; Statute Law Revision (Ireland)* [122]; British Museum (Transfer of Collection) * [236], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn*—Valuation of Property * [94].

### EAST INDIA (PUBLIC WORKS).

Report from Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, *brought up*, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be *printed.* [No. 333.]

## *NOTICE OF QUESTION.*

### GREECE—ALLEGED AGREEMENT WITH TURKEY.

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: I beg to give Notice that to-morrow I will ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether there is any truth in the statement made by Safvet Pasha to the French Ambassador at Constantinople, as reported by the Special Correspondent of *The Standard* of to-day, to the effect "that England had promised Turkey that she would not permit Greece to receive any additional territory, and that without this assurance Turkey would not have ceded Cyprus to England?" I will also ask whether the second secret document we hear of to-day, as having been signed at the Foreign Office on the 31st of May, had any reference to the future limitation of Greece?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I think I had better answer the Question at once; but the hon. Member can repeat it again to-morrow, if he likes. There is no report, and there is certainly no document, of the character alluded to by the hon. Member.

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that there was no secret document signed on the 31st of May at the Foreign Office, or that it had no reference to the affairs of Greece?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: There was no document signed on that day that had reference to the affairs of Greece.

## *QUESTIONS.*

### CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE ACT —DEPRECIATION OF MACHINERY.

#### QUESTION.

Mr. HIBBERT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Commissioners for general or special purposes have agreed upon the scale of deductions which they propose to allow under section twelve of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act of the present Session for depreciation of machinery or plant; and, if so, whether he can inform the House what such deductions are?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, it was never contemplated that the Commissioners should fix any hard-and-fast scale of deductions; but it was proposed that they should have a certain latitude in the matter, and the scale of deductions would necessarily be determined by the circumstances of different cases and different trades. It was impossible for him to inform the House what the deductions were.

### SCIENCE AND ART MUSEUM (DUBLIN).

#### QUESTION.

Mr. M. BROOKS asked the Vice President of the Council, If he can state,—the title of the body which is to be intrusted with the local supervision of the Department of Science and Art in Dublin; the mode of appointment of such body, and the names of the persons already selected to form it; the powers and duties, with regard to the promotion of Science and Art in Dublin, and through the rest of Ireland, which such a body is to exercise?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: At present there are no Commissioners in any way associated with the Department of Science and Art in Dublin; but an arrangement has been made by which the administrative work there will be carried on by a Director, as in the case of Edinburgh, who will be directly responsible to the Education Department for the disbursement of the sums annually voted by Parliament. The body to be intrusted with the local supervision of the Science and Art Museum is a Board of Visitors, consisting of 12 Visitors—four nominated by the Lord Lieutenant, five by the Royal Dublin Society, and three by the Royal Irish Academy. Their duties will be to make annual Reports to the Education Department, which are to be laid before Parliament, on the condition, management, and requirements of the Museum, and to advise upon points affecting the administration. The Board consists of the Duke of Leinster, Lord Rosse, Sir Arthur Guinness, Sir Charles Lanyon, Sir Samuel Ferguson, Dr. Jellett, Sir Robert Cane, Mr. Uniacke Townsend, Professor Emerson Reynolds, Dr. Molloy, Professor Percival Wright, and Mr. Alfred Jones. Their duties will be confined to the Dublin Art and Science Museum; the other art and science schools and establishments in Ireland remain as they were.

### INDIA—FAMINE IN CASHMERE.

### QUESTION.

MR. RALLI asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he can give the House any information as to the extent and causes of the famine which was stated by the "Times" of India, as quoted in the "Observer" of Sunday last, to be existing now in Cashmere?

MR. E. STANHOPE: No, Sir; we have not at present received any official information upon the subject.

### ARMY — PROMOTION OF GENERAL OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE asked the Secretary of State for War, If the senior Major in the Army is entitled to brevet promotion as Lieutenant Colonel, under paragraph 20 (P) of Royal Warrant for Promotion, on the death or retirement of a General officer of 70 years of age, although the vacancy may be absorbed and no Colonel promoted to the rank of General?

COLONEL STANLEY: On the death of a general officer of 70 years of age, no promotion of any kind is made. On the retirement of a general officer of 70 years of age, the senior major in the Army could not be promoted, unless a colonel were promoted to the rank of major general in succession.

### THE LUNACY LAWS—LEGISLATION.

### QUESTION.

MR. DILLWYN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a Bill in the next Session of Parliament to carry out the recommendations of the Select Committee on the Lunacy Laws?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I am bound to say that I have not at present had time to give any attention to this question. It is my intention to consider it in the course of the Recess, and at the beginning of next Session I may be able to answer the Question.

### NAVY—MR. HENWOOD.—QUESTION.

CAPTAIN PIM asked the Right honourable gentleman the Member for Pontefract, Whether he has seen the Petition of Mr. Charles Henwood, ordered by this House to lie upon the Table, and subsequently printed in the Appendix to the Twenty-third Report on Public Petitions, No. 392, complaining of erroneous statements which have seriously prejudiced his professional reputation and prospects, in the Minute written by the Right honourable gentleman in reference to the "Captain"; whether he was not led into error when stating in that Minute that the plan described for the "Duncan," and illustrated by a "curve of stability," was "Mr. Henwood's design;" and, whether, if such is the case, he will take steps to remove the stigma which has in consequence so long attached to Mr. Henwood's professional reputation?

MR. CHILDERS: I might decline altogether to answer this Question, as I am not a Minister, and it does not relate to any Bill or Motion of mine; but if my answering it will save the time of the House, which has already been a good deal taken up by Mr. Henwood's grievances, I will do so. I have read Mr. Henwood's Petition, in which he complains of a Report on his plans made by the professional officers of the Admiralty in 1867, long before I was First Lord, and published *in extenso* by me in a Parliamentary Paper of the year 1871. I neither had then, nor have I now, the means of determining whether those officers were accurate or not in their professional criticisms of Mr. Henwood's plans which my Predecessors had received and acted upon; and if it is any satisfaction to him to know that it was not my business, nor within my competency, to review these scientific calculations submitted to a previous Government, he is welcome to the admission.

## CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND) — PRISON DISCIPLINE.—QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the observations of the Chief Baron at the late assizes at Naas, and to his refusal to sentence women to imprisonment, except for crimes of violence, because they will have to pass many nights lying on a deal board, or plank bed, as it is called; whether this regulation of lying on a deal board is not a novelty introduced from England for the first time into Irish prisons; whether the Government is not aware that it has excited wide spread dissatisfaction amongst those who have to administer the Law in Ireland, and has been publicly characterized by Mr. Baron Dowse as a form of torture; and, whether the Government will forthwith revert to the use of beds or hammocks in Irish prisons?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) (for Mr. J. Lowther): I have seen the remarks of the Chief Baron. I am unable to state since what time plank beds have been in use in the Irish prisons, but they have been used in many English prisons for a great number of years. The Irish prison rules have established a uniformity of practice in this respect. A great deal of misconception exists as to this particular incident of the sentence, and there appears to be some exaggeration in some of the statements that have been made. An adequate supply of bedding is invariably furnished to each prisoner, and under no circumstances is a prisoner obliged to sleep in his clothes. The working of the rule will be watched in the closest possible way, and I hope it will be found to be worked with consideration, and without any unnecessary harshness.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY: The reply of the right hon. and learned Gentleman is no answer to my Question. I shall repeat it to-morrow, in some form or other; and shall, before the Session ends, endeavour to get a vote of the House on the subject.

## INDIA—THE INDIAN BUDGET.

### QUESTIONS.

Mr. BRIGGS asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When the debate on the Indian Budget will take place?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: In reply to a Question which was put to me on this subject some time ago, I expressed a hope that the Indian Budget might be taken at the beginning of this week; but since then the debate on Eastern affairs has come on, and has rendered it impossible that that hope should be fulfilled. We are now in such a position with regard to Supply, that it has become absolutely necessary that we should proceed with the remaining Votes as soon as possible; and it is, therefore, not in the power of Her Majesty's Government to name any particular day upon which the Indian Budget will be taken. We propose to take the Education Vote on Monday, and the Army Supplementary Votes on Tuesday, and to proceed with the other Estimates throughout the week.

Mr. CHILDERS inquired, Whether the Education Vote would be taken before or after the right hon. Gentleman's Statement in introducing the Supplementary Estimates?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I think that my Statement will have to be deferred until Tuesday. The right hon. Gentleman will see that with regard to the Education Vote it is a matter of urgency; and, probably, the question of the policy of the Supplementary Estimates should rather follow than precede that Vote.

Mr. CHILDERS asked, What was the gross amount of the Supplemental Civil Service Estimates?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that the amount of the Supplemental Civil Service Estimates would be about £80,000. He hoped that the Papers relating to them would be in the hands of hon. Members shortly.

## THE TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLES 2 AND 61.—QUESTION.

Mr. E. JENKINS asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the 61st Article of the Treaty of Berlin, assented to by England and Turkey at a period subsequent to the secret Convention of the 4th of June, did not supersede the second clause of the first Article of that Convention, and substitute the surveillance of the Powers for any special right granted to England under that Convention?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): In my opinion there is no inconsistency between the Articles referred to in the Question of the hon. Gentleman. The general reforms in the administration of Asiatic Turkey, provided for under the Convention of the 4th of June between England and Turkey, will of necessity include those particular reforms in Armenia which are prescribed in Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin. The Porte will be under an obligation to make known these latter reforms to the Powers, and they will superintend their application. This latter provision is not likely to interfere with the policy of Great Britain, whose only object is to secure by every possible means the due execution of the reforms required.

MR. E. JENKINS: I beg to point out to the hon. and learned Gentleman that he has not answered my Question. I did not ask him with regard to the policy of Her Majesty's Government in Turkey, but with regard to the interpretation of the two documents. I asked him whether the second document does not supersede the first?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): I am sorry I did not answer the Question so as to make myself intelligible to the hon. Member; but I should say most decidedly that the second Treaty does not supersede the first.

## VALUATION OF PROPERTY BILL.

### BILL WITHDRAWN.

In reply to MR. HIBBERT,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that there appeared to be no use in keeping the Order of the Day respecting the Valuation of Property Bill upon the Paper, and therefore it would be read and discharged.

Order for Committee read, and *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

## IRELAND—LONDONDERRY AND BELFAST—PAY OF CONSTABULARY.

### QUESTION.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he will state why the county and sub-inspectors of the Londonderry Royal Irish Constabulary force do not receive the same pay and allowances as the officers in the same position in Belfast; whether the men of both forces do not receive the same amount of extra pay; whether a recommendation in favour of the Londonderry officers was not made by the late Inspector General; and, whether the Government has any objection to lay such recommendation, and any correspondence relating thereto, upon the Table of the House?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON): The men of the Royal Irish Constabulary who are sent to Belfast and Londonderry receive the same amount of extra pay, but the officers stationed at Londonderry do not receive the same pay as the officers at Belfast. Recommendations in favour of the former officers have been made, and are under consideration, and the Irish Government hope soon to be able to bring them under the notice of the Treasury. The Papers relating to the subject are confidential, and not such as it is usual to produce.

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. MELDON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When he proposed to give facilities for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill; and if he could name a day when he could give such priority to the third reading of that Bill as would enable a discussion to be taken?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he was sorry that, in the present state of Public Business, it was not in his power to name a day for that purpose.

MR. MELDON gave Notice that, on Monday next, on going into Committee of Supply, he would move that this House should resolve itself into Committee of Supply when the Order for the third reading of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill had been disposed of.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—QUESTION.

In reply to Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL,

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, that a Notice of opposition to this Bill having been placed upon the Notice Paper, the Committee upon it could not be taken after half-past 12 o'clock to-night; but he trusted that that Notice would, upon further consideration, be withdrawn, in which case the measure might be proceeded with to night.

---

*Ordered,* That the Orders of the Day, which are appointed for To-morrow, at Two o'clock, be deferred till To-morrow. —(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### EASTERN AFFAIRS.—RESOLUTION.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [29th July],

"That, whilst this House has learned with satisfaction that the troubles which have arisen in the East of Europe have been terminated by the Treaty of Berlin without a further recourse to arms, and rejoices in the extension of the liberty and self-government of some of the populations of European Turkey, this House regrets :—

"That it has not been found practicable to deal in a satisfactory manner with the claims of the Kingdom of Greece, and of the Greek subjects of the Porte:

"That by the assumption under the Anglo-Turkish Convention of a sole guarantee of the integrity of the remaining territories of Turkey in Asia, the Military liabilities of this Country have been unnecessarily extended.

"That the undefined engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the better administration of those Provinces have imposed heavy responsibilities on the State, whilst no sufficient means have been indicated for securing their fulfilment:

"And that such engagements have been entered into, and responsibilities incurred, without the previous knowledge of Parliament.—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

And which Amendment was,

To leave out from the first word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learned with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire,"—(*Mr. Plunket,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, the question before the House, as I understand it, is not one of general criticism upon the Treaty of Berlin, but as to what estimate we are to form of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government from the time of the signing of the Treaty of San Stefano down to the present time. That appears to me to be the question which is clearly before the House, and to that question I will clearly confine myself, as far as the nature of the argument will permit. The Government have come back from the negotiations which have resulted in the Treaty of Berlin, after having obtained what they call a most complete triumph. They say that they have brought back with them honour and peace. No Government could, I think, wish to claim more for itself under such circumstances. It occurs, however, to me to inquire in what, in the peculiar circumstances of the case, the honour of the Government consists? Now, I think the honour of a Government under these circumstances would consist in its carrying out in the main the policy which it has always advocated, and in being able to give effect to that policy without doing anything that it would be ashamed to avow, or that this House would have reason to disapprove of. That is my notion of the honour of a Government returning from difficult negotiations; and what I propose to inquire is whether the Government has satisfied that condition? What were the views with which Her Majesty's Government entered into these negotiations? We have been told what those views were over and over again, and so we can have no doubt with regard to them. The view of Her Majesty's Government in entering into these negotiations has been to maintain the integrity and the independence of the Turkish Empire; and it is by that that they must stand or fall. I am not anxious to catch at words in this matter, because the language on this subject held by the Earl of Beaconsfield, the First Minister of the Crown, has been entirely consistent throughout. The noble Earl has always said that that was the object of the policy of Her Majesty's Government—nay, more, so completely has he been imbued with that idea that, since he has returned home, at the banquet which was given to him on Saturday last, he said that the Powers had come to the conclusion that there should be no partitioning of Turkey, and that the existence and the strengthening of that Empire were necessary for the peace of Europe. That is the language of the noble Earl uttered since the signing of the Treaty of Berlin? What I want to inquire into is, whether Her Majesty's Government, holding as they do that opinion, have reason to be satisfied with the terms of the Treaty of Berlin. The notion, of course, that anything could be lost by Turkey has been vigorously repudiated, and the word "partitioned" is scorned; but I maintain that not only has Turkey been partitioned, but that she may fairly be said, so far as Turkey in Europe is concerned, to have been dismembered; and as a proof of that, I would only refer to the several Powers amongst whom 11,500,000 people have been divided. No less than seven Powers have received some of the legacy, and received it under the auspices of Her Majesty's Government. They are Russia, Austria, Roumania, Servia, Greece, Montenegro, and, I am sorry to say, England. Seven Powers have received donations more or less large out of Turkey; and yet the noble Earl the Prime Minister tells us that the object of the Powers was the strengthening of Turkey, and that that object, we are to assume from their claiming all the honours of the proceeding, has been attained. Another point which strikes me as very remarkable is this. The one point which the Government has striven to attain has been the separation of Bulgaria into two parts. That point has been attained. I will not stop to say at this moment whether Russia would not have been much more effectually encountered by one large State than by two small ones; but that point, at any rate, the Government may claim to have attained. But look how the Government has been obliged to dress up that achievement in order to make it palatable! What they say is, that two-thirds of Bulgaria have been placed under the direct political and military rule of the Sultan. That statement has also been introduced into the Congress; but putting things in the Congress will not alter the fact, and I appeal to the House whether there is the least ground for saying that two-thirds of Bulgaria, or whatever it may amount to, has been replaced under the direct political and military rule of the Sultan? This is a question, of course, of the honour of the Government. If it is so, they are entitled to honour; if it is not so, then not only have they no right to honour, but they deserve the more blame for deluding people by pretending to have done that which they have entirely failed to do. Now, the first thing I observe is that this country, which is under the direct political and military sway of the Sultan, will have administrative autonomy. As far as I understand the word, that cuts off the political part of the Sultan's rule at one blow. If a country is to govern itself, it is not to be governed by the Sultan in the way the Sultan understands government. Then order is to be maintained by a local *gendarmerie* and local Militia. Here, again, you get a Constitutional force, a force not at the will or disposal of the Sultan, and evidently connected with the autonomy that is to be granted. Then, again, there are to be no Bashi-Bazouks or Circassians to garrison the frontier. There are, however, to be regular troops; and so complete is the military control of the Sultan over this Province, that the regular troops are not to be billeted on the people, but are only to be allowed to go up and down certain garrisons, where if they happen to quarrel with the people behind them, they will run the risk of starving. A Christian Governor is to be appointed; but he is only to be appointed with the consent of the Powers; so that the very person who is to govern is not in any sense the Delegate of the Sultan. Perhaps it may be said the Sultan will have to do with the internal organization? The Great Powers are to organize the powers and functions of the administrative, judicial, and financial systems, and this is called placing the Province under the "direct political and military rule of the Sultan." I maintain that it is not creditable on the part of the Government to hold this language. It is seeking by mere words to controvert facts; and it is the less creditable, because the attempt is so exceedingly transparent that it really can deceive no one, and must re-act in discredit upon those who attempt it. There is no doubt that the Government has succeeded in separating this Province from Bulgaria, and perhaps, in some degree, diminishing the influence which Russia would otherwise have over it; but to say that they have placed it under the political and military rule of the Sultan is in the most direct contradiction with the facts, and facts supplied by the Government themselves. Then we come to what has happened since the Treaty of San Stefano. Is it quite clear that Turkey was not better off as the Treaty of San Stefano stood? Turkey has been divided into I know not how many portions which were not contemplated by the Treaty of San Stefano; and I am not sure that the labours of Her Majesty's Government have not tended to make matters worse than they were; but anything more unsatisfactory to the Turkish mind I cannot conceive, and well might Turkey say—

> "Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena cruoris?"

They may say—"Who has not had a slice of our country?" So far, then, I think I am correct in saying that the Government have not succeeded in establishing any great claim to honour in connection with these transactions. It appears to me that it is very doubtful whether all these efforts of Her Majesty's Government have not left matters rather worse than they found them; and it will take a great deal of reasoning, indeed, to prove that they are better. I now come to the next point, which has been much dwelt upon, and that is the case of Greece. Now, as far as Greece is concerned, the case has been fully stated. Greece had to choose between two alliances. She might have chosen to associate with Russia, or she might have chosen to associate with England. In an unhappy hour for her own prosperity she chose the alliance of England. ["No!"] She chose the alliance of England; and most unwisely, as I think, she took the advice of England. There are occasions when it is necessary for people to be bold, as there are occasions when it is necessary for them to be cautious; and if ever a nation was challenged to the utmost to exert itself, and to come forward and assert itself and its liberty, that nation was Greece, in the war between the Sultan and Russia. She might have sustained heavy losses. She might, perhaps, have lost some of the pillars of the Parthenon—for what I know our schoolboy feelings might have been wounded—but undoubtedly, if she had come forward, she would not have been in the position she is in to-day. As an Englishman, I am grieved to say that had she allied herself with Russia, her position, when the partition or dismemberment took place under the auspices of the Government, would have been a very different one from what it is now. I do not merely assert this; but look at what happened? The noble Earl the First Minister of the Crown undertook to advocate the cause of Greece, to bring it into the Congress, and it was understood that he was to advocate it. When you look at the Protocols you will see that he had hardly a word to say in favour of it, but everything against it. Listen to his language. He said—

> "An erroneous opinion has been attributed to the Congress, an intention to proceed to the partition of a worn out State, and not to strengthen, as I assume it has done, an ancient Empire which it considered essential to the maintenance of peace."

So that Greece was quite mistaken in supposing that there was anything going, or that that was the policy of the Powers, although she saw them doing it before her eyes, and saw only six other Powers receive portions of the Turkish Empire. That was entirely a mistake of Greece. She did not understand the policy of the Powers—that policy being, according to the undoubted authority of Lord Beaconsfield, to strengthen, instead of dismember and destroy, Turkey; and when she came to England, England's whole view was entirely against anything like giving a share of Turkey to any other Power. The Earl of Beaconsfield said the Greek Government was entirely mistaken as to the views of Europe; that "States, like individuals who have a future, can afford to wait."

> "Thine be the joyless dignity to starve,"

must have been the advice given to Greece. All I can say is, that if the

Greeks, instead of taking the advice of one poet, the Earl of Beaconsfield, had taken the advice of another poet, Lord Byron, they would have stood in another position—

> "Trust not for freedom to the Franks.
> They have a king who buys and sells.
> In native swords and native ranks
> The only hope of freedom dwells.
> But Turkish force and Latin fraud
> Would break your shield, however broad."

I may be prejudiced, or I may be wrong; but I think we have got very few laurels in that respect. I now come to a very unpleasant part of the duty I have taken upon myself, and that is to consider a number of secret arrangements. It will be remembered that we were for three or four months negotiating with Russia, in order to induce her to make a clear statement of her views before we went into Congress. The notion of anything being held back was to us utterly intolerable, and we risked the chance of going to war in order to have everything fair and above board. Such were our splendid and magnificent views. I am going to speak of two secret Treaties, and I should have supposed myself that that was all that might have been spoken of. But something has occurred this morning that looks extremely like a third secret Treaty. I really do hope that if any Member of the Government should rise in the course of this evening's debate, he will have the kindness to tell us, at any rate, whether there is another secret Treaty or not, and how many more there are? If we are not to know anything about them, at any rate, it would be a satisfaction to know how many there are. It may be a childish wish; still, I hope the Government will tell us. We come, then, to two secret Treaties. I consider that when England went into the Congress she went there with the appearance, and certainly with the belief on my part, and I expect on the part of most of the Members of the Congress, of absolute disinterestedness. She went there in a judicial capacity, utterly disinterested as regarded herself, to do the best she could to avert the horrors of war, and give a fair, a judicial opinion on everything that came before her. That, certainly, was the attitude which, in my simplicity, I attributed to England at that time. But how utterly mistaken we were, when we found there were two litigants in this case. Russia was one litigant, and Turkey was the other. I will not split straws as to which was the plaintiff and which was the defendant. That might be a difficult matter to settle. England professed to act impartially; but she went into this Congress with a secret Treaty with one of the litigants in one pocket, and with a secret Treaty with the other litigant in the other pocket. I ask you, if any of you were arbitrators between two persons, and those persons found out that you had made a secret agreement with regard to the subject-matter of their dispute, not with one, but with both of them, and you happened to all meet together, what sort of language do you think would be used by them? I shall not press that further for the moment. I hold it was a gross disrespect to the other Powers; it was a violation of the understanding on which the Congress was held—that the Powers who went there went avowedly with the intention that everything was to be submitted to them as a Congress possessing all the dignity and authority of Europe. It was a violation of that understanding when you previously withdrew practically from their consideration, as a judicial body, questions of enormous importance and difficulty, and carefully concealed the fact from those with whom you were to act. It was a species of dissimulation which cannot be sufficiently reprobated. It would be intolerable if practised by individuals; and I have yet to learn that States, although their consciences may be rather dull, are to be entirely exempted from the laws of morality. This was, as we all know, a Treaty in which England agreed with Russia that she would give up the notion that Batoum was to be restored to Turkey. That, I think, was the main effect of the Treaty. But, then, the most extraordinary thing happened. We were not content with the Treaty, but we actually issued a despatch in which we directed that a sort of comedy should be acted for the benefit of whom it might concern. The Treaty having been signed, sealed, and agreed to, by which we formally conceded Batoum, as far as England could do it, to Russia, the Marquess of Salisbury wrote these instructions to Lord Odo Russell. Here is the first instruction given to Lord Odo Russell, who, we are told, knew about it—

"There is no ground for believing that Russia will really give way."

Not much, I should think, when we had given up all claim to resist. Then the despatch continues—

"It is possible that you will not be able to shake her resolution."

Observe, this is the third page of the Blue Book with regard to the Protocol; and so we have the agreeable reflection that this, coming in the very front of the battle, will leave a witness against us to all time, and every future historian will make the infamy of the thing conspicuous. The despatch goes on—

"You are not on that account to abstain from earnestly pressing the matter."

Certainly not; for if the fact that you have given up a matter altogether does not make you abstain from earnestly pressing, I do not see that anything else should. The instructions proceed—

"In case of failure, you will be made acquainted with the course which the Government has determined to pursue."

That makes the thing complete. Here you have the suggestion that failure was possible, but by no means certain, and that Lord Odo Russell would be made acquainted with the course to be pursued; while, to make the thing quite plain, we are informed that Lord Odo Russell had been made acquainted with everything already. This might be very good in a play; but think of it being done in real life! Imagine any of us being found out acting such a part! And what makes it worse is this—I should have had more feeling for it if anything was to be got by it; but the thing appears to have been done merely to see how many falsehoods could be put in a despatch. [*Cries of* "Oh!" "Order!" *and* "Withdraw!"]

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I rise, Sir, to Order; because I think that the word "falsehood," as applied to the Government, is not Parliamentary language.

MR. LOWE: I think the word has Ministerial authority. [*Cries of* "Withdraw!"]

MR. SPEAKER: If the observation of the right hon. Gentleman is intended to apply to any Member of this House, of course, it is un-Parliamentary.

MR. LOWE: I will not repeat anything that is offensive to hon. Gentlemen. [*Cries of* "Withdraw!"] The Speaker, I understand, has ruled that I am not obliged to withdraw.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman. On the point of Order I did not quite understand your ruling, Sir; but what I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say was, that in a certain case the Government have introduced certain expressions with a view to see—or, as if they wished to see—how many falsehoods they could put into a despatch. And I imagine that, as Members of the Government are sitting in this House, such a charge made against the Government collectively is un-Parliamentary.

MR. LOWE: The answer is, that I said nothing about the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the right hon. Gentleman does not intend to apply that expression to the Government or to any Member of the Government. If that is so, the expression might be allowed to pass without his being called upon to withdraw it. If that is not his meaning, then I am bound to call on him to withdraw it.

MR. LOWE: I bow, Sir, to your ruling and withdraw the expression. The result of this transaction was that Russia obtained Batoum, and the Earl of Beaconsfield was at great pains to show that what had been parted with was good for nothing. But I will not pursue that point any further. I assure hon. Gentlemen that I have said everything I intended to say about it. I will now turn to the second secret Treaty—that is, the Treaty between us and Turkey; and that, of course, is a still more serious affair. It is treated as a very light affair, as if it really meant nothing at all; whereas I maintain it is the most serious document that could possibly be imagined. It is said to be a Guarantee—that is, an engagement to assist another person. No doubt it is; but that is not the whole. It is a great deal more than a Guarantee. It is a bilateral contract with Turkey. A mere engagement to another person might be treated very lightly; but this contract is one of the most solemn kind. We undertake, on the one hand, that we will fight for the Turks. They undertake, on the other hand, to do two things—they undertake to give us the Island of Cyprus, and to put in force such reforms as may be agreed upon between us. Observe, these two terms are not executory, but executed. The Island of Cyprus has been given up to us; we have had what we asked—we have had the consideration; we are absolutely bound by this; and it is quite ridiculous to say that this is a mere executory Agreement. It has every feature that an executed Agreement can possibly have, and we are bound by it in the very firmest manner. The Treaty is, of course, of the very highest consequence; because, as has been already shown, it fixes us to a particular point where we are bound to be to await the attack of Russia. The *champ clos* is fixed, and we cannot be absent; we must be there to meet her whenever Russia chooses. Even poor Bob Acres was obliged to do that; but we must not only be there, but we must always be ready. We must have a Force always ready to give effect to this Agreement whenever it is demanded. It is an Agreement, therefore, which touches most nearly and vitally the interests of England; because it does amount in some shape or other to a permanent increase to our Army, and it obliges us to place our Army in some situation where it can easily reach the point of attack, if any attack is made. It is therefore, I repeat, an Agreement of the most serious nature; and I cannot express too strongly my regret that it should have been made without the slightest intimation of it being given to Parliament. Then, the next point is to my mind even more extraordinary, and that is our taking the Island of Cyprus. Now, we had been the patrons and assistants of the Turk in all his evils and all his miseries. We had been a sort of Good Samaritan to him. But when the Good Samaritan found the man who had fallen amongst thieves, he pulled out his purse, took out 2*d*., and gave it to him. Our charity seems to be of a different kind. We say to him—"You have not got such a thing as half-a-crown about you, have you?" and so take what he has. Now, I maintain that Cyprus is in no way a station fit for the purpose for which we pretend to use it. That purpose is that we may obtain a depôt for our Forces, from which we may act in performance of our engagements with Turkey. Will anyone tell me how Cyprus will assist us in that operation? Granted that we have a large Force in Cyprus. Granted that Russia advances from Batoum into the territory of the Turks. How could we resist her by Forces from Cyprus? Where should we land them? When we had landed them, how should we get them across the country? It is rugged, it is swampy, it is a desert, it has no roads and bridges. How are we to bring artillery, and all the machinery of modern Armies, from Cyprus to fight Russia by that way? and if we could do it, how long would it take us to do it? And how much would be left of the Turks by the time we arrived on the scene? The Island of Cyprus was wanted; but not for this purpose. We wanted something for a flourish—something to make a figure—to excite a little enthusiasm, to gratify what the Marquess of Salisbury calls the "Imperial instincts of the country"—some wretched thing of that sort, in order to excite the imagination of mankind, and show what great people we are; what great conquerors; and how we are treading in the steps of those great people who have conquered in the East. I am bound to say that there is one thing to be stated for Cyprus, and that is, that if it is not very valuable, we have got it very cheap; but I think not wholly unattended with that which is sometimes supposed to follow cheapness. Let us look a little further. The country which we are to defend is a country entirely different from that which has been the scene of operations. It is not a country where there are many different races. It is a Mahometan country, in which there is no disaffection. People talk about Asia Minor as if that was the only country in question; whereas our Guarantee extends, not only over Asia Minor, but over Syria, Mesopotamia, and Turkish Arabia; and it appears to me that to suppose by anything we can do we can really reform those countries is simply ridiculous. Their people do not want reforms in our sense. They are in the extremity of misery; they are nearly starving; they are almost skinned alive by soldiers who receive no pay; they are robbed by brigands; they are plundered by Pashas who received no pay—those are their grievances, and I ask you how are you to remove them? You may reply—"Nothing can be easier. Go to the Sultan, and say to him—make roads over these places, pay your soldiers so that they may not plunder, put down by armed force these brigands, make roads, bridges, and railways, open up trade and commerce, and everything will go on well." The Sultan will reply—"Nothing can be more true than what you say, but I have not got a shilling to do it with." What is the answer which would be given? Why, the answer which is always given in Turkey, "Backsheesh." All this raving about Asia Minor merely comes to this—that England, in exchange for the honour of being allowed to shed her best blood at any time at the call of Russia—in consideration of being allowed this splendid privilege, is allowed the further privilege of spending any number of millions in relieving the miseries of the Sultan's subjects. It is not a question of the goodwill of the Sultan, it is a question of his power. The country is utterly drained and destroyed. You cannot go on year after year drawing from the resources of a country and the people without utterly destroying that country. The thing cannot be redressed by good government or anything else—what is wanted is money, money, nothing else. We have purchased for ourselves the liberty of spending any quantity of English money in helping these people; and, when we have done it, so far as I can see, we shall have left them very nearly as we found them. I am perfectly satisfied that when the people had been enabled to accumulate their savings, there would arise somebody who would think that money much better transferred to his pocket, and the old process be gone through again. The fall of the Roman Empire was due to a system of plunder under which the country suffered—plunder not, as was generally supposed, by the Goths and Vandals, but by their own Governors. The whole system, from beginning to end, was one of organized plunder. It was from no defect in the administration of justice; but owing to the simple fact that the Government took to itself so much of the produce of labour that it left nothing for the people to exist upon. That is, and always will be, the case so long as you have Oriental Governors. Nothing can be more vain than to suppose that by any amount of money or paper you can alter that state of things. I need not trouble the House by saying anything of what exploits we may perform in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Turkish Arabia. I think it extremely probable that there may be found gentlemen who will induce the Government to make a railway for some 900 miles across that howling desert, with a suitable guarantee from the Goverment to its friends in the City who agree with the Marquess of Salisbury that trade never flourishes so much as under the influence of an Imperial despotism. I want to know why we should be called upon to be so particularly happy at having obtained the liberty of going into all this expense and trouble? Will anyone show me how the thing can be done other than by a lavish expenditure of money? If it is necessary, of course we must submit to it; but can it be shown to be necessary? So far from being a thing to be proud of, and to be called Imperial and all that, I say you have put upon us a calamity which will destroy finances already not in good order; which will increase the demands for the Army; and which will bring us into collision with all manner of persons with whom, in our insular position, we have no business to be brought into collision at all. The question, then, is—What is the necessity that forces us to all this? What pressing necessity is there? Is it, as I understand it, that Russia wants to take Turkey in Asia into its own hands? I do not believe it. That Russia would like to do anything which would suit her own ends I can well believe; but you will find it to be a true observation, that no poor country ever did itself any good by taking a poorer. It is not land that a poor country wants, it has plenty of that itself; what it wants is money—a country from which it can get plunder. Take the classical instance of the men who came to urge the Ionians to help them to fight against Darius, and who were told to leave off their disputes among themselves, in order to get rich on the gold and silver of the Persians. Russia would not profit by Asia Minor, and will actually have to incur expense to maintain her own conquests. I hold it absurd to suppose that Russia has any desire for Asia Minor. But then, it is said, Russia is going to India. That is a subject which has been so admirably treated by a noble Lord "elsewhere," that I will not go into it at length here. The reason that we hold India is that we got Indian money to take it with. It was not taken by England, but by the East India Company. But India is virtually an island. There is really no means of reaching India with a modern Army and appliances except by sea. The only other way, even seriously suggested, is by Persia and Afghanistan. Everybody knows that Russia could take Persia any day she liked, and thus the only possible or conceivable road to India is already within her reach. Why, then, should we incur all this expense, trouble, and danger, for the purpose of preventing her from getting that which she does not in the least want, because she has got a better thing already? If India is to be taken, it must be taken through Afghanistan; and, so far as Persia is concerned, Russia has now the right of conquest. But if we were to remove all manner of difficulties out of her way, it is impossible that Russia should do that which we have, as it is said, provided against. How did Alexander get into India? Why, by climbing over the Hindoo-Koosh. Imagine a modern Army, with artillery, trying to climb the Hindoo-Koosh. The thing is a perfect delusion. If these are the considerations which are to influence us, I think I have shown some cause why we should have paused —why, I am quite sure, we should have been consulted—before a step of this kind was taken. But, Sir, suppose all this is to go for nothing, the question still remains—Have we a right to adventure on such a scale? We are told it is Imperial policy. Well, when anything very foolish is to be done, we are always told it is an Imperial matter. When we took over Cyprus we were told we had regained our military character, and that under an Imperial system trade flourishes, commerce extends, wealth increases. For the sake of argument only I am willing to admit that; but this I say—an individual has a perfect right to go on any romantic expedition he pleases. He may devote his efforts with perfect liberty to any object he thinks right, if he only makes suitable provision for his wife and family, and no one has the right to blame him for it. But have those who are answerable for the conduct of the affairs of a great country a right so to deal with the money of the poor? You may take credit for spending money on this Imperial policy; but who are the people who make the money? Have you consulted them on the subject? Have you asked them whether they are ready to hand over their hard earnings to pay for such expeditions? Are you quite sure you are doing your duty towards those people, when, without consulting them or those who represent them, you, by a stroke of the pen, change altogether the whole system and policy of the country, and adopt an entirely new policy, the very reverse of that which has hitherto been pursued, throwing, as you must do, the burden on millions of poor people whose Representatives have never heard a word about it? Sir, I entirely deny that war is the mother of commerce in any sense. It is the enemy of everything that is good, and of many other things besides. Take all the incidents of history. Rome pursued her course of conquest, and conquered the world. "These are Imperial works, and worthy kings." But what was the result? The power of Imperial Rome was broken in conquering the world; it dwindled away, century after century, because commerce would not flourish. It was so Imperial that its people were robbed to sustain the Imperial policy. Take, again, Louis XIV. Did he leave France in a better state than he found it? He left it in a state of the most abject misery. Napoleon took advantage of the enthusiasm of his country to become Imperial; and, therefore, according to that doctrine, commerce ought to have flourished. But he destroyed a generation of men, and, after all his conquests, he left France infinitely weaker than he found her. To conquer is not the vocation of England. The East India Company, by means which I will not stop to consider, conquered India; but that was not the act of England. England has been a colonizing, not a conquering, country. The last time when England sought to be a conquering country was during the Hundred Years War between England and France. From that time, England has been a commercial, a manufacturing country—a country of seamen and traders. It has not been a conquering country, it has grown rich by other means. Why, then, are we to be told that under this new system we are to become the envy of the world? Why is all this to be changed? I have only one point more, and that touches a question on which I feel deeply. We are in the habit of considering ourselves the freest country in the world. We have long led the van in that direction. Well; let us see what has been done within the last few weeks. We have had formed, by twelve Gentlemen of whom I desire to speak with all respect, but among whom I recognize no moral or intellectual superiority to make them my master and me their slave—we have had formed, and studiously concealed from us, I will not say a great conspiracy, but a great plan—a great scheme for entirely altering the whole policy of this country, for transforming it from what it has hitherto been—a country of peace, industry, and commerce—into a country afflicted with the wildest schemes of conquest. ["No!"] Yes, I say the wildest schemes of conquest. We have to leave the pursuits which have been congenial to us, and under which we have become great, to go into that path which so many nations have trod before us—that of entering upon distant and unprofitable visions in search of glory and prestige. That has been done. It may be quite right, it may be perfectly proper; but I say it is an absolute change from anything that has ever been done in this country for the last 400 or 500 years. We have never been, it is our pride that we are not, a military nation. We are a nation of seamen, traders, manufacturers, workpeople. We have not been, since the Middle Ages, a military nation. Now, Sir, I say that, by a Treaty absolutely concealed from us, a change has been effected which has placed us in a position to act with armed forces in Syria on the smallest notice. We have undertaken to keep order in an enormous portion of the earth's surface. That may be right; but I ask, is it right that the obligation to do so should be incurred without the people of this country, who will have to pay for it, in whose scanty earnings it will make a most serious inroad, who find that taxation is growing heavier and heavier, while public expenditure is becoming more and more reckless, having, through their Representatives, had an opportunity of saying whether such an obligation should have been undertaken? What has this House of Commons done—we, on whom you are throwing all the unpopularity of finding the money for this lavish expenditure—what have we done that this should be forced upon us without our having had an opportunity of saying a word on behalf of the thousands and hundreds of thousands whom we represent? What justification, I ask, is to be offered? What was the extreme and overbearing necessity, what the tremendous urgency, which compelled us to occupy Cryprus and enter into the Convention with Turkey which was so carefully concealed from the House of Commons? I claim on behalf of the House of Commons that it should be consulted when money is to be spent and on the causes of money being spent. It is a mockery and a delusion to say that the House of Commons holds the purse-strings of the nation, when 12 Gentlemen sitting in a single room hold the power of bringing about the events which compel the money to be spent. If the House of Commons is intrusted with this right, it is also a part of our Constitution that we should be placed in a position by those who, for the time, are the Ministers of the Crown to be able to discharge our duty fully and effectually. This is not a small matter. It is not as if I were objecting to a merely trifling item of expenditure. It is really a complete and entire change in the system we have heretofore carried out. How, I ask, did this come to pass? Who gave you this power? Time was when the Kings of England not only reigned, but conducted in their own persons the principal affairs of government. At that time, it was part of the Common Law that the Prerogative of the Crown should be absolute—that the King should have the power within his Prerogative of doing what he liked. That was the law, and it is the law. But, of course, we know that after the Revolution the King ceased to administer the government himself. It was administered more and more by his Ministers, until at last it was administered wholly by them. As long as the King administered the Constitution, he had a great reason for exercising moderation, because he had a great stake in the country. Our ancestors were not inclined to be treated by their Kings as we have been treated by the Ministers of the Crown. They had a knack, when the King unduly stretched his Prerogative, of putting him aside and setting up someone else in his place. Though he was in theory absolute, yet he had a very considerable motive to use his Prerogative with moderation. The Revolution came, and the change that I have mentioned followed—the administrative government of the country was placed in the hands of the Gentlemen who, for the time, possess the confidence of the House of Commons. Now, so far from that mending the case, it has to some extent been a great deal worse. And why? Because those Gentlemen have not the same stake in the country that the King had. If they do anything that displeases the House of Commons and the country, they know pretty well what is the worst that can happen to them—and what happens to us all, sooner or later—they lose their places. Therefore, they can produce the most enormous results—they can dare the most extremely audacious things, without having to suffer anything very severe in consequence. Therefore, the use of arbitrary power has become much easier and stronger against the people than it was in the old times before Ministers governed the country. If that is so, "How comes it," you will ask, "that there has been no complaint; that we have sat still for 200 years under this Prerogative, and never said anything against it?" The reason is extremely plain. We have had a succession of statesmen who knew their duty to the Crown and to the country. They knew that their duty to the Crown was so to manage its Prerogative as not to give it the arbitrary character that has been strained to the utmost in very recent times; and that their duty to the country was, so far as they could, to discourage any sudden or violent alterations, or, indeed, anything that could tend to cut down authority. Therefore, both Whigs and Tories have agreed to use sparingly and with great caution the enormous powers which are dormant in the Prerogative of the Crown, so as to take away all excuse for making any further attacks or inroads upon our ancient Monarchy. They were men who put their country above their Party; and they were above the notion of getting any advantage, however great, at the expense of turning public anger or dislike against the Crown. We have lived, no doubt, in some sense under a sort of Republic for many years; but it has been a Republic which recognized the origin from which it sprung, and has been faithful to the traditions of the English Monarchy, as far as possible. But what have you done? For the first time in English history, I believe, you have devised in your own minds an enormous scheme of innovating policy. It may be very good, but it is thoroughly new and unthought of. You carefully concealed it from the people of England, and then by means of this antiquated weapon called Prerogative—a weapon which everyone respects, but which nobody expected to see again drawn from the scabbard—you have made a Treaty, and have used the power not as it ought to have been used. The effect of that policy will have to be fully considered by the people. You have used it to surprise them against their will and against their interest, and have taken from them the power which they possessed, and have probably saddled them with an immense burden and loss of life. This you have done studiously and deliberately, without giving them the means of expressing their opinion. It is perfectly manifest, if this state of things may be supposed to be permanent, the liberties of this country are not worth a day's purchase. Of course, if it was a question of ship money or general warrants, there would be many people in this country who would be willing to spend their last shilling to fight the matter to the utmost; but unfortunately the law is against us. The good sense and the wisdom of those who came before us have left this old law in existence, in the full belief that their confidence would never be betrayed. That has now passed, and the Government has by its action put the Prerogative face to face with the interests and feelings of the people. You have done all in your power to drag Royalty into collision with its subjects. If any evil comes of this matter, it is to you that it must be attributed. Is it likely, or is it possible, that this great country, which sets an example of freedom to the whole world, will submit to have these things done for it, to have these things thrust down its throat — not by triumphant majorities, those we must submit to—without being allowed to say a single word on the other side? Are we to be told that we must cause the Queen to falsify engagements into which She has entered, or submit to that which many of us think now—and more of us will think before long—is contrary to the best interest of this country and of those whom we represent? What right have you, or has any body of men, to place the House of Commons in such a position? What is the right to deliberate upon a decision which is already taking effect, and with regard to which we are told we must tamely submit, or appear to be offering factious opposition? That is the plain question to which I have called the attention of the House; and I do hope that some hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side will show how it is consistent with the rules of the English Constitution that we should be in this manner deprived of the right of deliberating upon the matter in hand before a decision is arrived at. I would ask some hon. Gentlemen opposite to tell us why the Government, with an undoubted majority, have employed all these manœuvres, have taken all this trouble, and have adopted all the strange proceedings, if their object was not to deprive us of the power to make a single remonstrance? Anything more wild or dangerous I cannot imagine. It is vain now to remonstrate. The thing is done, and we must get out of it as well as we can; but I am bound to say that, in my opinion, it is perfectly impossible, if this Convention is to stand, that the English people can be content to leave this matter of the Prerogative in its present position. Look at what it means, if you are to take these old laws and interpret them literally. The Queen has the undoubted Prerogative, and could let loose every felon now confined in Her gaols, without anybody having the right to say anything against it; the Queen has a right to make Treaties, and She could make a Treaty ceding the Isle of Wight to France, without anyone having the right to object; the Queen is the fountain of honour, and She could make an Earl of every cobbler in London, if She thought fit, equally without any person having the right to object. These powers might have been treated as one of the curiosities of the law in old times; but they are now come to be absolutely earnest. It is in your power, by a mere exercise of the Prerogative, absolutely to shut the House of Commons, and deprive us of the possibility of giving that opinion, which we are bound on behalf of our constituents to give in regard to the objects you have in view. This is the most serious part of the case. The rest we may pass for the present; but this, I hope, we shall not allow to go on. I will not blame our ancestors for it. We have been too confiding. We have looked upon a proceeding, such as we have witnessed in connection with this Convention, as being so improbable as to differ in nothing from the impossible. We have been mistaken and deluded, and it is our own fault that we have suffered such things; but I hope we shall not suffer ourselves to be still further deluded.

Lord JOHN MANNERS: The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down promised the House that he would make a disagreeable speech, and he has kept his promise; but whatever may have been the feelings with which his Friends and Supporters listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, we, on this side, who have so often heard disagreeable sayings from his mouth, accept what he has said to-night with the greatest good humour and complacency. At the end of his speech, the right hon. Gentleman threatened us with a revolutionary campaign—so much the worse for him and his Allies. Standing up, as we do, for the old established rights of the Crown, and the accompanying immunities of the people, we need apprehend no very great or serious attack from the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues. If, because Her Majesty's Government, in the undoubted exercise of their rights, and acting in accordance with long-established precedent, have taken a course, suggested a policy, and negotiated a Treaty, which do not meet with the approval of the right hon. Gentleman, he is to get up, and in the face of this House announce that he will agitate for a revolutionary re-settlement of the fundamental principles of the Constitution, all I can say is, let him go to any constituency he pleases on that particular platform. Before I sit down, I shall show that what the right hon. Gentleman calls a secret Treaty was negotiated in accordance with the strictest precedents; but, before doing so, I will make some few comments upon the opening accusations of the right hon. Gentleman. He complains of the Government because we have not, he says, maintained our honour. We are, I am sure, very much indebted to the right hon. Gentleman for the superabundant care which he takes of our honour; but we are, on the whole, of opinion, that we ourselves can take care of it without any assistance from him. And why, I would ask, does the right hon. Gentleman say that the Treaty of Berlin is inconsistent with the honour of the Government? Because, forsooth, a few months ago, it was stated to be their object and wish to maintain and uphold the independence and integrity of Turkey! Now, I would ask, was the Government of England alone, when the Treaty of San Stefano was signed, to ignore the fact that by its provisions the independence and integrity of Turkey were most seriously impaired? It was, indeed, because we recognized that fact that we did not cease to struggle to bring that Treaty before the assembled Powers of Europe in Congress at Berlin, and in that Assembly to fight a stiff battle to restore to Turkey, to a great extent, her integrity and independence. The right hon. Gentleman went on to quote the language of the Marquess of Salisbury's despatch, to the effect that the result of the Treaty of Berlin had been to strengthen Turkey, and to contend that, on the contrary, it had greatly weakened and impoverished her. But is the Marquess of Salisbury, I should like to know, the only great statesman who took that view of the effect of the Treaty? We have all read what Prince Bismarck said on the subject, as well as the opinion of the First Plenipotentiary of France, which coincided with the view taken by Count Schouvaloff, which was that Turkey had gained rather than lost by the new stipulations. Right hon. and hon. Gentlemen may dispute the proposition; but, cavil as they please, there can be no doubt that, as far as Turkey in Europe is concerned, the Treaty of Berlin has restored, to a great extent, strength, vitality, and independence to the Ottoman Empire. I admit that, in our view, that was not sufficient; and therefore I come to the Convention of Constantinople, and am prepared to contend that by those two acts, which ought to be taken together, Turkey is sufficiently strong and independent to fulfil those great objects which have been the objects of English statesmen from time immemorial—namely, that the Power established at Constantinople should be sufficiently strong and independent to maintain the guardianship of the Dardanelles. The right hon. Gentleman then went on to criticize with extreme severity the statement of the Government, that Eastern Roumelia is now under the direct military and political rule of Turkey. I do not know in what excess of language the right hon. Gentleman did not indulge in contradicting that statement; but Article 13 of the Treaty said—

> "A Province is formed south of the Balkans, which will take the name of East Roumelia, and will remain under the direct military and political authority of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, under conditions of administrative autonomy."

Why, then, is Her Majesty's Government to be told that they are wanting in consistency and honour, because they describe Eastern Roumelia as being constituted under the political and military rule of the Sultan—the exact words of the Treaty of Berlin? The right hon. Gentleman says he wants to know how the political and military rule of the Sultan is maintained? Why, by the exercise of all the attributes of Sovereignty. He declares war and peace; he has the right to negotiate Treaties in Eastern Roumelia; he appoints Governors, and every military commander in that Province. He appoints all the civil officers; and yet the right hon. Gentleman tells us we have forfeited our honour because we have described Eastern Roumelia as being under the direct political and military rule of the Sultan. The right hon. Gentleman then told us, as we have been told before, that Turkey, instead of being strengthened and re-invigorated, is absolutely partitioned. My answer is, that she is no more partitioned than almost every other Great Power of Europe has been in the course of years. Nearly every one of the Great Powers has had from time to time to submit to the loss of Provinces, and such an operation, no doubt, Turkey has undergone; but she is not partitioned. She herself feels and acknowledges that she has greatly gained by the substitution of the Treaty of Berlin for that of San Stefano. I now come to what the right hon. Gentleman has said as to our conduct towards Greece. Greece, he tells us, did not go to war because she trusted to England, and the result is that she has now got nothing. He asks whether Greece would be as she is now if she had not followed our advice? No, Sir, undoubtedly Greece would not be as she is now if she had not followed our advice. She would not have been with her territory untouched by the tread of conquering armies and her coasts unbombarded, with her people contented and happy; and, above all, with the prospects of very considerable accession of fertile territory to her small Kingdom. No, Sir, Greece would have been, doubtless, in a very different position, although the right hon. Gentleman seems inclined to think that she would have been happier if she had suffered all the horrors of war. I do not think that the people of Greece or the Government of the country will take that view. Her Majesty's Government believes that Greece, when she receives this large accession of territory, will most cordially thank them for the wise counsels which we gave them during those distracted months, not only to her, but to Turkey; for it must not be forgotten that Turkey had just ground of complaint against Greece. Does anyone suppose that at the end of the war Turkey would not have sufficient military and naval force at her disposal to carry fire and sword into Greece if she had been so disposed? It is notorious that Her Majesty's Government strained every nerve, and used their utmost influence, to prevent the outraged Government of Turkey from proceeding against Greece, from whom she had so often received provocation. The right hon. Gentleman says Greece has received nothing, while Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro have received an accession of territory. Why, Greece will receive more in point of territory than any one of the States to which he has referred. I pass now from the first part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech to what I think the House will say is the most serious charge he has made. He was pleased to talk of what he termed two secret Treaties. I deny, in the first place, that there were two secret Treaties. There is one Treaty which has been entered into in accordance with universal precedent which, of course, may be said to have been secret until it was signed; but it is, as far as I am aware, different from no other Treaty of the kind in that respect. But the right hon. Gentleman talks of another secret Treaty with respect to which my lips, I fancy, are to a great extent sealed. After what occurred in the House the other evening, I hardly know how I can allude to it. But what the right hon. Gentleman, in the exuberance of his fancy, is pleased to term a secret Treaty I should prefer to give this account of. It is now perfectly well known to every Member of this House that Her Majesty's Government made every possible effort to bring the Treaty of San Stefano under the consideration of all the Powers of Europe assembled in Congress. Now, to bring those efforts to a successful issue, it was necessary to follow the wise rule of the Earl of Derby—that if you want to go into Congress successfully, you must go into it with some definite propositions. We thought it expedient to follow that wise counsel; and, therefore, we approached the Russians in a friendly spirit to see what possibilities there were, if a Congress were once assembled at Berlin on the Treaty of San Stefano, of our bringing about a peaceful result. Nothing could exceed, I am glad to say, the cordial anxiety of Count Schouvaloff to smooth away difficulties and to co-operate in this attempt to come to an understanding on the negotiations which might be undertaken, and a series of amicable conversations resulted. Suppose there had never been any record of these conversations between Count Schouvaloff and Lord Salisbury, would there be any justification for saying that we had entered into a secret Treaty? But there was a record kept; and is there anything in that record which forbids any other Power in Europe, or which forbids even Russia and England, from maintaining in the Congress at Berlin any course they might think fit on the subjects brought under the notice of that Assembly? All that the Agreement amounted to was this—that if on certain points which might arise Russia and England were not able to come to an understanding, they agreed that none of those points should form a *casus belli.* That is the explanation of what the right hon. Gentleman calls the secret Treaty. The right hon. Gentleman talked of the "comedy" which was being played at Berlin when the English Plenipotentiaries contested at the Congress the acquisition of Batoum by Russia. The right hon. Gentleman seems to forget that but for those amicable conversations, that "comedy" might have ended in a tragedy. Fortunately, however, the Emperor of Russia authorized a great concession on the subject of Batoum, and agreed, instead of making it a second Sebastopol and a constant menace and threat to the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire, that it should be simply a commercial port. I think the House will see that this was a great concession; and it shows how the Great Powers were influenced by the representations of our Plenipotentiaries, and that this question of Batoum was seriously discussed and re-considered at the Congress at Berlin. The right hon. Gentleman, following his usual course, and taking a legal view of the case, asks what would be said by two litigants if, on coming into Court, they found that their Judge had entered into a secret arrangement with each of them beforehand? In the present case, he says, England was acting the part of the Judge as between the two litigants, Turkey and Russia, with each of whom she had previously entered into a secret arrangement. The right hon. Gentleman has denounced those secret arrangements; but I know what is the opinion entertained with regard to them by the two Powers most interested in them. From neither Russia nor Turkey have come those disagreeable expressions of opinion on the subject which we have heard from the right hon. Gentleman to-night. I will now turn to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, which has excited so greatly the wrath of the right hon. Gentleman, and which has induced him to utter his tremendous threat of a revolutionary campaign being opened throughout the country. In the settlement arrived at by the Congress at Berlin Her Majesty's Government thought what had been done was, upon the whole, sufficient to maintain the position of Turkey in Europe, and that by enabling Turkey to guard the passage of the Balkans with her regular troops, by authorizing the Governor General of Eastern Roumelia to call in the aid of the Turkish troops when necessary, and by permitting Austria to assume a position to command the approach to Constantinople, enough had been done to secure Turkey against any further attempt on the part of Russia to advance towards that city. But, no doubt, matters were very different with regard to Turkey in Asia. In spite of the very important concession made by the Emperor of Russia with reference to the port of Batoum, it was impossible not to see that the possession of that port, of Ardahan, and of Kars, with their adjacent territories, laid Turkey in Asia open to future invasion by Russia. Therefore it was that Her Majesty's Government gave Russia notice that, in the event of her retaining those acquisitions, we should take steps to meet the danger which we saw might arise in the future. Russia, having persisted in retaining those acquisitions, the steps which Her Majesty Government took were such as were strictly in accordance with precedent, and were only calculated to enable us to fulfil the obvious obligations and duty which, in our opinion, lay upon us. I have heard it said—and, indeed, the right hon. Gentleman has said it himself—that Russia will be deterred from advancing further south in Asia Minor by the difficulties presented by the physical conditions of the country. What right the right hon. Gentleman has to anticipate what will be the action of Russia in the future I am sure I do not know. Her Majesty's Government, however, must judge of the future with reference to the past. We do not find that even the arid deserts of Central Asia have stopped the tide of Russian conquest; and we have yet to learn that there is anything to prevent her from advancing south of Kars and Ardahan when she thinks right to do so. Her Majesty's Government must not only look to the past and the future, but they must act for the present; and we have acted for the present. And what has our action been? The right hon. Gentleman has denounced our action by saying that it will impose a burden of taxation upon the children of millions yet unborn, which no people could hope to sustain. But the whole object of the Convention is expressed in half-a-dozen lines. [Mr. LOWE: Hear, hear!] The right hon. Gentleman says "Hear, hear!" but was there no ambiguity in the Tripartite Treaty of 1856? Was that Treaty laid upon the Table of the House before it was signed, and did it impose no burdens upon the children of millions yet unborn? Did not that Treaty move forward the frontiers of England to the Caucasus? Why, the Anglo-Turkish Convention actually diminishes, instead of extending the obligations of this country as far as Turkey in Europe is concerned. The Tripartite Treaty of 1856 guaranteed the whole area of the Turkish Empire. Does the right hon. Gentleman contend that there were no dangers ahead at that time; that all was serene in the European and Asiatic sky; and that there was no danger then of entering into a Guarantee by a secret Treaty about which Parliament had never been consulted? The very year after the conclusion of that Tripartite Treaty and Guarantee there broke out the Indian Mutiny. And see what this Convention has done. It has limited our conditional Guarantee to Turkey in Asia. The right hon. Gentleman says that this Convention will never come into operation. Well, I do not say that it will. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that Russia is far too wise ever to dream of marching her troops from Kars and Ardahan down to Constantinople and to the Persian Gulf. In that case, the Treaty will never come into operation; and all the horrors the right hon. Gentleman has anticipated as certain to flow from it are imaginary, and the children of the millions yet unborn may sleep in their beds in peace, and will escape the terrible burden of increased taxation which the right hon. Gentleman predicted they would have to endure. I am very much inclined to think that the right hon. Gentleman is right on this point, and that this Treaty will do much to maintain peace in Asia Minor, and that it will give great influence to the party in Russia who are in favour of peace and civil progress. I think, moreover, that this Treaty will enable these great improvements in Asia Minor to be carried into effect which Her Majesty's Government are so anxious to secure. The right hon. Gentleman, following the example of the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), denounces the secret Treaty as if it were the first time we had ever entered into one. I have already referred to the Tripartite Treaty of 1856; let us take another, which was a favourite Treaty with him, the Treaty guaranteeing Belgium. Although the right hon. Gentleman, in the pursuit of parsimony, had cut down the Army and weakened the Navy, in 1870 he felt himself compelled to propose an addition of 20,000 men to the Army, in order that he might maintain and vindicate the Guarantee given to Belgium. My noble Friend the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon) told us of the Treaties guaranteeing Sweden and Norway and of the Treaty guaranteeing Portugal. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) has told us that England has not been a military Power for the last 500 years. To listen to him, one would think that Marlborough never existed, and that the Duke of Wellington was a Quaker. We have had no military experiences on the Continent, and at the end of these long campaigns, in which some thought that England played no inglorious part, it is to be concluded there were no Treaties of Guarantee. Was there no Guarantee with Portugal? Is the Guarantee with Portugal in existence or is it not? Did Mr. Canning in 1826, or did he not, send 6,000 men to Portugal to maintain our Guarantee? Does not the House feel that this accusation of imposing burdens on the people by Treaties of Guarantee is one of the wildest inventions that ever occurred to the fertile brain of the right hon. Gentleman? Passing to the acquisition of Cyprus, the right hon. Gentleman says it is badly situated for carrying out the object in view. No doubt, he is a great authority on all military and naval subjects; but he will permit me to place more reliance and confidence in the military and naval advisers of the Government than we do in him. We believe that, for the legitimate purposes in view, Cyprus is well and admirably situated. We have at least the consolation of knowing that Lord Napier of Magdala is of a different opinion from the right hon. Gentleman. We are content with the choice which has been made, and it is no little satisfaction to know that the people of Cyprus are content also. The right hon. Gentleman says—"Tell us how you propose to apply Cyprus to these purposes. Where do you mean to send your naval expedition? What will be the point at which you will land your military force?" I hope the right hon. Gentleman and the House will think we exercise only a due and proper discretion if we decline to give answers to these fishing questions. The right hon. Gentleman pictured in the most alarming fashion the awful consequences which would follow from any military expedition we might send out under his guidance and advice. Well, we are not likely to follow the advice of the right hon. Gentleman, or to be guided by his opinion as to where an expedition should be sent, if the necessity should occur, which I sincerely trust and believe will not be the case. The right hon. Gentleman gave us a woful picture of all the horrors which awaited our Forces. I was reminded of a parallel anticipation which preceded the Abyssinian campaign. The right hon. Gentleman took a leading part in that debate. There was no disaster he did not prophesy; no success he thought possible, and the unfortunate English soldiers were doomed, by a relentless and stupid Government, to lose their lives in the Abyssinian mountains. Coming to the obligation Turkey has entered into to reform her administration in Asiatic Turkey, the right hon. Gentleman says in effect—"The people are happy in their intense misery and do not want to be reformed; they are harassed by brigands, pillaged by pashas; they have not a sixpence left; they have no roads and no railways; they have not the comforts and they have hardly the decencies of life, and yet you have entered into a covenant with the Sultan that their condition shall be improved." Well, it is so; we have entered into a covenant with the Sultan—he has entered into that covenant with us—and we are in hopes that, before long, very great and beneficent results will follow from the terms of that Convention. The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that all that part of Asia which belongs to Turkey is involved in utter, hopeless, irremediable misery. But that is not the opinion of some authorities. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman has read a remarkable paper in *The Times* by Mr. Geary on the Valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates, describing the capacities of those fertile lands. He does not give a dreadful picture of pillaging pashas and devastating brigands; what he says is, that only a little more power is wanted to put down brigands and to keep order; and, contrary to the persistent statements of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, he says that it is to the regular Turkish troops and to a better police that the people have to look for a revival of their prosperity. The terms of this Convention will, we hope, enable the people of these vast and interesting countries to derive the benefits which Mr. Geary speaks of. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe), with a grand climax of fireworks, denounces us for having invented a novel policy running counter to all the principles which have made England great. We are told that we resemble Louis Quatorze and Napoleon I., and that we have plunged England into a policy of interminable war. Can anything be conceived more wild than such language in reference to a Convention, the object of which is the improvement of the condition of the people of these regions and the reformation of their government? Can any project be more humane, more sensible, and more likely to develop the blessings of peace? The right hon. Gentleman says the Convention clashes with the 61st Article of the Treaty of Berlin, by which all the Powers are to superintend the reforms granted by the Sultan to his Armenian subjects. If that be so, then all the Powers have entered into a wild crusade. Have Russia, Austria, and Germany done so? No; according to the right hon. Gentleman they are quite justified in undertaking to superintend the reforms the Sultan may grant; but England has embarked on a policy of aggression by entering into this peaceable Convention. We are told the two things do not agree. The right hon. Gentleman was evidently in some perplexity when he asked whether the Treaty of Berlin did not override and put an end to the Convention? The answer is, the two things run on parallel lines. By the Treaty the Sultan undertakes to grant reforms to his Armenian subjects, and to communicate them to the Powers; and, by the Convention, he covenants with us to agree to certain reforms which will be applicable to the Asiatic Dominions. We have the right to agree with the Sultan as to what the reforms shall be; and when they are granted, it is open to the Powers to supervise them so far as they relate to Armenia. I believe, Sir, I have now answered the main charges of the right hon. Gentleman. There are, with the permission of the House, one or two observations I should wish to make respecting the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. In the course of that speech, he spoke of the British

Plenipotentiaries at Berlin as favouring the cause of servitude against that of freedom. That is a startling statement to make. It reminds me of a saying of the late David Urquhart, that one-half of the miseries and blunders of mankind arise from the misuse of language. I think, if ever there was an illustration of Mr. Urquhart's aphorism, it is to be found in that astounding statement of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman said this—

> "I have already said that, as a general rule, the British Plenipotentiaries took the side opposed to that of freedom. Now, let us see what part they actually played. When the Congress came to deal with Bulgaria, which was to have full practical emancipation from the Turkish rule, what do we find? We find simply that they directed their attention to limiting in the utmost possible degree the local area of the new State, even to the extent of taking from it districts inhabited by a pure Slav population. . . . . Next, when I look to Roumelia, I find that the British Plenipotentiaries laboured to extend its limits as against Bulgaria, but at the same time, to limit its internal liberties as against the Porte."

What can be the right hon. Gentleman's notion of servitude? It proceeds upon this—that every acre of land of European Turkey that is not handed over directly or indirectly to the influence of Russia or the Slavs is taken from the side of freedom and carried over to the side of servitude. According to this notion of the right hon. Gentleman, the Treaty of San Stefano ought to have been held sacred; we had no right to interfere with it, except to enlarge its boundaries and hand over all European Turkey to Bulgaria. In this House there are Gentlemen of varied religious opinions—there are Gentlemen of the Jewish persuasion—there are Roman Catholics—there are those connected with the Established Church, and Protestant Dissenters of all shades of opinion. Well, I would put to them this question—As far as civil and religious freedom goes, would they rather live in Eastern Roumelia, under the direct limited rule of the Sultan, or in the new Bulgaria? Let us hope that the new Bulgaria will be all her friends hope; but we cannot —we dare not—shut our eyes to the fact that up to this time there have been bitter and gratuitous religious persecutions going on there; and I thought it a strange comment on this that the right hon. Gentleman twitted the Great Powers assembled in Congress at Berlin with doing so much to secure for the future civil and religious liberty in Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria. One more observation I venture to make on the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. At great length, and with immense pains, he endeavoured to sow the seeds of discord between this country and France. The right hon. Gentleman gave the House, the country, and Europe to understand that, in consequence of the conduct of the Government at Berlin and Constantinople, there is great alienation between the two countries—that, in fact, there is great exasperation. Sir, I give to that statement the most unqualified and explicit denial. Throughout all these long and perplexing negotiations, not a cloud has arisen to disturb the good feeling that has existed between France and England; and the Government upon their part ever sought to consult the feelings, the wishes, and even the prejudices of France. The right hon. Gentleman, in the same spirit, quoted a paragraph from the *Journal des Débats;* but I do not know—I do not believe— that that journal is the representative of the French Government or the French people. But will the right hon. Gentleman enter into a covenant with me with respect to the *Journal des Débats?* I should like to ask, is he prepared to take that paper as an authoritative exponent of French opinion with respect to himself? Will the right hon. Gentleman say that the description which for now two years has weekly appeared in that journal respecting his conduct, motives, character, and career is such as the House may take and implicitly believe? If he will say that, we may be prepared to consider what it says about the conduct of the Government. Well, Sir, we have proceeded throughout all these difficult and entangled negotiations in complete harmony with the French and Italian Governments. The right hon. Gentleman has done his best to replace unity and harmony by discord and alienation; but I tell the right hon. Gentleman he will fail in his attempt, as he has failed in all his attempts in the past. He will fail, because France and Italy know that he does not represent the feelings and opinions of the great people of England. They know that he represents a minority, that is dwindling and dwindling every day. They know that the longer he proceeds in his course, the more violent and ferocious his speeches, the more he denounces the conduct and vilifies the character of the Government, the more he misrepresents the opinions and feelings of the English people. The right hon. Gentleman says that the Prerogative of the Crown in making Treaties has hitherto been safeguarded by the conduct and character of the Ministers who have advised its exercise, and that it has been so maintained; because up to this day the Ministers of the Crown had an accurate knowledge of the public sentiment of the people. That is precisely the case now. I tell him it is because the present Government possesses the knowledge of the prevalent sentiment of the people of England that Her Majesty's Ministers, the Advisers of the Crown, are sitting where they are, and that the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends sit in Opposition. It is in spite of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, that the Prerogative of the Crown is safe. We have done nothing to strain or stretch it; and that is more than can be said by Gentlemen who sit opposite. And now, setting aside personalities and carping criticism, I ask the House to consider the simple question before us—which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London never once touched in his speech. The real question is, what for the future shall be the policy of England in Eastern Europe and Western Asia? Shall it be that policy which is adumbrated rather than expressed in the Resolutions before us? Shall it be that policy alluded to rather than explained in the speeches of the right hon. Gentlemen—a policy of insular isolation and calculating selfishness—a policy which, shrinking from all risks and refusing all responsibility for the future, will probably end in the failure to discharge those responsibilities which we have already incurred—a policy which will again doom this great country to a position of sterile impotence in the Councils of Europe; or is it to be the policy which Her Majesty's Government adopt, approve, and maintain—a policy which, in the course of a long series of years, has created, has made, out of a barren Island in the Northern Seas, a great and a growing Empire—a policy which, in a just cause and for a worthy object, will not shrink from risk, and will not avoid responsibility—a policy which, we think, believe, and hope, if adopted and carried out, will bestow upon the regions of Asiatic Turkey some, at least, of those blessings which North America, Australasia, South Africa, and India have learned to associate with Western civilization, and the name, and power, and influence of England?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he was especially anxious to draw the attention of the Government to one or two points that had been raised in the course of this discussion. The noble Lord (Lord John Manners) who had just sat down, in the course of his speech, stated that the Government had restored the strict integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, which for four centuries had been so abused. But if that were so, he (Mr. Chamberlain) did not think their action would permanently conduce to the honour and credit of the Government. He wanted to ask the hon. Gentlemen who sat opposite, and especially their supporters, whether they really had in contemplation the results which had been arived at, at the time they voted those liberal Supplies, when they made certain declarations to those who were unpatriotic, and who had the misfortune to differ from them on the question? The noble Lord had told them that Turkey had not suffered any partition or dismemberment other than that which other Powers had suffered. But history did not afford him any instance of this—where any country had lost two-thirds of its territory, which had been distributed amongst the several Powers. If the demands of England had been reasonable, did anyone suppose they would not have been conceded to ordinary negotiation, or that there would have been any necessity for those secret proceedings and menaces which had kept the country in a state of ferment so long? He asked the House, now that the Treaty was before it, to consider the question. He said, broadly, that in no single case in which Russia had shown an intention of insisting upon her demands had she now been compelled to concede anything. In the conditions of the Treaty of San Stefano there were alterations of points which Russia admitted her readiness to consider before the Powers of Europe, and accept the decision of the Powers. Sir Austen Layard, writing in June, 1877, said that to form Bulgaria, as far as the Balkans, into an autonomous Province, would be to bring under Russian influence and rule the inhabitants of that part of European Turkey; and to take away from the Porte the fortresses of the Quadrilateral would place the rest of that part of the Empire and Constantinople at the mercy of Russia. If that statement was true, how could it possibly have been the interest of Russia to fight against conditions so favourable to herself? Upon a review of the whole matter, they now saw the results which had been obtained. There never was a worse investment in this country than the £6,000,000 which was voted to the Government. The noble Lord who had just sat down exhorted them not to shrink from the responsibility that was before them, and employed a great part of his remarks in minimizing the responsibility, and stated that only a detachment of Metropolitan police was required to civilize Asia. But, assuming that work was to be done, he must say that was not an appeal which could be made with safety to hon. Members of that side of the House. He was willing to admit that the wealth and power of nations, like the wealth, power, and influence of individuals, were trusts to be used for the benefit of others, but not merely for selfish advantages or privileges. There were obligations which they had to fulfil, and if the Government were asking their support to undertake such a responsibility as this he would not object, although their responsibilities were great enough, and, in the words of the poet—

> "Already the too weary Titan daggers under
> the too vast orb of fate."

It would be better to fall under a heavy load of unselfish responsibility than to turn aside and not touch with the little finger the burden which others were called upon to bear. But he asked those Members of the Government, who now taunted other hon. Gentlemen with unwillingness to undertake responsibilities, how it was, that only 12 months ago, the Government refused to consider a much less responsibility? He recollected the then Secretary of State for War (now Viscount Cranbrook) lifting his eyes to the skylight, and asking from whence we derived, from Heaven above, or the earth beneath, a commission which would justify us in undertaking the civilization of the Turkish Provinces in Europe?—and yet now the Government, which strained at this gnat, had actually swallowed the camel of the Turkish Convention which landed them into liabilities not contemplated. Think what the conduct of the Government had cost this country and Turkey. Turkey, encouraged by the tacit acquiescence of this country, now saw its Exchequer in a complete state of bankruptcy, saw itself stripped of its bravest soldiers; it had lost 1,000,000 lives, and its population, whether Christian or Mahomedan, subjected to the unheard of miseries arising out of one of the most dreadful wars of this century; whilst this country had lost £10,000,000, at a time when the people could hardly spare it, and at a time, also, when trade was in a stagnant and paralyzed condition. They had seen the state of things which had been brought about by Her Majesty's Government, and they were now told that we ought to undertake these new and extraordinary obligations. He did not think so much of the money. England was, no doubt, a very wealthy country. She could afford to have her fling, and, if she pleased, could spend £10,000,000 to satisfy the vulgar patriotism of the music halls. But he thought the principal point they had to consider was the matter upon which the future judgment of the people would go —how far in the operations of the Government they had safeguarded the interests of the subject-populations of the Porte. A short time ago, there was presented to Parliament a map showing the amount of territory restored to Turkey; but the restoration of territory was much more imaginary than real. The deprivation of territory was, fortunately, effective enough. Millions of people had been relieved from an oppressive and crushing rule which had pressed upon them for years, and millions more were entitled to appeal to one or other of the Powers of Europe when next oppression became too heavy to be borne. The sacrifices of the late terrible war had not been altogether without compensation. Blood had been poured out like water, but it had not been altogether fruitless. The result had been that independence and freedom, with all the blessings which follow in their train, had been permanently assured to large populations who for long had been misgoverned and misruled. What was really unsatisfactory in these proceedings was this—that throughout the Protocols they saw evidence, and behind the Protocols they suspected evidence, that the British Plenipotentiaries, he would not say leaned in the direction of servitude, in deference to the susceptibilities of the noble Lord, but showed themselves the ready and willing champions of the selfish fears and jealousies of great despotisms; and that, on more than one occasion, they repressed the aspirations and limited the claims of the subject-nationalities. They had seen territory restored to Turkey, and they had given over large populations to the care and government of Austria-Hungary. We had even done something for Persia, although they had been told by a noble Lord that Persia was the worst-governed country in the world. On the other hand, we had taken from Servia some of the territory reserved to her by the Treaty made by Russia. And much worse than that was an action of which we should have to be ashamed, and that was, we had wrested from Montenegro the hard-won spoils of the valour and patriotism of her citizens, and taken from her the territory which she had acquired and held against enormous odds. On the other hand, England had made a warm protest against the retrocession of Bessarabia. The Plenipotentiaries had simply rehearsed a comedy in private, which was afterwards performed in public at the Berlin Congress, to the scorn of Europe. Our Government had opposed, and caused to be rejected and reduced, and afterwards ridiculed, the claims of Greece. Such action by this country towards Greece he could only describe as being most unwise and most ungenerous. English statesmen, from the time of Canning, had left it upon record that it was to the interest of England that the claims of Greece should be respected, and, when possible, promoted; and that it was to the interest of England to keep on friendly terms with that little maritime nation. And even the present Prime Minister spoke of the brilliant future before the Greeks, yet they had reason to believe he had thrown them over, in order to create an alliance with the corruption and despotism of the Turkish Empire. England had long owed a reparation to the Greeks. We had confined them within so small a territory that they had no room for development, and we had also burdened them with a heavy debt. In the circumstances, it would be a grievous thing if Italy and France undertook the championship of rights and claims which were confided orginally to our guardianship. They made a two-fold charge against the Government. In the first place, they did not take at the right time the necessary steps in order to secure for the Greeks a full hearing of their case at the Congress; and, in the second place, when the question of Greek's claims came before the Congress, the action of England reduced the concessions which would have been otherwise made. He particularly wished to draw the attention of the Home Secretary to this matter. There were two propositions before the Congress. The proposition of the French was to the effect that the Greek Delegates should be admitted to the Congress when the question of the Border Provinces was discussed; and, secondly, that they might be called in by the Congress whenever any point in which they were likely to be interested was under discussion. To the first of these proposals the English Plenipotentiaries moved an amendment to the effect that the Delegates should be called in when questions affecting the Greek Provinces were under discussion; because it was urged that otherwise their presence, when Crete, Macedonia, and Thrace were being discussed, would be impossible. It appeared that the French proposition reserved full liberty to the Congress to call in the Greek Delegates whenever it thought fit to do so; and Prince Bismarck showed that when the question of Crete, Macedonia, and Thrace was brought forward, it would be seen who were the friends of Greece and who would vote for her being heard. Well, when that question was discussed the English Plenipotentiaries were absolutely silent, and did not in any way suggest that the Greek Delegates should be called in. Whatever might be the reason, this was what actually occurred, and surely it was a most unfortunate result. The English Plenipotentiaries prepared a Memorandum fully dealing with the cession of Bosnia and the Herzegovina; but there was not a word applying to the transfer of Crete to Greece. The English Representatives were able to support the selfish claims of Austria-Hungary, and at the same time to appropriate by secret Treaty an Island in the Mediterranean, and could do nothing whatsoever for the population of Crete, who had placed such profound confidence in the generous intentions of the British Government. Within the last century there had been five revolutions in the Island of Crete. Could there be any better evidence of the kind of government to which the inhabitants had been subjected? Yet we had found it impossible to do anything for them, and had handed them over to the tender mercies of the Porte. The next charge he had to bring against the Government was yet more serious, and it had already been mentioned by his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke). It amounted to this—Whereas the Representatives of France and of Italy were willing that Epirus and Thessaly should be absolutely annexed to Greece, the English Representatives opposed this suggestion, and reduced the proposition until it became—that which appeared in the Protocols—a mere suggestion to Turkey that she might consent to rectify the frontiers of Greece.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, the hon. Member had stated that the proposition of Italy and of France was that Thessaly and Epirus should be given up wholly. On what page was that to be found?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, it was not in the Protocols; but his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea stated that he had received private information on the subject. At the same time, his hon. Friend said the information had been confirmed by statements in some of the leading German newspapers. He was aware that the Home Secretary was not going into newspaper reports; but hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House, who got everything that was worth having from newspaper reports, could not afford to be equally independent. The peace which the noble Lord had brought us from Berlin was only an armistice, and not a permanent settlement. That Eastern Roumelia would, he did not doubt, ultimately unite with Bulgaria in obtaining their complete independence; and he was equally certain that Epirus and Thessaly would in due time become united to Greece, as certain as the unity that had taken place in Italy and in Germany. He supposed the Prime Minister would not be cynical enough to tell Greece to be patient, unless he thought in due time she would meet the reward of her patience, and that her aspirations, although postponed, would not be entirely and for ever extinguished. He wished to say a word or two upon the subject of the Anglo-Turkish Convention; and, first of all, he wanted to know of hon. Gentlemen opposite whether they thought that the policy of warlike preparation, which had been adopted, was necessary to obtain that Convention? He took it for granted that Turkey would only have been too glad to make that Convention without the necessity of calling out our Reserves, or bringing the Indian troops to Malta. If it could have been seen that this was to be the policy of England, he could not help thinking that the Crimean War might have been avoided; because we could then, as we were doing now, have joined in the partition of Turkey. The noble Viscount (Viscount Sandon) had told them there was no ambiguity in the Convention; but he considered there was great ambiguity in the way in which the Government had described it. Throughout the whole of the proceedings the Government had been speaking with two voices, and he did not know which was the true voice. The noble Lord had told the House that we had only given a limited and conditional Guarantee; and the Home Secretary told them on Tuesday that we had undertaken to protect Asia Minor from Russian attack only upon the express condition that Turkey reformed herself, and that we did not undertake to reform her. These statements appeared to be perfectly clear and decisive when taken by themselves, and if they were true it was hardly worth while to discuss the matter much further, for this was a sham Convention, perfectly useless, and not worth the paper on which it was written. About the same time, Lord Salisbury was stating in "another place," that the policy pursued by the Government had given to our diplomacy a character of plainness and frankness which, perhaps, within recent years, it had been in danger of losing. The expression, "recent years," was surely a slip for "recent months." If the Guarantee was based upon the promises of Turkey, which experience had shown over and over again were not to be relied upon, how could it be anything but misty and shadowy, and how could it possibly give a plain and unmistakable character to English diplomacy? Her Majesty's Government, it seemed to him, were on the horns of a dilemma. If the Convention was necessary to protect British interests, it ought not to rest upon such a broken reed as Turkish promises. If it was not necessary, then what excuse could there possibly be for committing this country to these new and vast and onerous obligations? No one in this country believed that Turkey would reform herself. The noble Lord had given them a very favourable description of the state of things in Asia Minor; but even according to his account, they wanted what we were accustomed to consider essential to good government. They wanted a policy; they wanted an administration of justice, which was mere extortion, a tax which was legalized robbery, and officials who were corrupt; and it was inconceivable that the Central Authority at Constantinople, bankrupt and discredited, and torn by internal dissensions, could ever institute the reforms required of it. And if Turkey was not to reform herself, who was to reform her? The President of the Board of Trade anticipated that Her Majesty's Government would do so. The other day, the noble Viscount (Viscount Sandon) invited them to join with the Government in bringing commerce, and civilization and prosperity, happiness, and peace to the hapless populations of these neglected lands. Well, he was not sure but that when Her Majesty's Government seriously undertook that work they would find in himself an earnest supporter; but at present they seemed to suppose that they could accomplish it—that is to say, educe order out of chaos —by a stroke of the pen, and by virtue, forsooth, of that increasing wisdom which, according to the President of the Board of Trade, the Sultan had been showing from month to month. It was not in that way that our Indian Empire had been formed. The care, prudence, foresight, and skill of our ablest statesmen had all gone to the making of it, backed by the personal influence and authority of England herself; and the same results were to be achieved in Asiatic Turkey by what?—by the stroke of a harlequin's wand. The Government could not maintain that they were entering upon a great work of civilization, and at the same time deny that they were undertaking new responsibilities. They must either accept or reject both propositions. If they rejected both, then the Convention was a sham, intended merely to cover their retreat from an awkward position. If they accepted both, then he could only say that never in history had this country been called upon to take so momentous a step with so little information. He would not venture, having no knowledge and experience himself, to speak at any length on the military side of our responsibilities; but, at the same time, when he found that some of the most considerable of military authorities, that some of our best Indian administrators, and many of our own statesmen doubted and denied the necessity of the course that had been pursued by the Government, it was open to him, ignorant as he was of the subject, to doubt also. He would point out that even the Government themselves had not ventured to rely on the importance of Asia Minor in this matter. They had been told that that would lead to something dim and distant in the future, and that Russia wanted to have possession of it, and would then have a recruiting ground. The Opposition had been taunted with having no alternative policy. If he might suggest one, it would be this—to ascertain where the vital interests of England really lay, and where her real defence properly began, and to wait till those interests were menaced, instead of rushing to meet a danger which possibly had no existence. They were told by the Government that they were pursuing a policy of duplicity. Duplicity was bad enough; but there was one policy which was worse, and that was to rush at full steam on to the rocks. The Government were following the latter course. In his opinion, it was clearly shown that while, on the one hand, the possession of Asia Minor by Russia would bring with it numerous involvements to her of a very serious and embarrassing kind, and not bring her one step nearer to a practical attack on India; but by assuming the Protectorate of Asia Minor we brought our defence of India up to the very jaws of the Russian fortresses, leaving to Russia—what we ought jealously to have prevented her getting—the choice of time, place, and circumstances for attacking us. He felt, therefore, under such circumstances, the Opposition had only one and a clear duty to perform, and that was to protest against new obligations and liabilities which had been cast upon us without our consent or knowledge. The Government had been doing on this occasion what they had done on many previous occasions. They had been deferring liabilities which they did not themselves like to perform. They had drawn a bill on posterity for the defence of Asia Minor, and it would be for posterity to judge their conduct and decide when the bill fell due, whether they felt bound by the obligations contracted in their name, but certainly not with their consent. For himself, he had no doubt as to what the result would be. Her Majesty's Government could not stem permanently the tide of events, and all they could do would not save the Ottoman Empire from its well-deserved and inevitable fate.

Mr. Alderman COTTON professed himself at a loss to understand the policy of the Opposition. A few short months ago their cry was peace, and some of them on that side of the House were disposed to join in the cry; but now they had obtained peace—a peace beyond their expectations — in terms of great moment to this country, hon. Members opposite were speaking as if they would have preferred the alternative of war. The origin of the late war was certainly not due to the Government, but rather to the speeches of hon. Members opposite and their friends, who led Russia to suppose that this country would not go to war for Turkey. Peace with honour used to be the incentive words for war. Now they were a sublime truth—an accomplished fact. Peace had now been restored, and he unhesitatingly said, a peace with honour, and he wanted to know why hon. Gentlemen opposite did not put the pipe of peace between their lips, and join us in the happy song. He denied emphatically that the Government had acted ungenerously towards Greece. From its foundation as a Kingdom that country had always enjoyed the sympathy of the English people, and would continue to receive it. Five thousand miles of frontier was proposed to be given to Greece; and he thought the Greeks, when they came to consider the results of the Congress, would admit they had received great consideration, and received quite as large an accession of territory as they had expected to obtain. He would say to Greece—"Be patient. As a nation scarcely half a century old you have done great wonders to hold your Kingdom and your power against a nation whose people hated you, and were hated thoroughly by you in return. The time will come when Epirus, Macedonia, and Thessaly will, in all probability, be added to Greece; but that cannot be done in a day." The object of the Congress was the consideration of the San Stefano Treaty, and not the partition of the Turkish Empire. Had Russia succeeded in her advance to Constantinople, and established herself there, what would have become of the Kingdom of Greece? We could not suppose that Russia would have tolerated a Kingdom of Greece for a moment. Greece would at once have become a tributary State. But now we had required Turkey not to attack Greece, and had put Russia further away from her. Russia, in his humble judgment, had been put back many years. At the present moment her position was not an enviable one. She was confronted by the discontent of Poland, wars and rebellions on her Chinese frontier, the conquered but disaffected tribes up to Persia, the wide-spread ramifications of secret societies all over the Empire, and the varied and conflicting interests of north and south. It would not, therefore, be to her advantage to break the provisions of the Treaty, or to rush needlessly into a fresh war. He felt that we should have some difficulty in managing the Turks; but was England one whit the worse for taking possession of Cyprus, or for the Convention she had entered into with Turkey? He believed that nations in the East had had quite enough of war, and would hesitate before they entered into it again. He believed that the Government, in going for peace, had studied the wishes of the people of England, and that the people of England were in accord with the acts of the Government, and did not go with the hon. Member opposite in denouncing the Convention or what was done at the Congress. Some hon. Members talked about secret agreements. Did they think it was possible that Russia would have attended the Congress if something like an understanding as to the course at the Congress had not been come to? Much had been said about the susceptibility of Italy and France. He did not think they felt aggrieved at the Convention between England and Turkey. What was the object of the Government in printing the Anglo-Turkish Treaty some few days before the Congress separated? It was to give the Plenipotentiaries there present an opportunity of communicating with their respective Governments, and of protesting, if they thought fit. But not one protested. The only protest that had been made proceeded from hon. Members on the other side of the House. The whole plan of the Opposition had been to throw discredit on the Treaty because it was made without the sanction of the House. Did they suppose that if the Treaty had been submitted to the House it would not have received the sanction of the House? It would have been sanctioned by a large majority; but to have submitted it to the House would have involved the loss of much time, a time when the world was on tiptoe to hear peace proclaimed from the Berlin Congress. There had not been a foreign journal—except some out-of-the-way paper—which had complained of the action taken by the noble Lords at the Congress; he had never known acts of such importance as these, done by public men, meet with such approbation both at home and abroad. As to Cyprus, it would be a most valuable acquisition to the English nation. Through Cyprus the civilization of England would be more and more opened to the people of the East. The Treaties, he was sure, would redound to the honour of England, and lead to an ever-widening path to our civilization and commerce.

MAJOR NOLAN said, he could not blame the Government for the course they had taken in many matters. For instance, he approved their conduct in calling out the Reserves, and he did not consider that they could well have acted otherwise. He also thought the Government were quite right in securing such a position as Cyprus, and he did not blame them much for their conduct at the Congress at Berlin, where they could not have achieved much more than they had done without seriously risking a war. But he contended that Russia had retained all she fought for in Asiatic Turkey, and in European Turkey she conquered up to the very gates of Constantinople. He believed Russia entered into the Congress with a splendid military plan, and although she had given way in certain particulars she had got an equivalent for it. He considered the question of Greece to be to a very great extent a sentimental question. England was not able to secure all she wanted in her own interests in the Congress, therefore she could not be expected to secure those of Greece. Having said so much in approval of the policy of the Government, he would revert to one point which seemed to him to outweigh all others, and that was the Anglo-Turkish Circular. Why we should have bound ourselves hand-and-foot to go to war on a future occasion, it might be very likely at a cost of as much as £200,000,000, for the protection of Turkey he could not understand. He could not see any sufficient military reason whatever for such an engagement, but he saw many objections to it. The Crown at the present moment was in such a position that it would have to go to war for Turkey if Asiatic Turkey was attacked; but he hardly thought that the country was so much in the hands of the Crown that it could not get out of such an engagement. He expected that the Government on this occasion would receive a majority, probably of 120, and in that case the House of Commons would have agreed with the Treaty. It might even then be said that the House of Commons was five years old, and a future Government might say that they would not accept the judgment of the House of Commons of 1878. He was not at all sure that the country would not be appealed to on a question of such gigantic importance; and even then, being unaware of the immense responsibilities that had to be undertaken, the country might again return the Government opposite to power. If that were so, the country would have ratified the Treaty; and that being so, if at any future time Russia invaded Turkey, England would be bound to go to war. In the late negotiations they shrank from the responsibilities of going to war. He did not say they were not right in doing so. The country, he had no doubt, would have consented to war; but it was not eager for it, and, therefore, if Government had engaged in war, they would have undertaken a very great responsibility. The fault he had to find against the Government was, that if they wanted war they should have gone a year ago, when Turkey was in a much better position than at present, and not have left it to a future Ministry, who would be in a comparatively disadvantageous position. Before the late war Turkey had all the resources of European Turkey; but at the present time, roughly speaking, she had only one-half of those resources. She had been deprived of a formidable position—namely, the largest river in Europe—as a frontier, which was always considered the principal protection Turkey had against Russian advance. If England went to war with Turkey against Russia she would have to fight without the Quadrilateral, with the Balkans as the Turkish frontier. In "another place" a good deal had been said by the Prime Minister; but the greatest military writer—Jomany—simply laughed at the Balkans as an immense military position, and Count Von Moltke attributed little importance to the Balkans as a Turkish frontier unless Turkey held certain places; in fact, in future, Turkey would be fighting without any real frontier, the Balkans in their present condition offering no formidable obstacle. The next war would, he believed, be one for the possession of Constantinople and Gallipoli. In reference to Asiatic Turkey, the noble Lord the Postmaster General had given it to-night as the opinion of Count Schouvaloff that Turkey was actually in a stronger and in a better position than before. That, of course, was a polite thing for Count Schouvaloff to say, but nothing more. The Postmaster General had also given it as the opinion of the French Plenipotentiary that Turkey was now more compact. Certainly it was; but he considered it rather strange that the noble Lord should read out the extract, which was to the effect that Turkey, at the expense of the sacrifices, was more compact. Whatever might be said of the results of the Congress, it might be taken as certain that Turkey had been very materially weakened, both in Asia and in Europe. Of her strength in Asia, the Home Secretary had, he believed, spoken erroneously; for in that part of her Dominions there was no continuously defensible position, but only mountains which, considering the general elevation of the country, were almost insignificant. On the other hand, it was to be borne in mind that Russia had constantly been overcoming the natural obstacles in her way. She had now got what it had always taken the first year of her previous wars with Turkey to obtain; and in case of a future war with Turkey she would, as it were, commence with one year's fighting to the good. He had, therefore, no confidence in the present military situation of Turkey. The noble Lord at the head of the Post Office had said that precedents were not wanting for our protective alliance with Turkey, and had instanced among others the Tripartite Treaty. But that Treaty, compared with the Treaty of Berlin and the Anglo-Turkish Convention, was easy of accomplishment and fulfilment, especially as it provided us with powerful Allies, while the new Guarantee would have to be maintained by us alone and in all probability at a vast cost. Also, as the noble Lord had said, there were the Treaties for the protection of Portugal, and Sweden and Norway; but in both cases we had in our favour either strong Allies or a defensible position. In short, England had entered into a very bad bargain, and into an engagement the fulfilment of which, at no very distant date, would probably cost as much as £200,000,000, and that would affect his, as well as other constituencies; therefore, it was not to be entered into with a light heart. The hon. and gallant Member concluded by remarking that he did not blame the Government for many of their acts, which he considered wise and unavoidable; but he believed that they had simply postponed the engagement, and in doing so they had left England in a much worse position to fulfil it than that which she previously occupied.

Sir JOHN HAY contended that by concluding the Convention which they had done with Turkey, the Government had pursued a wise course. They had defined a clear and distinct boundary, which they declared that Russia should not pass. Until a boundary line was drawn between Canada and the United States, causes of embroilment were constantly arising; but since the boundary had been clearly defined, peace had been maintained between England and the United States without a fear almost of its being broken. He carried his mind into Asia, and he believed the same policy there would be attended with success. He did not believe that it would be impossible to compel Russia to respect the boundary so drawn by the Government. As he read the Convention, it meant this. Hitherto Great Britain had engaged with other Powers to protect Turkey in the work of reform; but other Powers had not always found it convenient to support England in the desire for reform. In Asia Minor, none of the Powers were willing to assist England, and it was in Asia Minor that England's great interests lie. They said to the present Sultan, whose conduct was guided by the instincts of humanity—"We will show you the way this country may be reformed;" and they said to Russia—"You must not cross the boundary line while those reforms are going on." To the eastward of this territory lay Persia, and they knew how vast were their interests in that quarter; and he thought a railway to our Indian Possessions was quite within the bounds of possibility. Then a hostile advance by Russia on India would be easily threatened by our position on her flank—a position which would enable England to expose Russia to the greatest danger. He, therefore, differed from the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Major Nolan) who distrusted the Convention. Again, the possession of Cyprus appeared to him to be of the greatest possible advantage to England. It was quite true that in Cyprus there was no harbour for large ships; but no difficulty was experienced in landing troops, and the position was invaluable in making it easy for England to protect the Suez Canal. With regard to Greece, he did not see what there was to complain of. The Greek Government had been fostered by this country from the beginning until now, but the Greeks had not shown themselves very capable of governing. There were, no doubt, many causes for the failure; he was not blaming the Greeks for the failure. When he had the honour of serving in those parts, and visiting Greece, he could then ride to Marathon or Thermopylæ with as much safety as he could now ride to Wimbledon or Epsom; but within the last few years it had become hazardous work travelling in Greece. There was a noble Lord in the House who could speak with authority on this subject, and they all knew how many excellent British subjects had lost their lives while travelling in the most innocent manner in that so-called civilized country. They looked forward with great hope to an improvement in Greece; and, no doubt, if her territory was extended—if they gave her larger responsibilities—they would enable Greece eventually to take a higher place in Europe than she now held. Several of the hon. Members on the Opposition side who had addressed the House spoke frequently of the Berlin Treaty, but they altogether omitted to consider the Treaty of San Stefano. They forgot that when that Treaty was made, Russia had her hand on her victim's throat, and that her Army was on the point of seizing Constantinople, with a huge Bulgaria in the rear taking up the heart of Turkey, and reaching down even to the Mediterranean. If that Treaty had been allowed to stand, it would have been impossible to hope that Greece would reach the height of her ambition. If Greeks had been incorporated in a new Slav State, there would have been no chance of their being transferred to Greece in case its expansion should ensue from the failure to regenerate Turkey, and of the success of the efforts to do so he had no very strong hope. Yet, if the arrangements which Russia had based upon her conquests had been completed, the Greeks would have been debarred from any increase of territory. We might entertain the hope that Greece would be enabled, by experience of good government, to claim the confidence of Europe and of her own people, and that, by acquiring Thessaly and Epirus, and Byzantium for her capital, she might become a Power strong enough to restrain Russian designs on Constantinople; but to say that we neglected Greek interests when we enabled her Representative to appear at the Congress, and when we saved a possible part of future Greece from absorption by Bulgaria was to exhibit a desire, not to benefit Greece, but to damage Her Majesty's Government; and the clause of the Resolution of the noble Marquess which contained this charge ought to be withdrawn. He confessed he had heard with regret that the European Plenipotentiaries generally had permitted Russia to seize that portion of Bessarabia which the

Treaty of 1856 had assigned to Roumania. He had not, however, much sympathy with Roumania. That State had been created that it might be an Eastern Belgium, and that Russia might not have access to the Danube; England, France, and Austria uniting, in the Tripartite Treaty, to make invasion of Roumania a *casus belli.* But the misconduct of the Turkish Government, the barbarities that were committed—not all on one side — and the appeals made to popular passion, rendered it impossible to carry out the bargain that had been made to defend Turkey. No one had ever expected Roumania to resist the power of Russia in her late advance to the Danube by force; but she had thrown herself into the arms of Russia, and assisted to break the peace of Europe, and, having benefited by such alliance, she had no right to come and ask Europe to defend her against her Ally. He thought the conduct of Russia had been infamous; but it was not our business to go to war to protect Roumania after she had neglected the duty for which she had been created. If Prince Charles had been true to his pledges, Roumania would have had a fair claim on Austria and England, and on France, if she had been able to unite with them. As it was, Roumania had fallen among thieves and had associated with them, and she must make the best of her bargain. There was even one advantage in what had occurred between Roumania and Russia, since it was a lesson to all the States of Europe in regard to what they had to expect from the promises of Russia, which were limited entirely by her earth hunger; territory she would have from friends who were foolish enough to trust her, or foes who could not resist. He entirely concurred with what the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Major Nolan) had said on the subject of Batoum. It was a great misfortune that port should have been given to Russia, and a hardship, because it had not been taken by force. Though he had not been at Batoum, he had served in the Black Sea and studied the charts, and he knew that away from the Crimea there were only two good harbours, Batoum and Bourgas. If the Treaty of San Stefano had been maintained, Turkey would have been left without a port; but by the Treaty of Berlin she had gained Bourgas, which was in a better situation, and a better harbour than Batoum. That was an enormous gain to Russia. As to the talk about keeping it a commercial port, it was naturally a strong place, and landing a few heavy guns and planting torpedoes would make it impregnable. The great advantage to Russia would be that they would now have a terminable harbour for the railway from Tiflis to Poti. The reason why the cession of Batoum, which had not been conquered by Russia, was a loss to us was that we were the natural opponents of Russia. The conditions in Europe, Asia, the Mediterranean, and all over the world, made us antagonists; and he did not believe there would be peace except for so long as, for her own purposes, and from fear of the power of England, Russia chose to maintain it. The gain of territory by Servia and Montenegro was advantageous, and he had always felt that the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria would be the surest guarantee for peace in that quarter of Europe. It enabled Austria to cut off a source of an enormous expense to her from the constant disturbances on her frontier, while it enabled her to assume a military position which would make it much more dangerous in future for Russia to attack Constantinople by land. For these reasons, he should support the Amendment; and he hoped his explanation would satisfy the hon. and gallant Gentleman who last spoke, and secure for the Amendment the votes of the Irish Members.

MR. J. HOLMS said, that the observations he had to make to the House had reference entirely to the Convention between England and Turkey, and he wished, as a humble Member of that House, to enter his most emphatic protest against that Convention. In his opinion, it entailed upon the people of this country unseen difficulties and interminable evils. At that moment, most thinking men in the country were considering what was likely to be the outcome of that Convention. He confessed that he had heard, with no small surprise, that the Government were not in earnest, and that in all probability the Convention would not be carried out. Now, he for one, would protest against any such course being pursued by the Government of this country. They had taken Cyprus as a pledge that they would carry out certain real and well-defined duties. Those were, first, that they should protect the Dominions of the Sultan in Asia against any encroachments by Russia; and the second was, that they should take care that the Sultan's Government was properly administered in that part of his Dominions. But there was something a little more even than that. In the despatch of Lord Salisbury to Sir Austen Layard, of the 30th of May, England clearly undertook another duty, and that was to protect the Sultan against his own subjects. But now another additional duty had been cast upon them by the speech of the hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket). Following, as the hon. and learned Member did, the very able speech of the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition, who, in his opinion, disposed entirely of that bogus, the attempt of Russia to take India, he explained to the House, and his views were endorsed the following night by the Home Secretary, that we were not undertaking this duty merely to protect our Indian Possessions, but in order to safeguard Constantinople against Russia. If that were not done, Russia might go through Armenia and take Constantinople; so that now they had four duties imposed upon them. He would venture to say that a policy of that magnitude should not only have been submitted to the House of Commons, but, in his humble opinion, it was a matter that should have gone much beyond the consultation of the Legislature; for he doubted very much whether the consideration and the wisdom even of the Legislature was enough in a case of that nature, involving, as it did, such enormous responsibilities, without first putting the whole case clearly and fully and understandably before the people of England. By that Convention the Government had undoubtedly pledged 34,000,000 of people of this country to defend the undertakings they had entered into. Now, he ventured to believe that if they were to submit the question to the calm consideration of the people of England, that they would look at it by the light of homely wisdom and common sense, they would not support the Government in entering into that Convention. He only wished the Government would test the question. He thought the very first question the people would ask would be this—Was it wise to enter into partnership with such a partner as Turkey? He thought they would inquire whether it was a safe sort of partnership, and whether such a Government as that of Turkey, which was either unable or unwilling, or perhaps both, to protect the lives and property and the honour of her peaceful and industrious subjects; and which, during the last 20 years, had squandered every penny of money she could obtain in loans from any Government. But if this new partner was in a hopeless state of bankruptcy a few years ago, what was his position now? He had lost the tributary States of Roumania and Servia, Bosnia and Herzegovina were now in the hands of Austria, and Bulgaria would have 50,000 Russian troops to maintain for the next nine months. Now, the direct consequence of that state of things was, that just as there was an increase of pressure of taxation, so there would be an increase of bad government. The Sultan regarded himself as the Vicegerent of the Prophet; the Pasha was the image of the Sultan; and the soldiers were the servants of the Pashas; and, consequently, the soldiers would do whatever they were ordered to do by the Pashas in order that they might return to the Sultan the amount of taxes which was demanded of them. The truth was that England was emulating Russia in her weak point. Russia had an enormous and wide-spread territory. He thought that the extension of the Empire by adding Colonies was one thing and was a safe policy, because the Colonies were self-governed. But the addition that was now proposed was of the worst kind. It was of the same character as that of India, which, at the present time, gave us no small amount of trouble. It was even worse than that, because they would not only be subjected to the control of their own Government or even to the control of the Sultan, but they would be subjected to something beyond that; for, undoubtedly, Russia might at any moment step in with something to say. With the permission of the House, he would quote one other extract from Mr. Crow's book, *The Greek and the Turk*, which would show the character of the administration England was undertaking in the East. The author said—

> "That taking the worst that was said of the treatment of the Christian rayah in Europe, he was 10 times more prosperous and happy than the inhabitants of the land which the Turks might be said to have to themselves."

It had taken all the European Powers to obtain justice for Turkey in Europe, while England was about to attempt single-handed to govern Asia Minor. Something had been said about the commercial advantages of this acquisition, and when he first heard of the new task we had undertaken, he was prejudiced in favour of the scheme. Now, however, that he had examined the matter carefully, he could only consider such an idea a hopeless delusion. It was impossible to have trade where people were so lawless as they were in Asia Minor, where there were no roads, and where the hope of having roads was most remote. So far from this Convention promoting trade, he believed it would tend greatly to throw the Persian trade into Russian hands, and tend to place Russia in possession of the shortest routes to India. There was no chance whatever of trade being developed under present circumstances. But then they would probably be told of railways and guarantees of railways. Well, first as to the Persian Gulf. Dr. Evatt said of it, that its shores consisted of mountain ranges running parallel with the sea, and having between their bases a small shelf of land, probably the hottest part of the known world. Without rain, without rivers, and without vegetation, it was impossible to imagine a land more barren or more desolate in appearance; while the climate was most trying to Europeans. As to the Euphrates Valley scheme, the same writer said that if ever it were constructed it would be constructed purely as an English undertaking. Turkey was unable to build it, and no other nation wanted it. Turkey was not wealthy enough to build it, and even if she were, a line through a desert would never pay. Such a railway could not be made without a guarantee from our Government, and if it were made, who would it be made for? Then, again, if they had a fear of Russia reaching India, how were they to guard the railway? How many soldiers would be necessary for the purpose? He would ask hon. Gentlemen opposite whether, if the people of this country were consulted, they would not consider the financial aspects of this question to be of a serious character. We had undertaken the Protectorate of a great territory, and we should have never-ceasing applications for money for railways, fortifications here and there, and other purposes. We had undertaken the guardianship of 1,350 miles of coast along the Mediterranean, more than once-and-a-half the mileage of the coast of Spain and France. And at Cyprus we were a vast distance from the point as to which the Prime Minister had declared to Russia —"Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther." It was difficult to say how many soldiers would be required. The Prime Minister had said that the late war was a great war, and that 1,000,000 of soldiers had been engaged in it. If that were true, were we to have that which all European countries had—a conscription? Let the Government put conscription before the country, and the working men would quickly thoroughly understand this question. Conscription once proposed would make the people more thorough-going politicians than this country had ever seen before. The Prime Minister went to the Congress, and he found it necessary to bring home something. The noble Lord was like Moses Primrose in *The Vicar of Wakefield*, who went to the fair and brought home as the price of the horse he took to sell a gross of shagreen spectacles. We sent the Prime Minister to the fair, and he had to bring something back; but what he brought back was scarcely what we expected. The more the subject was investigated the worse we should see it to be. Viewing the matter by the light of facts, we must admit that we were much damaged in the eyes of Europe. He thought the Government of England ought to have consulted the people of England before coming to so serious a determination.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, that there were really two questions before the House. The first was the conduct of the Government before and during the war, and the second their acts in relation to the peace. In regard to the first point, it had often been said that if the Government had supported the united action of Europe on the basis of the Berlin Memorandum the war would have been avoided, and results almost as satisfactory as those of the Treaty of Berlin would have been obtained. He ventured to say that no one who looked at the real position of the combatants would share such an opinion. The war had its origin, not in the Bulgarian rising, but in the ambition of one man, and in the determination of Russia to bring that conflict about before Greece had placed herself in a position which would have prevented Russia from arriving at Constantinople. Nowhere in the Resolutions had the Opposition ventured to say that Her Majesty's Government had been guilty of any neglect or want of due precaution or foresight in what they did before or during the war. The main question which arose in the debate related to the conduct of Her Majesty's Government with reference to the peace. The first Resolution, which seemed to bear the impress of the hand of the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), dealt with Greece. It appeared to be assumed that this country entered into a compact with Greece to do all we could for her at the Conference. In point of fact, however, the Correspondence in the Blue Books showed that the compact which existed had been loyally fulfilled by England. That Correspondence clearly showed that the question which the Greeks desired to bring before the Congress was the boundary question, and no other. The English Government also promised to use their best influence in order to secure for the Greek populations of the Turkish Provinces any administrative reforms and advantages which might be conferred on the Christian population of any other place. Looking at what had occurred before and at the Congress, he had no hesitation in saying that our Plenipotentiaries had fulfilled the engagements of the Government, and had done everything for Greece that it was possible to do. And who was it, after all, that complained? Not the Greeks. It had not been suggested for a moment, to his knowledge, by any Greek subject or by any Greek newspaper, that England had been disloyal. No; the charge came from hon. Members opposite, and not from those whose interests were at stake. What was it that Greece might be supposed to complain of? Not being allowed to go to war? Why, she was bankrupt in purse and lean in population, and had great cause to be thankful that she took the advice of England. Greece must solidify her own country, and that she was only just accomplishing, before she sought to extend her power. Could she hope to gain at once what others had only gained in time? She might thank Europe for preventing Russia barring against her the walls of Stamboul. If she only had patience, "the mulberry leaf would become satin." She had an inheritance still left open to her, and her wisest policy was to wait and learn how rare in the annals of history were the instances of national rejuvenescence. He would pass now from Greece to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. First of all, as to the mode in which it had been obtained. It had been said—"How dare you abuse Russia for having a secret Alliance with Turkey, and yet go with a secret Alliance yourselves with Turkey into the Congress?" It was all very well to put the proposition in that way, but a very serious consideration had been omitted by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. What Her Majesty's Government said to Russia was not—"You shall not have a secret Agreement with Turkey," but—"You shall not have a secret Agreement which contravenes the public Agreements of Europe." If the Anglo-Turkish Convention did in any way contravene the Treaty of 1856, then it ought to fall to the ground. It was because it was absolutely a step in the direction of carrying out that Treaty that we were allowed to go into the Congress, although we had an Agreement with Turkey in our pocket; and it was because the Treaty of San Stefano was in direct contravention of the Treaty of 1856 that England objected to it. But it was said the Prerogative of the Crown had been considerably abused, because the Anglo-Turkish Convention was agreed to without the consent of Parliament. With regard to this, there was one hon. Member opposite who must have been surprised to hear the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. He alluded to the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), who, on bringing forward a Motion to the effect that Commercial Treaties, at all events, should not be signed without the approval of Parliament, was met by the right hon. Member for Greenwich with the following words:—

> "The question is too large to attempt to discuss it now. It goes really to the root of one

of the most important parts of the Prerogatives of the Crown."

That was the view taken by the right hon. Gentleman, when it was proposed that Commercial Treaties should be discussed by Parliament before being signed; but it was one which did not seem to have occurred to him in the present case. The Treaty with France in 1860, again, was concluded amid the greatest secrecy—a circumstance, which only showed how the right hon. Gentleman could alter his views according to the circumstances in which he happened to be placed. There were other instances of a similar kind, and to accuse Her Majesty's Government of improper secrecy was altogether too monstrous. As to the right hon. Gentleman's remarks upon Cyprus, he could only say that our acquisition of the Island was perfectly in accordance with the Treaty of 1856, whereas the seizure of Constantinople by Russia would have been a breach of it. The second part of the Anglo-Turkish Convention referred to the work which had been undertaken in Asia Minor. Of this, it had been said that it was the most gigantic task that any nation ever undertook. While he did not know that that need frighten them, it would be seen by anyone who chose to look at a despatch of May, 1876, setting out the Turkish code of reform, how easy it would be to see whether that code was properly carried out or not; but he thought his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary had put the matter in the best possible way, when he said—

> "Surely what Russia can do England can do; surely if Russia is to be believed in stating she could undertake all these duties, England is not so far inferior in administrative qualities that she cannot do what Russia can do."

The hon. Member for the Elgin Burghs (Mr. Grant Duff) told them they must not point to India as exhibiting a state of things to Asia Minor. No; they pointed to India to show what England had done under far more difficult circumstances than now existed, and they said that the men who could do the work they had done in India could do the work that was still to be done in Asia Minor. He would ask the House which would be the more difficult task—to bring about a proper state of administration amongst a loyal people, or amongst the ruined and estranged people of Bulgaria? He would call as a witness, Count Schouvaloff. It was recorded, on page 68 of the Protocols, that—

> "Count Schouvaloff desires to give to the Congress a general idea of what has been done in Bulgaria since the Russian Army entered it, and what remains to be done there. The late Prince Tchekersky was struck with the fact that the Turkish legislation was well suited to the wants of the country, only the laws and regulations were not known to the public functionaries who were to put them in force."

What Russia undertook to do in Bulgaria, surely we, with our not inferior administrative qualities, might undertake to do in Asia Minor? If it could be done, they would all agree that it should be done. If England had such a work before her, she would not grudge a little labour or a little cost in carrying it out. But he would even take a lower ground, and say that while the markets of the Continent were being more and more closed to us by an insane love of great armaments, we could find markets in those old countries if they were educated in the arts of peace. By such means, England would be well repaid for whatever cost the task she had undertaken would involve. One word as to the attack which had been made upon Austria by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. It would not be forgotten that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced, a few weeks since, that Austria was our Ally, the right hon. Gentleman, in reply, and on the spur of the moment, bitterly attacked Austria, and endeavoured to sow the seeds of discord between that country and England. He wondered to see such a departure from the loyalty he owed to his country on the part of a right hon. Gentleman. No one had more respect with regard for the right hon. Gentleman than he had; but he could not remember anything that he more regretted than that attack upon Austria. The Government of Austria was now very far from being what it was 20 years ago. Even in Cracow the people were well governed, free from police espionage, and at full liberty to worship according to their conscience. It was not fair to say that Turkish Provinces were handed over to the tender mercies of Austria, and least of all by one who seemed to have given in his adhesion to the despotism of Russia. One word he wished to add as to the relations of England and Russia.

He did not believe that the result of this struggle, though it might have alienated them for a time, would be to separate Russia and England. He might, perhaps, be thought to be speaking with some especial reasons for such a hope; but, bringing to bear upon this subject such means of knowledge as had occurred to him, he regarded it in this light. The war was counselled and planned by one whose policy it was to guide his august Master and his country along the path of ambition, and consequent distrust of England. The day was coming when the advancing years of one whose age did not, however, interfere with his doing his country good service at the Council Board of Europe, would necessarily remove him from his high position. Who should succeed him in that high place? The advance of the Armies of Russia to the Straits, and the occupation of their strong places, the further weakening of Turkey, and the thwarting the will of England, would form a claim almost irresistible. That step had failed, and had brought serious losses on his country, and Europe was freed from the dangers which would attend such a succession to Prince Gortchakoff. Who then was to take his place?—for upon that would depend the future of the relations between Russia and England. He was glad to hear the words of appreciation used by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Second Plenipotentiary of Russia. Most carefully had he guarded the interests of his country; but upon those interests he had brought to bear his insight into the views and power of this country. Count Schouvaloff knew well that England aimed not at conquest, but progress; and under his counsels, grounded, as he believed they must be, on the value of friendship between England and Russia, the older country would, while she might sometimes restrain, lead her younger rival along the path of a real strength and greatness.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down had advised the Opposition to study somewhat more closely the religion of Russia. He would retort by advising the hon. and learned Gentleman to study somewhat more closely the religion of Christian charity, and not to impute a want of loyalty to their country to those who were unfortunate enough to differ from him upon some particular point. During the last two years, he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) had not deemed it necessary to trouble the House with speeches, or the Government with questions, upon Eastern affairs. He had known that delicate and difficult negotiations were going on; he had felt that the access to information possessed by private Members was of necessity limited, and he shrank from the responsibility of making newspaper paragraphs the basis of a question, or of building up a speech upon club rumours, which often turned out to have no substantial foundation. But to-night there was no question of idle rumours or newspaper paragraphs. With authentic documents before them—though neither so full nor so complete as they might desire—they were called upon to review the policy of Her Majesty's Government; and he would ask for the indulgence of the House but for a very few minutes whilst he sought to justify the vote which he intended to give after such review. Now the Resolutions which his noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) had submitted to the House embodied two separate sets of questions—the one connected with the Berlin Treaty, and the other relative to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. He regretted that those questions should have been mixed up as they had been, because he felt a disposition—and he knew many Liberals who shared the feeling—to express general approval of the Berlin Treaty, while expressing utter disapproval of the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The former appeared to have been built up upon a series of compromises between the Great Powers, and he had some reluctance to take hold of any one compromise out of the whole quantity, and to diminish a general approval by a particular expression of regret. As regarded the Convention, he believed there were so many strong reasons against it that it might very well have been separately brought before the House. With reference to the allusion which was made in the Resolution of his noble Friend to Greece, it had been hinted that that reference was unfortunate, inasmuch as it might give rise to the idea that there was a Party in this country which would be ready to support the Greeks if they saw fit to enter upon a struggle in opposition to

Turkey; but it could not be too fully denied by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House that any such Party existed, or was likely to exist, in England. The danger—if danger there were—arose from the Prime Minister having told Greece that she had a future if she would only wait, and those words—when interpreted by a Greek—could only mean, under the circumstances, an accession of territory by Greece. If it was to be obtained by peaceful diplomacy, why was it not done now? He feared that the words of the Prime Minister and the action of the Congress upon this point would give rise to future disturbances in Greece; whilst if it was true that whilst the Slav populations who had followed Russia had received a large measure of freedom, the Hellene populations, who had trusted England, had received nothing but fair words; he also feared that they had given a great and unnecessary power and prestige to Russia at the expense of this country. He was not prepared to express disproval of the Berlin Treaty as a whole, or join in the condemnation of the Plenipotentiaries who took part in settling that Treaty. As soon as those two Noblemen had been appointed Plenipotentiaries, he had shut out from his mind altogether the fact that they had ever been political antagonists, and had endeavoured to remember only that they were the Representatives of his country. And he felt bound to say that, although they might have committed mistakes in some of the difficult details with which they had to do, yet as a whole, he believed they had acted as they thought best to sustain the honour and reputation of this country, and he did not grudge them the public approval which they had received. He condoned any faults in the manipulation of the Congress. He thought that it was the duty of every Englishman to support and wish well to the peaceful solution which had been reached, and he trusted that the peace which the Plenipotentiaries had brought home might be lasting and satisfactory to this country and to Europe. He did not blame the proceedings within the Congress; but, turning to the words and actions of the Plenipotentiaries outside and beside the Congress in contrast to those within it, he gave them his unqualified disapproval. When he turned to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, he said at once that the longer he looked at it the greater astonishment did he feel both at the manner and the matter of that Convention. It would really seem as if they had been living in a mist and a fog during the last two years. During that time they had constantly had dinned into their ears stories about the duplicity, the intrigues, the secret diplomacy of Russia. They had heard these things in private conversations, they had read them in public speeches, they had seen them in the columns of the Press; even the very boards of our theatres had been employed to depict the system of espionage attributed to Russia, and the wily arts by which she was supposed to conduct her diplomatic strategy. But what would the theatres of St. Petersburg justly produce next year? There was no secret act of Russia which Government had not equalled in their recent action; and he said, more in sorrow than in anger, that they had dragged down the name of English diplomacy and statesmanship, and had committed a double offence against the Great Powers of Europe, and against the Constitution of their own country. How had they sinned against the Great Powers? Because they had concluded a Convention behind the backs of the other Plenipotentiaries, and had studiously kept it from them. At the very moment when they were sitting together in Congress upon those Eastern affairs to which that Convention related; at the very moment that our Plenipotentiaries were using conciliatory language and with a patronizing benevolence were patting the Russian Plenipotentiaries on the back for their conciliatory language and demeanour, our Government was concluding a secret Convention which could only be justified upon the supposition that Russia was not only not conciliatory but was both aggressive and treacherous. If this Convention was of any importance, why was it not to be submitted to Congress as well as the Treaty of San Stefano? That Treaty had been won by Russia at the point of the sword after enormous sacrifices of blood and treasure. But their Convention was also a result of the war, for they had told them that but for the war the Sultan would never have signed it. Why was not one Treaty as well as the other to be submitted to Congress? But the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon) had told them that the Great Powers were not offended, because none of them had protested. But Great Powers who had an adequate sense of their own dignity did not always protest unless they were prepared to follow up their protest by other action, and the absence of a protest did not necessarily imply any satisfaction or approval. But if the Government believed that the other Great Powers really felt satisfaction and approval, what a pity it was that they had not obtained the expression of such feelings in a regular and legitimate way by submitting their Convention to the Congress. And when the words of M. Gambetta were triumphantly quoted to the effect that Austria now stood as a sentinel at one end of the Eastern arena and England at the other, he would beg to remind the House of the vast difference between the two. Austria stood as the sentinel duly appointed by the will and authority of the Congress of the Great Powers. Austria was the keeper's dog appointed to watch the game, whilst England represented the poacher's dog who came to bay at the game without any authority, and might possibly be suspected of some sinister intentions. But whether or no the manner of making this Convention had been an offence against the other Great Powers, he maintained that it had been a grave offence against the Constitution of England. Parliament had no knowledge of this Convention till it had been made and ratified. He knew well the answer which would be made. In the first place, it was said that the Crown had a right to conclude Treaties without consulting Parliament; and, secondly, that if the present Convention had been submitted to Parliament, there would have been a delay, which would have defeated its objects. Let him deal with both assertions. He did not deny—no one denied—that the Crown had this right. His right hon. Friend (Mr. Lowe) had never denied it; and he would observe that, amid all the gibes and jeers with which the noble Lord the Member for North Leicestershire (Lord John Manners) had answered this part of the speech of his right hon. Friend, he had not been able to disprove or deny one of his assertions. This right of the Crown existed, but it existed upon sufferance, and its frequent and incautious use would inevitably endanger its existence. It was a right which should be used sparingly, and with great caution and judgment. The Government would find it dangerous to put Prerogative in the place of Representative action. They might quote to him precedents, as had been already done; but his reply was simple. This right was one, every exercise of which should be specially depending upon each particular case, and no precedent was of value unless they could show that a necessity for the exercise of the right had existed in the present case equal to that which had existed at the time of the precedent, and that the surrounding circumstances were identical. Not only should the right be sparingly exercised, but there were two conditions of affairs in which it should not be exercised at all. The first was, when the Treaty concluded without consultation with Parliament involved the adoption of any new policy which had not been submitted either to the Hereditary or the Elective branch of the Legislature; the second was when it involved a large additional expenditure of public money, or, in other words, a large addition to the taxation of the country which had not received the sanction of those Representatives of the people who were specially charged to watch over the taxation of those whom they represented. What did Mr. Fox say upon this point? Speaking of the Sardinian Treaty in 1794, he made use of these words—

> "He should perhaps be told, that the treaty being concluded by his Majesty, the proper representative of the country in all transactions with foreign powers, the House could not refuse to ratify it, without subjecting themselves to the imputation of a breach of faith. This doctrine he must peremptorily deny. If the House was considered as bound to make good every treaty which His Majesty, by the advice of his ministers, might think proper to conclude, there was a complete surrender of the public purse to the executive power."—[*Parl. Hist.*, xxx. 1312-13.]

Now, no amount of eloquence and no intrepidity of assertion on the Treasury Bench would convince any impartial mind that they had not entered upon a Convention which would entail a vast additional expenditure upon the country. They had done more. He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) would say emphatically that they had made an approach to personal government which, unless noticed and checked, might work infinite mischief. There were great advantages in personal government; the concentration of power, the easy wielding of authority, the facility of the execution of plans—all these were found of advantage in countries where absolutism existed. But our forefathers had arrived at the deliberate conclusion that the blessings of a free Constitutional Government outweighed all the advantages of any other system. Their opinion had been emphatically endorsed by the people of this country, and we ought to watch with a vigilant and jealous eye any encroachment upon our Parliamentary Privileges or our Representative system. Why was the Sovereign of this country so popular with all classes of Her subjects? He did not refer to those individual and personal merits which would secure affection to the present Occupant of the Throne, even if She were an absolute Monarch. But She was popular as the Sovereign of the country because in Her the nation recognized the Constitutional Head of a free people; in her they saw the embodiment and personification of their own liberties; the stay and support of their freedom at home, and the exponent of their free and unfettered opinions in Her intercourse with foreign nations. Weaken the link which bound together Sovereign and people through the action of the elected Representatives of the latter, and they struck a blow at the whole system of our Constitution. By every step they took in the direction of personal government—that is, of the assumption of an authority apart from and without the Representatives of the people—they gave the strongest encouragement to any Revolutionary or Republican Party which might exist in this country; and if, happily, none such did exist, they took the surest and most direct way to create it. They might laugh at and disbelieve this statement; but unless he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) was greatly mistaken, these things would not be forgotten in the country, and the Government would find that they had entered upon a dangerous experiment. And what had been the necessity for their secrecy? Why could not they have waited until the Congress had concluded its labours, and then considered their position with regard to Turkey? If they had intended to trick or deceive anybody, of course the motive was explained; but no one would wish to impute such an intention to Her Majesty's Government. He supposed the motive was to be explained in Lord Beaconsfield's words—"The objects we had to attain could not have been realized except by secrecy." What was that except saying in other words that they wanted something which they knew the Congress would not give them, and so they took it behind the back of the Congress. They put every moral pressure upon Russia to make her obey the decisions of the Congress, whilst they acted on their own behalf without submitting to any decisions. He could but think that the manner in which this Convention had been obtained, behind the backs of the Congress and of Parliament was, though hon. Gentlemen might not like to profess it in the House, something which the country gentlemen, who were the main supporters of the Government, would regret, and which would detract from the high character of English diplomacy, making it no longer possible to repudiate as heretofore, the epithet which was applied to it by the First Napoleon. What was the real object of the Convention? After all, it might come to nothing. No doubt we were bound by it to go to war if Russia attacked the Asiatic Dominions of the Porte; but if such an occasion arose, it would be for the England of that day to decide whether the war should be undertaken without reference to the Convention which had been obtained behind the back of Parliament. If this were true, the words were mere bravado, and insulting to Russia. But Russia would not protest. Russia was not dissatisfied. She had obtained much more by the aid of those who had always professed themselves the friends of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire than she would have done if we had gone hand-in-hand with her to enforce the decisions of the Constantinople Conference. But what, after all, was the object of the Convention? It could not be to effect reforms in Turkey, for the Government had told them that they had obtained a safe Northern barrier for Turkey, and that her power would be concentrated, so that she could have no difficulty in reforming herself. It had been said that the object of the Convention was to safeguard India by safeguarding Asia Minor; but the theory of any danger to India arising from that quarter had long since been exploded. In old days there had always been those fears; but the answer to them had been given in better words than he could use, which he would quote to the House. They had been told that Russia already possessed the only land-road to India—namely, by Persia and Affghanistan. Now, many years ago, we went to Affghanistan to depose Dost Mahomet, who was said to have been seduced by a Russian agent. In 1842, a Motion for Papers on this subject was made by Mr. H. Baillie, and seconded by a Gentleman who afterwards obtained some authority with the Conservative Party. This Gentleman ridiculed the idea of Russian invasion, and said that—

> "He did not believe, that we should be deprived of that Empire either by internal insurrection or by the foreign invader. If ever we lost India, it would be from financial convulsion."—[3 *Hansard*, lxiv. 450.]

And then, deprecating war, he went on to use the following remarkable words:—

> "Would they tell us that it was necessary to create a barrier for our Indian empire? When he looked at the geographical position of India, he found an empire separated on the east and west from any power of importance by more than 2,000 miles of neutral territory, bounded on the north by an impassable range of rocky mountains, and on the south by 10,000 miles of ocean. He wanted to know how a stronger barrier, a more efficient frontier, could be secured than this which they possessed, which nature seemed to have marked out as the limit of a great empire? But they wanted a barrier. A barrier against whom? . . . . The foe could not be Russia. For the noble Lord (Lord Palmerston) . . . . . had stated that the explanations of Russia were perfectly satisfactory."

Taking advantage of an interruption of Lord Palmerston, he continued—

> "Oh, then it was Russia. . . . . The noble Lord did want a barrier against Russia—with the noble Lord's peculiar views he was not surprised at this."—[*Ibid*, 455-6.]

He concluded this part of his speech by protesting against the idea that if Russia had designs upon our Indian Empire, she was to be resisted in Asia; it would be our duty to stop her in the Baltic and the Black Sea, not by the invasion of neutral nations or intermediate regions. The hon. Gentleman who spoke thus was Mr. Disraeli, now the Earl of Beaconsfield, Prime Minister of England. [An hon. MEMBER: What was the date?] The date was June 23, 1842; but the mountains had not moved—the sea was the same—it was only Mr. Disraeli who had changed, and he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) would appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, from the Earl of Beaconsfield, intoxicated with a diplomatic triumph and wishing to make a great impression on the theatre of the world, to the Mr. Disraeli who, at the time he spoke of, was applying his great talents to this question in a more unprejudiced spirit. Then, it had been said what alternative policy did the Opposition suggest? Was ever such an absurd doctrine preached in the House of Commons? A Government on their defence must be miserably weak indeed to expect those who criticized their policy to provide them with another, and to rely upon such an argument as a defence. To a similar retort, Sir Robert Peel had replied that he would prescribe when properly called in. Mr. Disraeli himself had said he would wait to see what he found in the pigeon-holes of his Predecessors before he announced his policy. The Party opposite had been ready enough to take their—the Opposition's—principles with their places; but they could hardly expect them to be green enough to supply them continually with a policy. He would, however, be generous, and would supply the Government with a policy. Was there no such policy as "leave it alone?" This, he thought, would have made a good impression on the taxpayers of the country. They had accused the late Government of "meddling and muddling," and now they themselves were doing so, to an extent which would greatly increase the public burdens. No doubt, the Government had already a large consensus of public opinion outside in favour of their policy, and that inside the House they were backed by a large majority. He knew well that Ministers would be followed into the Lobby by a large and compact majority. He did not grudge them the majority or the triumph. His own disappointment was that the Motion was not a specific Vote of Censure, instead of being one of regrets, as he confessed he was in favour of meeting his opponents face to face. But though the Government might have a majority now, they would find public opinion against them growing as the question became more understood. He should support the Resolutions of his noble Friend, believing that the Opposition was only performing a public duty in challenging the action of the Government; and although they knew they should be defeated in the coming division, yet, confidently relying upon the Constitutional principles which they had advanced, and the justice of their cause, they would appeal from the verdict of that House to the calmer and more matured judgment of an enlightened people.

Mr. BALFOUR had supposed that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, during the last two years, exhausted almost every form of invective against Her Majesty's Government; but since this debate began he had learnt that his resources were by no means exhausted. Formerly, the right hon. Gentleman scourged them with whips, and now he scourged them with scorpions. He did not believe there was any accusation which could be brought against the Government which was not implied in the indictment put forth by the right hon. Gentleman in his speech on Tuesday. He said that our policy at home was arbitrary, that our policy abroad was characterized by insanity; and, as far as he (Mr. Balfour) understood, by that low cunning which usually attended insanity. He should begin his remarks by alluding to the views expressed by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the course which Her Majesty's Government had pursued with regard to the Treaty. In dealing with that subject, he would first refer to a point raised first, he thought, by the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and afterwards discussed by the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). They alluded to some story that M. Waddington wished Thessaly and Epirus to be given to that nation, but that Lord Beaconsfield had objected. They also appeared to think that the proposal for the admission of the Greek Representatives to the Congress as made by the French Plenipotentiaries was more favourable to Greece than that which was adopted. [An hon. Member: Infinitely.] That was not the opinion of M. Waddington. A reference to page 77 of the Blue Book would show that M. Waddington concurred in the view of Lord Salisbury. It was not so much a question of what they would like to give Greece, but of what could be obtained for her. Professions of generous and noble sentiments could be very easily made; but the important question was, what was actually done at the Congress in favour of the Greek claims? They all knew that the late Mr. Joseph Surface professed to be a great admirer of everything noble and virtuous, but that his practice by no means agreed with his professions. The course which the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition took with reference to the discussion of the claims of Greece at the Congress was one of the most extraordinary that he ever heard of. The noble Lord read a number of extracts from speeches made by various Members of the Congress, and because he thought the sentiments expressed by other Powers—he was going to say the clap-trap uttered by them—were more favourable to liberty than what the British Plenipotentiaries said on the subject, therefore he concluded that the British Plenipotentiaries were on the side of servitude. As to the suggestion about Thessaly and Epirus being given to Greece without at the same time suggesting how they could be got to be given to Greece, they might as well suggest the giving of the moon to Greece. He now turned to the Anglo-Turkish Convention—that centre around which all the controversy now revolved. He must say that he thought the criticism on some part of it did not come very well from hon. Members opposite, as that criticism was inconsistent with what they had urged for the last two years. Hon. Gentlemen opposite appeared to have found it very difficult to extract a plain meaning out of what after all was a short and not very obscure document. Some of them seemed to think that the Convention obliged us to have a conscription, to contract an enormous debt, to increase the Army and Navy, and so on; others thought that they had made a mere paper Convention which had and could have no other object but to hand over Cyprus to the English nation. Neither of those views of it was founded in fact. The meaning of the Convention was that we were bound by legal obligation to go to war for Turkey against Russia if her territory in Asia Minor was attacked, provided that Turkey on her part showed a disposition to carry out real reforms in her administration. That was the whole extent of our legal obligation. But, in addition to that, a guaranteeing Treaty was also a strong declaration of policy and intention. In 1871, the right hon. Member for Greenwich made a speech which contained much useful information on the subject of guaranteeing Treaties, and which the right hon. Gentleman himself might read with some advantage, and derive from it some information of a calming character. In that speech, he expressed the opinion that most guaranteeing Treaties were, more or less, strong declarations of policy and intention. Well, by the Anglo-Turkish Convention, England had made a strong declaration of her policy and her intention. That declaration was that we regarded the State of Asia Minor as being a question in which we were nearly concerned and had a right to interfere, and also that we had the strongest interest in the welfare of its population. Turning to the advantages which they hoped to derive from the Convention, but scant justice had been done to their object by hon. Gentlemen opposite. They might expect by that Convention to do a great benefit to Turkey, to do, also, a considerable benefit to Russia herself, and even, it might be, to exert some beneficial influence on the policy of hon. Gentlemen opposite. The Treaty of 1856 failed, as the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade had pointed out, partly from the neglect of the English Government during a series of years, and partly, also, because no inducement was held out by that Treaty to Turkey to perform her promises respecting reforms. The present Convention, on the other hand, gave Turkey the strongest inducement to effect reforms, because such reforms were made the condition of our assistance to her in keeping her Asiatic Empire together. There was no corresponding condition in the Treaty of 1856, and no argument as to the failure of that Treaty could be said to hold good with respect to that of 1878. Then, with regard to Russia, he held that by that Convention they would confer a benefit on her, even from a Russian point of view. Even giving Russia all the credit which her enthusiastic friends claimed for her, it could not be denied that she had progressed in point of absorption of territory most rapidly during the last two centuries, and that the law of her progress in that respect had been constant. Around the edge of her frontier there was always a rim of discontent, sometimes caused by intrigue, and sometimes there were conflicts of hostile races and tribes; and the power of Russia became extended over the districts so disturbed. He looked on that as a sort of mechanical law guiding the Russian Government. He would assume that they were not responsible for this, but that it was imposed on them by an external law. How, then, should we strengthen their hands in that matter? That Convention would make those intrigues less probable, because it would make them less easy and less profitable. It would be far less easy for any designing persons to spread dissension among the tribes of the frontier if they knew that Russia would not interfere. On the other hand, the Russian Government, knowing that the result of advancing beyond her frontier would be a war with England, would resist the pressure put upon them by military authorities. He came next to the effect which he hoped the Convention would have on hon. Gentleman opposite. The noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), and other speakers, had loudly, but he hoped hastily, announced their conviction that in a few years England would not consider herself bound by this Treaty. Whether they did that in the interests of that public morality which they supposed the present Government had lowered he did not know. But he thought better of them than they apparently did of themselves. He did not believe that any English Government would at any time think itself absolved at its own free will from a Treaty entered into by Constitutional means; and he trusted that in future we should be preserved from the uncertain, mechanical policy which had been practised and recommended by hon. Gentlemen opposite during the last 10 years. The advantage of the arrangement to Turkey in Europe would be enormous. Russia, knowing that we had a consistent policy, would not run counter to it; while Turkey, under constant diplomatic pressure from our Envoys, and having given a pledge, the fulfilment of which we had a right to look forward to, would, he hoped, do something towards rendering that justice to her Asiatic populations which she had too often failed to do to her European populations. These were some of the advantages which he hoped would result from the Convention; and, taking that in connection with the Treaty of Berlin, he could not but think that the Government had attained a triumph of which they had reason to be proud. The diplomatic difficulties which they had to undergo seemed to him of the most arduous character. Of the difficulties they had sustained, not abroad, but at home, everybody in that House could form a judgment for himself. Through the most constant and bitter opposition, attacked weekly, almost daily, in the most bitter harangues by hon. Gentlemen who, he was afraid, remembered too much that they belonged to different Parties, and too little that they belonged to the same country, Her Majesty's Government had, nevertheless, been able to bring these negotiations to a successful and peaceful termination. How it might turn out in the future he could not say, not having those gifts of prophecy to which hon. Gentlemen opposite had laid claim; but he thought that, as far as human foresight could go, they had ground for believing that the result would be in the direction of preserving the peace of Europe, improving the condition of the populations which the changes effected, and preserving the honour, dignity, and welfare of this country.

Mr. LAING asked the indulgence of the House while he addressed himself almost exclusively to that branch of the subject on which he was able to speak with a certain amount of experience, owing to his connection with Indian affairs. There was one point, however, in connection with the Treaty of Berlin on which he had to remark, deeming it important that the public should not be left under any misapprehension with regard to it. He referred to the indemnity to be paid by Turkey to Russia. He addressed a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other evening with the view of ascertaining whether there was any foundation for the assurance so positively made in Lord Salisbury's despatch, that the payment of this indemnity was absolutely postponed till after the payment of the whole existing Turkish debts. His right hon. Friend referred him to the Protocols. These, however, he had read before putting the Question. He had read them carefully since, and he thought it would be found that Count Schouvaloff, on the part of Russia, distinctly guarded himself in his expressions, and only pledged himself to the postponement of this indemnity in favour of the anterior existing special hypothecations. If the right hon. Gentleman would refer to the Council of Foreign Bondholders of the Stock Exchange, to the Chairman of the Bank of England, or of any of the banks in the City of London, he would find that the statement in Lord Salisbury's despatch was inaccurate, and that the public would be misled if they were to invest in Turkish Funds on the strength of it. He would find it perfectly clear that all Russia had done was to postpone that claim to the previously-existing special hypothecations. There was absolutely nothing in this to prevent Russia at any moment claiming payment, or taking payment in ships, if there should be a change of Government at Constantinople, and if the Sultan and his Government were favourable to such a mode of paying the debt of Turkey. The form of the claim for indemnity effectually destroyed the future credit of Turkey, for the only way of raising any money requisite for carrying out the schemes proposed for the fortification of the frontier would be to make fresh special hypothecations, which would be expressly contrary to the engagement made to Russia. As to the general question, it was a question which, after all, must be considered by the light of Indian experience and the opinions of Indian statesmen. In India, schemes precisely similar to this had for the last 50 years been the subject of general discussion, and by actual experiment we had there tested the comparative wisdom of the two policies. India was the keystone of the argument in favour of this Convention. No one would suppose that England would have entered upon such onerous engagements, or incurred the expense involved by such a Convention, for any other reason than that it was necessary to defend our Indian Empire. In order to justify the Convention with Turkey, it was necessary to prove that any Russian advance on Asia Minor was a real danger to India, and that the policy of the Convention was the best means of arresting the danger, if danger there be. The first point was to be decided by the authority of experience, and by those plain arguments of common sense which every man could appreciate. It was mainly, however, a question of authority, because the conditions of Asiatic society and Indian society were so different from those of this country. He could corroborate what he had said by an array of Indian authority, and, what was more remarkable, an array of Indian authority beginning with the same illustrious name as a right hon. Gentleman opposite had begun his catalogue of authorities—namely, the Duke of Wellington. Lord Hardinge, a man who was particularly qualified to express an opinion on this question, was intrusted to draw up a Report of the danger that might occur to India from Russian aggression. Lord Hardinge came to the conclusion that there was only one practical route to India—namely, through Herat and Affghanistan, and by passes into the Punjaub; but he gave reasons why that route would be impossible to any modern army. He said that if anyone entertained the idea that a modern army could invade India by that route, they might dismiss the idea as a political nightmare. The Duke of Wellington fully endorsed that opinion. He wrote upon it—"Hardinge is perfectly right." At that time the position of Russia in regard to armed collision with the English in India was vastly stronger than at present. Since that time, Russia had not advanced a single point. On the contrary, she had considerably receded. At that time, Persia was as much under the ascendancy of Russia as she was now. The Persian Army was officered and managed by Russian officers. They had beseiged Herat, the first stage on the road to India, and that place was only saved by an heroic young English officer, Poltinger by name, who happened to be in the town at the time. We did not now require to make any Convention to let Russia know that if she meant to take Herat we should be ready to defend it. The position of this country was infinitely stronger in a military point of view now than then. At the time when Lord Hardinge wrote his Memorandum, Scinde and the Punjaub were independent States, and might turn against us. They were, therefore, a cause of the greatest danger. Now, Punjaub and Scinde were parts of our Indian Empire. They were about the most loyal and best-affected parts. They were the parts that supplied us with the best and most trustworthy soldiers. In this and in other respects our position had improved enormously. By the construction of railroads through India, and by the opening of the Suez Canal, we were practically very much nearer to our base of communication than we were in former times. In Lord Hardinge's time, reinforcements could only have been forwarded to resist invasion by sending them round by the Cape to Calcutta, and on by bullock waggons to the frontier. Now we had the Suez Canal, where steamers could be run through without change to Bombay; and, practically, we could concentrate the whole resources of the Empire on India in a very short space of time. Practically, the Guards could march out of Hyde Park and proceed to Peshawaur in six weeks, without disturbing a button of their uniform. Russia would have to traverse immense distances, through passes and over hills that were almost insurmountable. Occupying this position, it had been the policy of Lord Dalhousie, Canning, Lord Mayo, Lord Lawrence, and Lord Northbrook, to maintain—what had been so well called—a policy of masterly inactivity. That was, trust to your own resources first, and to the great distance between you and Russia. Rather than get within striking distance of Russia, or allow Russia to get within striking distance of you, you should trust to your own resources. He would like to read the opinion of a man of the highest authority—he meant Lord Lawrence—who had had special experience of India, and was well entitled to speak on this question. Lord Lawrence was the man who saved us during the crisis of the Mutiny. In 1869, writing on the proper policy to be pursued in India, he said—

> "That should any foreign Power, such as Russia, endeavour to stir up India to disaffection, our true policy would be to have full reliance on the highly qualified and disciplined Army stationed within our own territories. By strengthening our lines and consolidating and multiplying our resources, we should prepared for all those contingencies which no Indian statesman could disregard."

If he wanted a later authority than the Governor General of India, he should quote the opinions of a distinguised Member of Her Majesty's Government —no less a man than Lord Salisbury—

uttered little more than 12 months ago. The noble Lord said that—

> "I can assure the noble Lord that any danger of a Russian inroad on the frontier of British India is not quite so far advanced as he seems to imagine. The nearest point on the Caspian . . . . is over a thousand miles from our Indian frontier."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxiv. 1564-5.]

If the noble Lord had had a large map, he would have seen that the distance between Russia and India was not to be measured by 1,000 miles. There were mountain chains and deserts which were not easily crossed. It was said by hon. Members opposite—"If you object to our policy, tell us what is yours." He said the Liberal policy was that which he had quoted. Their policy was the policy of Hardinge, Wellington, Dalhousie, Lawrence, and Northbrook, and that which, until 12 months ago, was the policy of Lord Salisbury himself. Was that no policy? It seemed to him as if hon. Gentlemen opposite had been so stimulated by constant scenes that they were like a parrot that had so long been accustomed to stimulants that nothing weaker than brandy would induce him to talk. The Opposition had a policy of common sense, the Government had no policy at all. They had a right to ask the Government what counter authority they could bring on their side to justify their position? Surely, the first thing a solid and sensible statesman would have done, if he was considering the policy of such a measure as the Anglo-Turkish Convention and how to give it effect, would have been to consult some Indian statesman, who would have given him the best advice on the subject. There were two men in England now whom the Government might have consulted—one was Lord Lawrence and the other Lord Northbrook. The way in which he would challenge the Government was this—he would ask them to produce some authority, such as he was able to produce on the other side. Of course, he could hardly expect the Leader of the House to notice the points made by all hon. Members in that House; but he might fairly challenge the Government to give him the authority on which they relied in opposition to the authority which he had quoted. He might ask whether they had consulted, or had they not consulted, Lord Northbrook or Lord Lawrence. But that was not the question. It was said that if we made with Affghanistan a similar Convention to that we had made with Turkey, we should have a powerful Ally against Russia. Did hon. Members remember when the Expedition against Cabul was started, and what the result was? It was a blow more fatal to us in India than all the difficulties in Asia Minor had been during the last half-century. Suppose they took a large scale map, and put one finger on Peshawaur, and another finger on Erzeroum, and let anyone tell him which was the most available for operations, Peshawaur or Erzeroum? At which would an English Force fight with the greatest advantage, and at which with the greatest disadvantage? The thing spoke for itself. At Peshawaur, they could concentrate an Army of 100,000 English troops and 100,000 Native troops, without any great pressure on the resources of the Empire. Those Forces could be maintained there, and fed by reinforcements from the whole military strength of the Empire, while Russia could not put on that line a single soldier. They would have to march 1,000 miles over a desert country, a country destitute of fixed population, or inhabited by predatory tribes whom it would be difficult to prevent from interfering with communication. They would have to go slowly on through mountain defiles, which would present most serious obstacles to transport. Physical obstacles would make it impossible for Russia to attack India on that position. It would take a camel and a-half for every man to reach that place. Compare that with Erzeroum. If war broke out between Russia and England, Peshawaur would have been inaccessible; but now we should have to take Erzeroum. If war broke out between Turkey and Russia in Asia, Russia would concentrate the bulk of her troops in that region, because we could not attack her in Europe without violating the Treaty recently made, and without bringing Austria and Germany upon us. Russia would concentrate her Forces upon the Asiatic frontier, and with Kars, Alexandropol, and Ardahan, she could bring up her whole force, and choose her own time and opportunity. We could not abandon the Turks without dishonour. If we sent a small Force, it would have to retreat, and could not stop until we got our ships of war to bear on

Russian ports. Russia could compel us to fight a pitched battle, on the result of which the fate of the whole of Asia Minor would depend. Compare that with the situation at Peshawaur, and then tell him what had been done for the security of our position. The great drawback of the Convention was that we had lost our liberty of action as regarded Russia. Before that Convention was signed, we occupied an impregnable position. Then, we need not have fought Russia until we chose. We should have selected our own time, place, and opportunity. Meantime, we need not have spent a single penny. We could have sent our Reserves, and prepared ourselves for the war if it came. Now, how different was our position. We had become partners in a concern, the signature of either partner in which might bind the firm. Suppose Turkey was to renew the war? She had nothing to lose, with England at her back. What was so easy for her as to force our hand in some part of that frontier where a collision was almost certain to occur? It was a matter of every-day experience that in the plains of Peshawaur predatory tribes came down and plundered, and the Government had to send expeditions up into the hills to punish them. Russia would be in a similar position at Batoum. There was a tribe called the Lazes, whose principal industry it was to transport their own daughters to the harems at Constantinople. When these failed, they would plunder, and take women wherever they could, and send them off to Constantinople. Suppose these people crossed the frontier, and some colonel of Cossacks followed them into Turkish territory and burnt their villages. Were we to be committed to a war with Russia on that account? Another consideration was, that in the event of war breaking out between Russia and Turkey, we lost, to a great extent, the co-operation of other Powers. We had strenuously striven to leave Asia out of European Treaties and European concert. In all former wars between Turkey and Russia, war in Asia had been a mere episode. The field of operations had been Europe, and if Russia went too far, the European Powers, who had a joint interest with ourselves, had come in. But here they were all shut out. They would say that Asia was England's care. The temptation to Russia would be to make war in Asia because we could not get any other Power to come into the field and make an alliance with us. We should have to bear the whole brunt, and that upon 100 miles of frontier of a difficult country, against an Empire like Russia, that could bring 500,000 men into the field. That was what would be the result of this Convention. He did not wish to go into the question of how we had behaved to France in this Treaty. He valued the French alliance so highly that he would not go into the question; but he might remark that he did not approve of that part of the Treaty which extended our power in the Mediterranean. In the Levant, we had France and Italy backing Greece, while we were left in the position of backers of Turkey; and that was an anomalous position to be left in. He now turned to another point—the responsibility which we had incurred in our endeavours to introduce good government into Asiatic Turkey. Here, again, our Indian experience came to our assistance by teaching us the lesson that a system of protection must be supported by paramount power. If we had undertaken to protect Native Princes in India against internal, and possibly external aggression, it had also been proved that we were powerless to produce good government. A case exactly in point was that of Oude, in which we were at first reluctant to interfere with the internal administration; but this, at last, becoming so atrociously bad, we were obliged to annex the Kingdom. If, again, we considered the question of our relations with the Nizams, it would be found to be notoriously the fact that we only got on tolerably well with them; because, by a happy accident, they were possessed of wise ministers, who knew they must govern according to our ideas. But the state of things would be very different if there existed at Hyderabad or in Scindia any equality of force or scope for intrigue. The first question which presented itself was, what are we going to do with the Porte? If the Porte was to appoint its own Pashas and officers, and in its own way to collect taxes and administer justice after its own fashion, the task which we had undertaken of introducing good government was simply and absolutely impossible of execution. The appointment of the Pashas was the key of the whole question, and this was at present effected, mainly by harem intrigues or by bribery at Constantinople, where every second or third year after an appointment when the money paid for this bribery was exhausted, a fresh candidate came forward and squeezed the old man out of his place. That system, as everyone knew, had been the ruin of Turkey. Unless the appointment of the Pashas, rested with us, of what earthly use was the forwarding of diplomatic notes and remonstrances? Take the Province of Asia Minor, which, by the Treaty of Berlin, had been taken from Russia and given back to Turkey. The introduction of order and good government into this Province alone of all the others in Asiatic Turkey was most important, and, at the same time, most difficult. It was most important, because it was inhabited, to a large extent, by a Christian Armenian population, as well as by some of the wildest tribes; in short, the condition of the Province was such that, in his opinion, the establishment therein of good order and good government would tax the energies and abilities of all the statesmen who had administered affairs in the Punjaub. He repeated that unless we took into our own hands the nomination of officers in the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey, our diplomatic remonstrances would be treated by the Grand Viziers as the last Grand Vizier had treated the despatch of Lord Derby, who wrote in the strongest terms demanding the punishment of Chefket Pasha, and charging our Ambassador to read the despatch to the Sultan personally. The result of that remonstrance was that Chefket Pasha was not only not punished, but actually promoted. Again, if we worried the Porte with angry remonstrances, we should make the ruling class our enemies, and they would be only too glad to turn towards Russia. Taking the other alternative, and supposing it were possible to get over that initial difficulty of prevailing on the Porte to give us *carte blanche,* and to allow us to appoint British officers, he admitted the organization of the Asiatic Provinces on an Anglo-Indian footing to be possible, inasmuch as it was within the resources of the Empire, which could not, however, fail to be strained by that enormous task. He thought he could prove that fact in a moment. Let them compare the situation of Asiatic Turkey with the situation of India. Nobody who knew anything about India could doubt which was the easier to govern. In India we had a large, and, in the great majority of cases, a peaceful and industrious population; all internal enemies and warlike tribes had been pretty well suppressed; we had railways and river communications throughout the country, an increasing commerce, and a large and certain revenue; yet, with all these advantages, how much did the maintenance of India cost us? In Asiatic Turkey there was the reverse of all these advantages. The country, which was as large as France, Spain, and Italy together, was to an enormous extent barren, interworked with mountain chains, and possessing but a scanty population, a large portion of which consisted of predatory tribes. In India we had but one North-Western frontier to guard, whilst in Asiatic Turkey we must defend against Russia the whole line extending from Batoum to the Persian frontier, thence by the plains of Mesopotamia till we reached Egypt, where we must keep watch and ward against the Bedouins of the Desert. He desired the House to consider for a moment the extent of the frontier which he had just traced. If we wanted to introduce into Asiatic Turkey anything like order and good government, we must divide the country into administrative districts or circles not to large for the personal supervision of District Commissioners, who would have to be appointed to every one of these circles, and who must be supported by a reliable police force in addition to a small and reliable military force. By the term reliable, he meant that these forces should be officered and paid by England. In addition to that, there must be stationed at all the principal towns brigades or divisions of regular troops in considerable force, so that we might be prepared, in the case of any internal movement becoming serious, to march out and support the Assistant Commissioners. Again, we must have one or two great general reserves either at Cyprus, Trebizonde, or some other place to back up the district reserves, and secure our hold upon the country. There were 3,000 miles of a most difficult and impracticable country to be guarded, a task which, although it was within the resources of the British Empire to attempt, could not be seriously contemplated unless we were prepared not for one or two years, but for one or two generations, to put up with Estimates that would make the shades of Peel and Cobden shudder. India had a revenue of £50,000,000, and we had to maintain there an Army of 200,000 men, the charge for which we could hardly meet owing to our state of financial tension, which obliged us, in the case of a failure of the opium crop, for instance, to apply for British subsidies in order to avoid bankruptcy. But would the revenue of Asiatic Turkey, even if we paid nothing to the Porte, exceed £10,000,000 for a long time to come, and would anybody say that 250,000 men were more than sufficient to guard the frontier of that country? He asked, what was likely to be the amount of the deficit after providing for these expenses of government? The real danger, as far as India was concerned, in his opinion, lay in the question of taxation. We talked of our prestige; but prestige in India meant the conciousness on the part of the Natives that within the limits of that country we were all-powerful. Supposing the Native knew that Russia had annexed some portion of the Sultan's territory, what did he care? He felt that we were near and ready to strike hard if necessary, and he knew that other peoples, like the Russians and the French, were too far off to come to his assistance. There could be no greater fallacy than to suppose that the Natives in India would be conciliated by an undertaking to defend the Asiatic Provinces of the Sultan. Everybody who knew anything about India must be aware that more than two-thirds of the population was not Mahomedan at all. If this part of the population had any feeling in our favour, the Indian Mutiny afforded them an opportunity to come to the front; but instead of that they were proved to be the ringleaders of the rebels, and actually set up a Mussulman at Delhi to contest our authority. But the great majority of our Mussulman subjects in India were perfectly loyal; because they felt that they were well governed, and that our rule protected the free exercise of their religion. The Natives cared very little about what was going on in distant lands; but they cared a great deal about having to pay income tax, the licence tax, and the salt tax. Of course, it was only reasonable that we should be able to impose upon them increased taxation when it became necessary to do so; but, on the other hand, our popularity would be extended by a reduction of taxation. The conditions of the repeal of the salt tax and licence tax was economy, and economy in India meant military reduction; indeed, there was no other large economy that could be effected. Without wishing to occupy the time of the House unnecessarily, he would quote the words of Lord Canning who, when he met him for the first time in India, made the remark that "danger for danger, he would rather undertake to govern India with 40,000 Indian troops without the income tax than with 80,000 with it;" or, in other words, that our policy in India ought to be to keep our military expenditure to a minimum, and to allow the old military spirit of the warlike tribes to die out. How far had the policy adopted by Her Majesty's Government been consistent with the policy indicated by Lord Canning? If the policy of the Government were to be carried out—and he admitted that it was possible — greatly increased taxation must ensue; for it was idle to suppose it could be done with anything like the Estimates of the present time, and it was equally idle to suppose that such increased Estimates could be met by raising the income tax. Then, by how much would they increase the malt tax, and other imposts? The country could, no doubt, afford to bear a large additional amount of taxation, but he maintained that it should not be made to do so without clear and absolute necessity; because, as we were likely soon to encounter the full force of foreign competition in all matters of trade, it was most important that the country should not be handicapped in the race. By striking in this way at the roots of our commerce and manufacturing trade, we struck at the power which could be founded upon them alone. On the other hand, by husbanding our resources, and acting on the maxims of common sense, we should establish a power which would enable us to defy, not the might of Russia alone, but that of the whole world united.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS said, that during these great transactions which had taken place during the last three

Sessions, it had been his pride and satisfaction to give his support to Her Majesty's Government in the policy they had pursued. There had been many who, like himself, had refrained from putting forward their own individual views and suggestions at such a great crisis of time, when Her Majesty's Government was engaged in transactions involving the most grave and anxious considerations to the country. But the time had now arrived when they were free to express their individual views upon what had been done in the name of the country by the responsible Ministers of the Crown. It was satisfactory to him, as an humble and independent supporter of Her Majesty's Government, that at the conclusion of these great transactions—at the end of this great crisis—he was able to offer them his hearty individual support, in the belief and conviction that what they had endeavoured to accomplish was likely to result in complete success. This debate had been conducted in a most remarkable manner; they were in the habit of supposing that at least one of the most important points in any Resolution was to be found in its conclusion. But, in the case before them, the noble Marquess who had so powerfully brought forward the Resolution had passed that part of it over with disdain. The same course had been taken by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) and the right hon. Member for Greenwich. But very different was the manner in which the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) dwelt on the same subject. He, at least, could not understand how it was that this most important part of the Resolution had been passed by with such disregard. For his own part, he (Mr. Charles Lewis) could understand exactly how it was that the noble Marquess did not refer to that part of the Resolution. The noble Marquess recollected that he had been a Member of a Government which had produced the Alabama Treaty; he recollected that he had been a Member of a Government which, by that Treaty, altered the international rule by which the conduct and liabilities of this country were to be guided. He remembered that the Treaty produced by his Government fixed upon the country a liability of £3,500,000, which, by no possibility of international law, could the country otherwise have been forced to pay. They had heard, in the course of that debate, many denunciations of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government with reference to the Prerogative of the Crown. It was a most remarkable thing that Liberal Ministers, when they went out of Office, generally got very uneasy and critical about the Prerogative of the Crown; but when in Office, they were by no means backward in using the Prerogative of the Crown, even for the purpose of overbearing the voice of Parliament. It must be recollected, when they heard these great denunciations from the right hon. Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe), and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), that it was the Administration of which they were Members which, by Royal Warrant, overbore the Constitutional action of Parliament with reference to Purchase in the Army. It could, therefore, be well understood how it was that the noble Marquess passed over in the way he did that part of his Resolution relating to the non-sanctioning of this Treaty by Parliament before it was made by the Crown. Passing by that, there were one or two preliminary observations, which must have occurred to many in the progress of the debate. At the end of the Berlin Congress, and when peace had been secured to the country, what had the Opposition to say with reference to the policy of the Government? Merely a succession of vain regrets—merely a succession of violent attacks and suggestions of deceptive conduct on the part of the Government. One would have thought that their love of country, or, at least, their love of commerce, would have prompted many hon. Members opposite to offer to the House some suggestion as to the mode by which this great and advantageous opening up of the East might be utilized with the greatest benefit to the country. But when they remembered what happened at the end of all these transactions, they could not help going back to make a remark or two as to the way in which the country was treated while the Eastern Question was occupying the attention of the Government. What had been the real cause of all the difficulties of the country with foreign nations? What had caused the vacillation of Austria, the aggressive spirit of Russia, and the holding back of France and Italy? For the first time in the history of this country, grave questions of foreign policy—the supreme question of peace or war—had been relegated to hysterical public meetings in all parts of the country. A great display had been made by ministers of religion, who denounced the Government, and misled the people by drawing upon their Christian sympathies and upon those kindly feelings which existed in all and especially in the English people. They had endeavoured to draw the people aside from the primary object of the policy of the Government and involve them in a political controversy and attack. True, all that had been passed by, and during the last two years the country had seen Her Majesty's Government, by a series of wise and judicious steps, consolidating the power and advancing the influence of England in the Councils of Europe. Although there might have been in the earlier stages of these affairs some sort of vacillation and some want of consistency in their policy—which he was not prepared to deny—yet, during the last year, and especially during the last six months, hon. Members sitting on that side of the House had seen with the greatest satisfaction that the Government had been gradually progressing towards that point to which the country had now attained—namely, a peace, which in its terms was creditable to the Powers which obtained it—and secured to England, after its many sacrifices, important collateral advantages which would be useful and creditable to the nation in time to come. He would merely refer in passing to the fact that the three great steps that had caused the most violent discussions in the House—namely, the demand by the Government and the grant by the House of the Vote of £6,000,000, the calling out of the Reserves, and the transport of a small contingent of Indian troops to Malta—these three great measures of policy had been the object of the most violent attack on the part of the Opposition. Yet he believed, and he thought the nation understood, that this series of measures had placed the country in the position in which it now found itself in the Council Chamber, planting down its firm foot and receiving the admiration and respect of Europe. After the speech which they had heard with so much pleasure from the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, it would be impertinence in anyone sitting on that side of the House to attempt to go into the general questions which were involved in this Motion. If the country desired an intelligible, unanswerable statement as to the policy of the Government, he had the greatest confidence in feeling that a deliberate and careful reading of the speech of the Home Secretary would at once dissipate any doubts and difficulties that might remain in the mind of any impartial person desirous to be informed what the policy of the Government had been, and how it could be supported. But he desired to refer, though not at any great length, to that part of the address of the noble Marquess, and to that part of these transactions in which, owing to the peculiar circumstances by which they were surrounded, was to be found the most vulnerable part of the Government case—he meant the Anglo-Turkish Convention. It had been said not only that it was bad in principle, but that it was insulting and deceptive with regard to the mode of its working, as regarded the other Powers; that it was ineffective, and must be ineffective for any good, and would increase the military and pecuniary responsibilities of the nation. Now, he would say with reference to the charge of its being insulting and deceptive to other Powers, that they might at least have expected that those who had been so seriously injured and subjected to such conduct would have been the parties complaining of it. But, so far from that being the case, none of the foreign Powers, said to have been treated so badly by Her Majesty's Government with reference to the entering into this Convention, had made any complaints. On the contrary, so far as they were able to discover any evidence on the subject, it seemed that foreign Ambassadors and Plenipotentiaries had been actuated by the same reasonable views with which Her Majesty's Government were possessed, and that they looked upon the undertakings of the Convention as having reasonable objects in view which were to be carried out in a legitimate way. It had been said by a great authority that this was nothing short of an insane Convention, and it had also been alleged and repeated by many hon. Members on the other side of the House that the great responsibilities of this country had been enormously increased by that Convention. That was an abstract statement, and might or might not be perfectly true; but the question which the common-sense people of England would ask was not whether additional responsibilities and obligations had been undertaken, but whether it was necessary that they should be undertaken? That question would depend upon a great many considerations with reference to the peace of England, the route to India, the encouragement to Russia, and the possibilities of a successful advance by that Power, in the event of any difficulties hereafter arising, and other matters. With reference to the difficulties that might hereafter arise, it was in the power of anyone to produce such a marvellous bundle of prophecies as that to which the House had listened from the hon. Member for Orkney (Mr. Laing). In the course of a speech occupying an hour and a-half, that hon. Gentleman, who was accustomed to speak with great advantage to the House, had that night delivered himself of nothing more nor less than a series of prophecies in which, as their fulfilment was in the womb of the future, it was not in their power to checkmate him by the hard incidents of fact. When they listened to that long list of prophecies presented by the hon. Member for Orkney, they were inclined to remark that he was not the only Indian authority in this country; and it was a most remarkable circumstance that while a great authority like Lord Lawrence was in England, he had taken no part in this controversy, nor, so far as they had as yet heard, had he expressed any opinion against the policy adopted with reference to the route to India or Indian affairs. One or two observations of the noble Marquess had particularly struck him. Speaking with reference to our Indian Empire, he referred to the chain of mountains which formed the natural bar of India against incursions from one quarter, and he suggested that the safe proceeding for England to take was to wait until the enemy had arrived at those mountains before taking any measures to stop him. He would allow Asia Minor and Persia to be overrun, and yet say that no possible incursion could be made into India, because the chain of mountains would be an invincible barrier against the foe. But what would be thought by the people of India if, during the next quarter of a century, they heard that Russia was year after year pushing forward her boundary in Asia Minor and Persia, and arriving at the narrow barrier that separated her from the Peninsula? Was it not likely that the Indian people would take alarm, and that the prestige of England would be destroyed, if there was the slightest feeling of doubt as to the chance of the loss of her great Empire by the advance of Russia to its very gates? He confessed himself that he looked with great regret upon the course taken by the Opposition with reference to India. On the flag which heralded in many of the meetings they had heard so much of during the last year or two—"Perish India" was a motto not unfrequently found. To pay an extra income tax of 6*d*. in the pound, for the sake of maintaining our Indian Empire, was a wasteful piece of extravagance which a great many hon. Members opposite would not think of incurring. But, just at the very crisis of their fate, as it were, and when the extent of the influence the country would be able to maintain in the Councils of Europe was in the balance—when the question of the influence and effect upon their Indian fellow-subjects of that great act of policy—bringing the Indian troops into Europe—was waiting to be considered—one who stood most prominently forward as the late Leader of a great historical Party, and who might be considered with justice as a great orator, thought proper to rush to a magazine for the purpose of explaining his views on the condition of India, and on the conduct of this country towards it. When he felt it his duty to refer to this subject, and to the article written by the right hon. Gentleman, he (Mr. Charles Lewis) wrote a letter to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich—which he politely acknowledged—stating that he should refer in this debate to the article sent by him to a well-known periodical. No one, he ventured to say, could have read that article through without feeling the greatest distress and dismay as an Englishman. It was not the case of a man who had no forum to which he might go—it was not the case of a man of great authority, but who had no opportunity of making his views known, and of placing them before the country in a regular Constitutional form—for, as they well knew, there was no man the charm of whose oratory was so great in that House, or no man who could so certainly maintain the most complete silence when he addressed the House, as the right hon. Gentleman. But, instead of expressing his views as one who had been a responsible Minister of the country, he thought it his duty to go to the magazines, in order to inform them of his views with regard to India. The arguments thus presented to their Indian fellow-subjects with reference to the conduct of the English Government and people, he (Mr. Charles Lewis) had thrown into a short summary. It was not to be wondered at that the right hon. Gentleman had certain peculiar views with reference to restraining libels in the Vernacular Press of India. They were told by the right hon. Gentleman, in that article, that the people of England were not the masters of India; and he described their rule as being worked by an exceptional and, perhaps, a provisional character. The article went on to remark that 30,000,000 at one end of the world governed 300,000,000 at the other, and doubted whether the maintenance of British rule was in the interest of India. There was, further, an elaborate description of the wrongs of India in connection with its Military Service, and other matters; and, on the one hand, was set out the advantages derived by England from India, and, on the other, the burdens and distress to which India would be subjected in case of a war. Then they found the oft-repeated questions—Can India be content? Will India be content? Ought India to be content? The English nation was described as perpetrating the greatest injustice, and was distinctly told that it must be prepared for the results to which that would lead. Then the Indian soldiers, at that time being used in Europe, were informed that they were considered an inferior order. Finally, what England was doing in India with reference to the present rate of charge for an Army was characterized as a swindle. The article summed up the matter by saying that the English nation were not ordinary swindlers, but their case was as flagrant as that of a guardian who was unfaithful to his ward. Now, he maintained it was not in the interests of this country that such an article as that should go unrepudiated in that House, and he ventured to say it was very unfortunate that, owing to Parliamentary Forms, the opinion of Parliament was never asked, and could not be asked, with respect to that article. But he would make this remark, that the Government of which the right hon. Gentleman had once been the head had sent many men to prison for writing words not stronger than those. One looked with dismay at what must be its influence and effect upon the people of India, when they could read such an article as that written by one of England's foremost statesmen. The Ministerial side of the House had been taunted with the opinions expressed 36 years ago by the Prime Minister. It was not necessary for him to defend the noble Lord against the attacks of the right hon. Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen); but, knowing that at the time the Government was conducting important and delicate negotiations with foreign countries, the question of peace and war, and the conduct of the Government was canvassed on country platforms, and disposed of by speeches made on waggons at country railway stations, he thought it necessary that great debate should not close without someone, however humble, rising in his place and giving the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of justifying the statements he had made deliberately and in writing. Although he did not wish to trouble the House at any length at that hour, he must make one or two observations on the challenge thrown down by hon. Gentlemen opposite. It was said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich—"Why don't you dissolve?" "Why don't you test the opinion of the country?" But had hon. Gentlemen on the other side any doubt as to the opinion of the country upon the result of these great transactions? Had they any serious doubt about it? He believed himself that the reason of the suggestion was the fear that there would be a Dissolution, and the dread of having to meet it on the part of hon. Members opposite. Speaking for himself, he had no hesitation in saying that if anything depended upon individual opinion he would strongly advise and desire that the country should be appealed to, not merely on the conduct of the Government, but also on the conduct of those who had been attacking it for so many months; and as to what the result would be, he had no manner of doubt. Then came the modern innovation of his hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain)—the National Confederation of Liberal Associations—which was under the immediate patronage of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, who signalized its introduction into one of the Metropolitan boroughs by appearing as the leading supporter of a local shoemaker. What had been the course pursued by the Birmingham Confederation of Liberal Associations? When the Anglo-Turkish Convention came out, that Association issued a document, which he believed had not been brought to the attention of the House. They rung an alarm-bell, evidently being desirous to obtain possession of the consciences of the Liberal constituencies, and keep them under lock and key. Consequently, they issued this Manifesto, which, as it was short, he trusted the House would allow him to read. The Circular said—

> "The action of the Government, in concluding an alliance with Turkey for a Protectorate of her Asiatic Possessions, renders it imperative that no time should be lost in eliciting the opinion of the country, both as regards the policy itself, and the secrecy with which it has been adopted and enforced."

And then—missing a sentence—the Circular went on—

> "That such an alliance, involving this country in responsibilities incalculable in their extent and their possible results, should have been concluded between the Governments of the Queen and that of the Sultan, at the request of the former, and without the knowledge of Parliament, is inimical to the interests of the nation and dangerous to the liberties of the people. It is absolutely necessary that a protest should at once be raised throughout the country against the secrecy of the transaction which is of such momentous importance—against the policy of engagements into which, without its knowledge or consent, the Ministers have entered on behalf of the nation, and against the acquisition by the practical annexation of the Island of Cyprus, notwithstanding the professions of the Government that England desired no advantage for herself, but that she entered the Congress solely in order to maintain the faith of Treaties, and to protect the general interests of Europe."

What was the result of this Manifesto? Absolutely nothing; for he believed it was a fact that the promoters of it did not venture to call a single public meeting. Immediately the Treaty and Convention were published, this Circular was sent to every one of the subsidiary and affiliated Associations—which had sprung up like mushrooms—in the great boroughs of the country, under the immediate guidance of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. The result of the Circular had not been to arouse any feeling in the strong Radical classes; and, that being so, did the House believe there was any substantial question as to what was the opinion of the vast majority of the thinking people of England upon the subject. He ventured to believe that, while right hon. and hon. Members, who were opponents of the Government, had been hurling at the head of the Prime Minister the personal desire of plunging the country into a terrible war, to waste its resources, and spill the blood of its people—he believed that even with this charge against them, and which had been delivered from one end of the country to the other, the majority of the people of England believed in no such wickedness as having been at the bottom of the policy of the Government; but that, on the contrary, they, in their course of action, had been guided by their own conscientious convictions of prudent considerations, and had been desirous to obtain a peace honourable to them, and honourable to the country, whose servants they were. And if, instead of success attending their efforts at Berlin, they had had the miserable result of having to bring home a failure, he believed the vast majority of the English people would still have thought they deserved well of their country. But having brought home, as he had previously described, a glorious peace, they did not understand how it was that the only thing they heard from the Opposition were regrets at that peace. He ventured to say, in conclusion, that when this great transaction came to be recorded in the pages of history, it would be said that, under the auspices of a Government which was subjected to the most incessant and unsparing attacks, England had emerged from obscurity clear as the sun, and powerful as a strong man, aiding oppressed communities and consolidating them under its own beneficent rule.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK: Sir, our countrymen often remark with surprise that while our foreign policy is essentially peaceful and unselfish, foreign nations, so far from giving us credit for our disinterestedness, persist in looking on us as grasping, and—in one case, at least—have fixed on us the epithet perfidious. I must say, however, that we have, to a certain extent, ourselves to thank for this unfortunate result; and the events of the last few weeks will, I fear, strengthen an impression which, if essentially unjust and unfounded, is, nevertheless, not inexplicable. The foreign policy of England—not only the right, but the wisest policy—is to be frank and to be unselfish. I do not say that we have been selfish in taking Cyprus; on the contrary, I believe it will be a burden to us; but it certainly has the appearance of selfishness; and again, in spite of the elaborate explanations of Government, it is, to say the least, unfortunate that, while the Congress of Berlin was to settle these questions by European concert, we entered that Congress fettered by two secret Agreements. Hon. Members opposite appear to consider that the provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano have been very much improved by that of Berlin; but, for my part, I am by no means clear that this is the case. Lord Salisbury, in his despatch of July 13th, inclosing the Berlin Treaty, congratulates us that nearly two-thirds of Bulgaria "have been replaced under the direct political and military rule of the Sultan." The noble Earl at the head of Her Majesty's Government has also told us that, in great measure through his exertions, 2,500,000 of people have been restored to the government of the Sultan. Bulgaria, as constituted by the Treaty of San Stefano, was a powerful State. It contained more than 50,000 square miles, and 4,000,000 of people, with harbours on both seas—on the Archipelago and on the Euxine. Under these circumstances, both from its natural resources and its geographical position, it must necessarily have exercised a predominant influence in that part of the world. Hon. Members opposite will not question this, because the words are Lord Beaconsfield's, not mine. But, as Lord Salisbury observes in his despatch of June 13th, apparently as a matter of congratulation, in consequence of the changes made since the Treaty of San Stefano, "the new Slav State is no longer strong." Surely, however, this is rather a misfortune than an advantage. A strong and free Slav State would have been a bulwark against Russia; but a weak one will rather be a temptation to fresh interference and renewed aggression. Among the points in the Treaty of San Stefano most strenuously objected to by Lord Salisbury, in his celebrated despatch of the 1st April, were the compulsory alienation of Bessarabia from Roumania, and the acquisition of the important harbour of Batoum, which, Lord Salisbury said—

> "will make the will of the Russian Government dominant over all the vicinity of the Black Sea."

But, Sir, Bessarabia has been compulsorily alienated from Roumania, and Russia has acquired Batoum, though it is true that this important harbour has now shrunk to a miserable tenth-rate port—if it be a port at all—which will

> "only hold three ships at once, unless they were packed like the London Docks, in which case it might hold 10 or 12."

At any rate, Sir, I cannot regard the changes which have been effected in the Treaty of San Stefano as at all an equivalent for the immense expenditure, the check to our commerce and manufactures, the risk of war, and, above all, the bad feeling which has been created between this country and Russia. To my mind, however, the Convention with Turkey is, in an English point of view, even more important than the Treaty of Berlin. I regret the acceptance of Cyprus, which, I believe, will involve us in considerable annual outlay, and the acquisition of which is a bad precedent. But the possession of Cyprus sinks into complete insignificance by the side of our Protectorate of Turkey in Asia. By this we have put it in the power of Russia to involve us in a war at any time. For we cannot honourably evade the responsibility, having once accepted the shilling, in the shape of Cyprus. Suppose, moreover, that Turkey refuses reforms which we think necessary, rejects our remonstrances, and exercises an oppression against which we feel bound to protest. Are we going to force her to adopt our views? I presume not; but in that case we must surely give her notice that we do not consider ourselves bound to defend her. She then will certainly call upon us to restore Cyprus. "We ceded Cyprus to you," Turkey will say, "as the price of your promise to protect us against Russia. If you are not going to help us, you must, in honour, restore the Island to us." But, in the meantime, no doubt, the population will largely have increased, works will have been carried out, and capital invested. How can you then, in equity, hand these people over to Turkey? They have come to Cyprus, confiding in English law and English justice, and it would be a hard case indeed that they should, against their will, be placed under the Turkish Government. We hear a great deal about the engagements of Turkey, and the reforms she has undertaken to make. But what has she really promised? On this we have no definite information. In fact, it seems to be the policy of the Government to keep us in the dark. I do not, however, dwell on this; because I infer, from what has been said "elsewhere," that the Government really knows no more than we do. We are told that we are acting with an "independent" Power—that these arrangements are immature. But surely they are a most vital part in the proceeding. We ought not to have given our guarantee—if at all—nor to have accepted Cyprus, till we had a clear and explicit understanding on these questions. Promises alone are not sufficient. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department characterized Turkish promises as "waste paper currency." In a most important document—namely, the general instructions given to Lord Salisbury when proceeding to the Conference at Constantinople—Her Majesty's Government say—

> "That the mere announcement of reforms by the Porte cannot be accepted as sufficient, and that even if Her Majesty's Government would be disposed to accept such an announcement, no other Power would do so."

And again—

> "It is in vain for the Porte to expect that the Powers will be satisfied with the mere general assurances which have already been so often given, and have proved to be so imperfectly executed."

Further on, in the same document, it is stated that—

> "The whole history of the Ottoman Empire since it was admitted into the European Concert, under the engagements of the Treaty of Paris, has proved that the Porte is unable to guarantee the execution of reforms in the Provinces by Turkish officials, who accept them with reluctance, and neglect them with impunity."

Lord Salisbury himself, in his despatch to Lord Derby from Pera, on the 13th January, 1877, says, after referring to previous promises of reform—

> "A renewal of these promises, if it is accompanied by adequate guarantees of performance, would be a valuable concession; but without any such guarantees, little practical advantage is likely to be obtained by reiterating the proclamation of these reforms."

And again, a few days later—on the 20th January—

> "Without proper guarantees, any list of reforms, however promising, would have been exposed to the fate which attended the Hatti-Humayoun of 1856, the communication of which was recorded by the Conference of Paris. I am of opinion that a scheme, from which both these guarantees were omitted, would have been illusory."

Indeed, the miserably bad government of Turkey, and the non-fulfilment of many previous promises, was the only, though sufficient, justification for the Conference at Constantinople, and the line England took there. At that time, so little were we satisfied, that we were scarcely disposed to leave her alone; now, having passed from one extreme to the other, we have such implicit faith in her assurances, that on the strength of them we undertake to defend her. The noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade, in his eloquent speech, saw nothing but progress and prosperity in the future. He could foresee no danger. He thought we had undertaken no responsibility, and he entered, if not into war, into an engagement to make war, like M. Ollivier, with a light heart. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department does not go quite so far; but he says—"In this particular case the danger was not created by entering into the guarantees; the danger was there." Sir, I deny it. A danger was there, but not the danger which Her Majesty's Government have created for England. It was, of course, always open to us, if we thought it expedient, to resist any further aggressions of Russia in Asia. The Government might have notified this to Russia; but what we object to is that we have placed ourselves under Treaty obligations to Turkey. The present Government have committed not only themselves, but future Administrations also.

They have imposed a tremendous responsibility on the people of this country without their knowledge or consent. We are told that this course is necessary for the protection of our Indian Empire. But I cannot forget the words of Lord Salisbury in June last year. He said—

> "It has generally been acknowledged to be madness to go to war for an idea; but, if anything, it is more unsatisfactory to go to war against a nightmare."

In June, 1877, it was proposed that a British Consul should be appointed to some town in Central Asia, with a view to watch any possible intrigues of Russia; and what did Lord Salisbury say? He pointed out that between India and the Russian territories "there are deserts and mountainous chains," and that the danger "may possibly interest a future generation of statesmen, but is not of such imminence as to render necessary" the appointment of a Consul in Central Asia; and yet we are now told that it is so imminent that we must assume this tremendous responsibility. Our Indian frontier is, perhaps, the strongest in the world. A lofty range of mountains and an immense desert. We have thrown away this advantage. We have abandoned the fortifications provided by nature, and committed ourselves to fight Russia on her own ground—and what is worse, at her own time also. If we ever have a period of weakness, internal misfortunes, a rebellion in India, a desperate war—at that moment we are liable to be called on to fight Russia on ground of her own choosing, at her own frontier, 2,000 miles from ours. For my own part, I feel very grateful to Lord Derby and Lord Carnarvon for the efforts they have made to prevent the adoption of such a course. Speaking last year at the Merchant Taylors' School, Lord Salisbury used words which I should like to recall to hon. Members opposite. He asked—

> "Which is the wiser course—to allow your enemy to choose his own ground and to follow him through his deserts and impassable mountain chains, or to wait until he comes within your own range, where your armies will be able to deal with him with invincible effect?"

No doubt, a nation so happily constituted and so fortunately situated, as we are, has a duty to the rest of the human race. But, Sir, are we not endeavouring to fulfil it? We are even at present responsible for more than 400,000,000 of men of less civilized nations. Surely, this is as much as we are bound to undertake? It would be most unwise and imprudent to attempt more than we are reasonably sure of being able to perform. To defend India, we should husband our resources; but every year the present Government adds largely to the expenditure of the country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is the parent of a measure for the reduction of the National Debt; but, Sir, I fear that policy has become a thing of the past. Since the present Government came into Office, the expenditure of the country has increased more than £11,000,000. In 1873 it was £70,700,000; last year it rose to £82,400,000; and what it will be this year, no one yet knows. Of course, I do not object to the whole of this increase. Of the amount devoted to Education, for instance, we in this part of the House certainly shall not complain, though I should have liked to see increase of expenditure in some Departments—partly, at any rate—made up for by economy in others. But, Sir, if we look at our military expenditure, we shall find that, from under £25,000,000 in 1874, it has risen in 1878 to over £30,500,000, or no less than £5,500,000; upon the top of this we are to have an additional burthen, the amount of which we cannot as yet at all foresee. Our National Debt, again, is still the highest in the world; and you would do more to increase the strength of the country by reducing the Debt, than by the barren, or rather the costly, honour of owning another Island in the Mediterranean. Our fiscal system, though, no doubt, better than that of most other countries, is still far from perfect. There are taxes which it would be most desirable, if it were possible, to remit. The removal of the duty on tea and coffee, for instance, would be an immense boon, and probably do much to encourage temperance. Again, the tax on tobacco is so high as to offer dangerous temptation to smuggling. Our manufacturers are not now so prosperous that we ought lightly to impose on them additional burthens. The pressure of our National Debt, and of our heavy expenditure, already puts us at a disadvantage in competing with other countries less heavily burthened—such as the United States, and even our own Colonies. Apart from any hypothetical contingencies, apart from the possible complications and dangers in which we may find ourselves involved, one thing is certain—namely, that the policy of the Government necessitates a great addition of expenditure. Suppose we put it at £10,000,000, what does that mean? Ten millions sterling would enable you to take off the tea duty, the duty on coffee—in fact, all duties except those on fermented liquors and tobacco, and the whole of the income tax. Or, if it were thought more prudent, £10,000,000 a-year would enable you rapidly to pay off your Debt. I ask myself, then, and I ask this House, to consider which course would be most prudent, which course would best promote the interests of the country; that we should be relieved from the income tax, from all duties, except on fermented liquors and tobacco, on the one hand; or that we should guarantee Turkey? I cannot doubt what the reply ought to be. Russia will have no difficulty in finding an excuse for war, if she is disposed to do so. She can at any time place 50,000—nay, 100,000— men on the frontier of Armenia. Nay, by a feint, or a threat, or even an innuendo, she will be able to impose a heavy expense on us, to compel us to prepare for war, to send troops to the East; all of which will, of course, necessitate increased taxation, and check our commerce and manufactures, while scarcely putting Russia to the slightest inconvenience. For my own part, Sir, I feel strongly that Her Majesty's Government are departing from the lines of a wise and prudent policy. I believe that they are allowing themselves to be dazzled by the temptations of vanity and ambition, that they wish to make this country a great military Monarchy, that they wish to make our gracious Sovereign, not the Queen of England and the Empress of India, but, first, the Empress of India, and, secondly, the Queen of England. Sir, I doubt not that this House will support Her Majesty's Government by a large majority; not the less I make my most earnest protest against a policy which is full of peril, and which, I fear, sooner or later, we shall bitterly repent.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Lord Elcho.*)

Mr. MUNDELLA observed that it was becoming only too obvious that hon. Members on that side of the House who were most deserving of a hearing were listened to with a scandalous impatience which was most discreditable to hon. Gentlemen who sat behind the Treasury Bench. His hon. Friend was continually interrupted in the course of his speech by noises, which he was sure, in one case, came from an hon. Member occupying an official position. It was true that they should be protected against such conduct, and more particularly for this reason—that if his hon. Friend had moved the adjournment of the House, hon. Members on the Ministerial side would have cried "Go on!" but because he gave the House an intellectual treat, he was subjected to persistent interruptions. In his opinion, it was high time someone sitting on the Front Bench should interfere to restrain the indecencies of those who sat behind it.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had not observed any interruptions beyond a certain amount of conversation which went on while the hon. Baronet was speaking. [Mr. Mundella: Not conversation, but interruption.] He had not noticed any interruption; and, for his own part, he was much obliged to the hon. Baronet for the very interesting speech he had made.

Mr. GREENE said, that there was no man in the House who more frequently interrupted hon. Members when speaking than the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella). It ill became him, therefore, to lecture the House on that subject. He had used the word "scandalous," but he would wish the hon. Member to understand that he was not the dictator of the House of Commons.

Mr. O'DONNELL hoped that, before the debate closed, there would be sufficient opportunity given to Irish Members to express their opinions on this question. There was a good deal of opinion amongst Irish Members on this subject, and in some cases they did not like to be considered to have arrived at these conclusions by the reasons advanced on one side or the other. If the debate were to be completed the next night, he trusted that Irish Members would be allowed an opportunity of speaking.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER hoped that all hon. Gentlemen who wished to speak would have an opportunity of doing so; but this would depend, to some extent, on the length of the speeches.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

## ENDOWED SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS (SCOTLAND) BILL—[*Lords.*]

(*The Lord Advocate.*)

[BILL 157.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause A (Commissions to submit conditions of distribution of Parliamentary Grant with view to promotion of higher education).

MR. RAMSAY moved, in page 4, line 9, after the word "promoting," to insert "elementary," and in the same line to leave out "in," and to insert "and so as at the same time to secure adequate attention to the teaching of." He said, that the system of education that had been hitherto pursued in Scotland had brought the elementary schools into connection with the higher schools, and the higher schools with the Universities. If anyone were to be appointed under the Bill to take exclusive charge of the higher schools, it would indicate a desire on the part of the House to sever elementary from its past historical connection with the higher education. He, therefore, felt that if the Government should see fit to insist upon the insertion of this clause, it ought to be amended on the principle he had suggested. Instead of opposing the Amendment, he thought the Government should be pleased to have the opportunity of obtaining an indication of opinion from persons conversant with education in Scotland as to the means by which it could be best promoted. The connection between elementary and higher education was now so close that anything to interfere with that connection was, in the opinion of the people of Scotland, to be much deprecated.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 9, after the word "promoting," to insert the word "elementary."—(*Mr. Ramsay.*)

THE LORD ADVOCATE regretted that he was unable to accede to the Amendment. Under the Act of 1872, a Board of Education had been established to look after the elementary schools, and in order to complete its work it had been continued during the past year. It would expire next month. The purpose of the present appointment of Commissioners was not to superintend elementary education in Scotland, but to deal with endowed foundations, and they would have to deal almost exclusively with the question of higher education in Scotland. They would thus hardly be in a position to make those representations to the Government provided for by the Bill; for, in the course of the discharge of their functions, they would gain but little information as to the necessities of elementary education in Scotland. It would be too much to expect an unpaid body of Commissioners to make themselves acquainted with educational wants outside the scope of their duties.

Question, "That the word 'elementary' be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

THE LORD ADVOCATE then moved that the Bill be amended by increasing the number of Commissioners from five to seven.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE reminded the Home Secretary that the names of the Commissioners had been promised.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I am now able, with the permission of Her Majesty the Queen, to give the names of the Commissioners. They are Lord Moncreiff, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Sir James Watson, of Glasgow, Mr. Ramsay, M.P., Mr. James Campbell, Dr. Donaldson, and Professor Tait.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

## LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS (SCOTLAND) BILL—[Bill 271.]

(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Matthew Ridley.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 4, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Steam locomotives to be constructed so as to consume their smoke).

Mr. W. HOLMS moved, in page 2, line 24, after "smoke," to insert "and so as to consume its own smoke." He said, that as the clause stood at present it was only necessary to have a locomotive constructed on the principle of consuming its own smoke. He wished the clause to be amended, so that locomotives should actually have to consume their own smoke. In his opinion, there was no reason why locomotives on roads should not consume their own smoke as well as those on railways.

The LORD ADVOCATE would appeal to the hon. Member not to press his Amendment, for this reason. An understanding had been come to, upon which hon. Members were fairly entitled to rely that the Government would bring in a Bill for Scotland on this subject in the same form in its clauses as the Act for England. As the Bill at present stood it was in accordance with that understanding, and, no doubt, many hon. Gentlemen who took a different view from the hon. Member were relying upon the clause remaining in its present form. He could only say that an attempt was made to put a provision similar to that proposed into the English Bill, but after discussion it was not pressed. For these reasons, he could not consent to the Amendment being made.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, the proposal now made was almost impracticable. It was impossible to construct engines which should, under all circumstances, consume their own smoke. It was well known that, although the law was that locomotives on railways should consume their own smoke, they did not do so. Nevertheless, he thought the adoption of the principle of smoke consumption should be compulsory on every locomotive.

Mr. W. HOLMS said, that after the statement of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Power to local authorities to make orders as to hours during which locomotives may pass over roads).

Mr. W. HOLMS moved, in line 34, after "use," to insert "and speed." He said that he was a Member of the Select Committee with reference to the use of locomotives on tramways. Two of the points to which the Committee directed its attention were the consumption of smoke and the regulation of speed. In his opinion, it was desirable that powers to regulate speed should be placed in the hands of the local authority.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he must object to this Amendment on the same ground as the others, and would ask his hon. Friend not to press it. The Amendment proposed was not in the English Bill, and those who had relied upon this Bill being the same as that would have reason to complain if the Amendment were introduced. On the other hand, he must not be understood to speak upon the assumption that there was no power to regulate speed, for he considered that the general power of regulation naturally applied to speed.

Mr. W. HOLMS: Do I understand that, as the clause now stands, the local authority has power to make bye-laws and to regulate speed?

The LORD ADVOCATE: Yes, in my opinion, it has that power.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Power of county road authority to licence locomotives).

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY moved that the clause be omitted.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *struck out.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Friday, 2nd August*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—British Museum (Transfer of Collection) * (183); Prison (Officers' Superannuation) * (184); Statute Law Revision (Ireland) * (185).

*Second Reading*—Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) * (180); Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) * (168); Elders Widows' Fund * (182).

*Committee*—Idiots, &c. (Ireland) * (148-187).

*Third Reading* — Debtors Acts Amendment * (163); Naval Discipline Amendment, *now* Naval Discipline Act (1866) Amendment * (175); Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers Expenses) (Scotland) * (174), and *passed*.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday, 2nd August*, 1878.

MINUTES.] — Private Bill (*by Order*) — *Considered as amended* — Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Naval Discipline Act (1866) Amendment * [290].

*Second Reading* — Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland) * [253]; Metropolitan Commons * [287].

*Committee* — *Report* — Education (Scotland) [156]; Marriages (Fiji) * [285].

*Considered as amended—Third Reading*—Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) * [271], and *passed*.

*Third Reading* — Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) * [157]; Consolidated Fund (No. 4) *; Arranmore Polling District (Ireland) * [270], and *passed*.

*Withdrawn*—Disqualification of Medical Relief Removal * [282].

## *PRIVATE BUSINESS.*

## CHRISTCHURCH, NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, TITHES COMMUTATION BILL—[*Lords.*]—(*by Order.*)

### CONSIDERATION, AS AMENDED.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."

Mr. PLIMSOLL said, he had placed upon the Paper an Amendment, That the Bill be taken into Consideration on that day three months. Instead of making that Motion, he intended to substitute another—"That the Bill be re-committed to a Select Committee." His reason for taking that course was this—the Committee which had already sat upon the Bill was a small Committee, the numbers were equally divided in regard to the merits of the Bill, and the Bill itself only passed by the casting vote of the Chairman. Perhaps the House would consider it necessary that he should say a few words to explain the circumstances of the case. The authorities of St. Bartholomew's Hospital were the lay impropriators of the tithes of the parish of Christchurch, Newgate Street, and their tithe was derived from a Charter of King Henry VIII., granted between 300 and 400 years ago. About 200 years ago, the sum payable under this grant or decree was commuted or settled for a fixed annual payment of £200, and this sum had continued to be paid to St. Bartholomew's Hospital by the parish during all that time. Recently—in 1874—it was discovered that the terms of the original grant gave to the hospital a title to a sum equal to 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound from the parish. This discovery disturbed the arrangement which had existed for 200 years, and the hospital actually sued some of the parishioners, who had bought property in the parish, for a rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound, which upon even the limited area of this parish would amount, he was told, to a total rate of £7,180 per annum. The matter was thrown into Chancery, and was argued before the Master of the Rolls, who expressed, in the strongest terms, his sense of the injustice of the demand, and said he would trace every principle of law which bore upon the subject, in order to ascertain if there were not means of defeating the claim. In the end, the Master of the Rolls hung up the matter, in the hope that it might be settled upon some satisfactory terms of compromise. The action had been defended by two of the parishioners—Mr. Tyler, and the Board of Christchurch Hospital. Before the cause in Chancery was disposed of, a Bill was introduced into the House of Lords. Lord Redesdale refused to proceed with it, while a case was pending in the Courts of Law; so that nothing should be done by Parliament to deprive the persons interested of their legal remedy. But the promoters of the Bill settled privately with the opponents, and proceeded with the Bill as an unopposed Bill, forgetful of the fact that there were other owners of property in the parish who had not come forward, because they thought the claims of the whole body would be defended and fought for by the opponents, who had since been got out of the way. The terms of the compromise proposed in the present Bill was that, instead of receiving £200 a-year, the hospital should receive £1,100 a-year at once, £1,650 at the end of five years, and £2,200 a-year at the end of five years more. As Lord Redesdale pertinently observed, if the promoters of the Bill were entitled to £2,200 a-year, why did they not take it at once? Why should they shirk their rights? It was evident that the authorities of the hospital, under the name of charity, were asking for as large a sum as they could get at present, with the intention of putting on the screw from time to time afterwards. When the Master of the Rolls was made acquainted with the nature of the compromise, he lifted up his hands in astonishment and said—"And such things are done in the name of charity!" It appeared to him (Mr. Plimsoll) that the question was one which a Select Committee of the House of Commons was eminently well fitted to decide. He did not impugn the decision of the Committee that had sat already; but he thought he had stated a case sufficiently strong to justify him in asking the House to re-commit the Bill. He had already pointed out that the Committee were equally divided, and that the Bill was passed by the casting vote of the Chairman. It was not, therefore, disrespectful to ask the House to refer the measure to a larger Committee, who would be better able to deal with a Bill of this sort. He would, therefore, move, as an Amendment, that the Bill be re-committed.

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Does any hon. Member second the Amendment?

**Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS**: I beg to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the word "re-committed,"—(*Mr. Plimsoll,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

**Sir SYDNEY WATERLOW** trusted that the House would not consent to disturb the decision already arrived at—first, of the Committee of the House of Lords; secondly, of the recommendation of the Master of the Rolls after hearing the case for two days; and, thirdly, of the decision of the Select Committee of that House. His hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) suggested now that the Bill should go before another Committee. He (Sir Sydney Waterlow) saw no substantial reason for adopting that course. They had already referred it to a Select Committee, who, after hearing evidence on both sides, had decided upon recommending the House to read the Bill a third time. He thought his hon. Friend the Member for Derby had been very much misinformed in regard to the statement which he had been induced to make to the House. His hon. Friend said that terms of compromise were settled with the two opponents of the Bill in the House of Lords; and, therefore, that it was passed on the withdrawal of their opposition as an unopposed Bill. The real fact was, that Lord Redesdale objected to the Bill being allowed to go on, while a suit in the matter was proceeding in the Court of Chancery; and part of the compromise agreed to afterwards, and assented to by the Master of the Rolls, was that all the other inhabitants of the parish should be placed upon the same footing as the defendants in the Chancery suit. Therefore, in that respect, there could be no complaint, because all the parishioners were placed upon the same footing. He asked the House to pass the Bill for this reason. They all disliked tithes. He disliked them himself as much as anyone could dislike them; and in this case, he thought it was to the interest of the parish to bring about a commutation of tithes, in order to prevent the tithes from increasing year after year with the increase of the assessment of the parish. The object of the present Bill was to fix a definite sum to be paid by the parish in future years, so as to prevent the charge from increasing with the assessment. A statement had been circulated that the property belonging to Christ's Hospital was to be exempted from tithes. That was altogether incorrect. The great bulk of the property belonging to Christ's Hospital had been exempted from tithes ever since it was a monastery. That part which was monastical property was exempted from the payment of tithes; but every other part had to pay tithes, and every portion of the property that was liable to pay tithes was taken into account. Under the compromise, effected by the present Bill, Christ's Hospital would be required to pay a sum of £200 a-year; whereas what it would be called on to pay under an assessment would be about £300 a-year more, none but the titheable property being taken into account. He trusted that the House would consent to the third reading of the Bill, because the matter had now been in dispute for a considerable number of years, and the parish had already expended as much in the way of costs as it would have been required to pay in the shape of tithes. If the House objected to read the Bill a third time, the question must go back again in November to the Master of the Rolls, who was of opinion that he would have to make a decree for the payment of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound, notwithstanding the fact that he thought such a rate would be unjust. If the Bill failed to pass, there was very little doubt that the parish would have to pay that amount. He did not propose to go further into the merits of the case, because he thought those merits had been already thoroughly threshed out in the inquiries which had taken place in the House of Lords, and before a Select Committee of the House of Commons.

MR. ROBERTS said, he wished to say a word upon the subject, as he was one of the Committee appointed to consider the Bill. Although he thought it was desirable, in questions of this nature, to stop anything in the shape of litigation, he contended that the Preamble of the Bill, which was carried only by the casting vote of the Chairman, was not proved. The Master of the Rolls had clearly indicated his opinion upon the matter. He said that, although he might be compelled to give a decree in favour of the rate, yet he would take every opportunity of inquiring whether there were not some means of preventing him from doing what he regarded as an unjust act. Under these circumstances, he (Mr. Roberts) would be prepared, if the hon. Member for Derby went to a division, to give his vote in the same way as he had done before.

MR. ALLCROFT said, that he also sat upon the Committee to whom the Bill was referred, and although it was quite true that the Preamble of the Bill was only carried by the casting vote of the Chairman, the opponents of the measure had every opportunity of giving all the evidence they could against the measure. It was shown to the Committee that the great majority of the ratepayers of the parish were in favour of the Bill. This he thought ought to be enough to induce the House to pass the measure. It was quite true that the measure would very considerably increase the sum derived by the hospital from the parish in the shape of tithes. At present the sum paid was not very large. He believed the parish had been in the habit of paying £200 a-year in the way of commutation of tithes; but St. Bartholomew's Hospital had recently been told that it was entitled to claim a much larger amount than that—indeed, that it had a right to claim a rate amounting to 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound. A rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound would amount to no less than £6,000 or £7,000 a-year, and the determination of the Hospital to increase the charge so largely would, no doubt, give rise to very considerable litigation within the parish. Litigation had already commenced, and when the case was brought before the Master of the Rolls, he said at once that the law was against the parish, and that if he was required to give a decision, his decision must be in favour of a rate of

2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound. In that case the parish would be saddled with the full payment of an annual sum amounting to between £6,000 and £7,000 a-year. The Commissioners, not wishing to do that, had come to a compromise, of which the Bill now before the House was the result. Instead of paying £6,000 or £7,000 a-year, the parish would be required to pay £1,100 a-year for the first five years; £1,650 a-year for the next five years, and £2,200 a-year afterwards. His own opinion was that that was a very fair compromise, and that it was to the interest of the parish to accept it. Under these circumstances, he hoped the House would reject the Amendment of the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll), and consent to read the Bill a third time.

Mr. GILES remarked that he had some personal interest in the matter. All the persons who had been hitherto opposed to the measure had, he believed, given way, and now, at the last moment, when the Bill had reached its final stage, the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) came forward with an objection to it. He (Mr. Giles) could not find that any of the parishioners entertained any real objection to the compromise which would be effected by the Bill. They had had full opportunity of being heard before the Committee, where they could have raised any objection they chose, but they had abstained from doing so; and now, at the last moment, an attempt was made to throw over the Bill on the third reading. He trusted that the House would not yield to such a demand. If it did, the only result would be that the parishioners would have to expend a still further sum in litigation, and in all probability in the end, the same advice would be given to them by the Master of the Rolls as that which he had already given—namely, that the parties should endeavour to arrange terms among themselves. The advice of the Master of the Rolls had been taken, and terms had been arranged. He hoped the House would do nothing to throw over the arrangement, and to land the parish in further litigation, and expense, and waste of time.

Mr. E. JENKINS thonght the case brought forward by his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) was, to say the least of it, a strong case for further consideration, and for not proceeding hastily in the matter. What were the circumstances of the case? It appeared that the Commissioners of St. Bartholomew's Hospital had recently made a claim upon the parish of Christchurch for tithes, which enormously increased the sum the parish had been in the habit of paying. The parish resisted the claim, and two of the largest ratepayers had been put forward to fight the battle on behalf of the whole of the parish. While they were engaged in fighting the battle, a Bill was introduced into the House of Lords for the purpose of carrying through Parliament a compromise which would have the effect of defeating the results of the litigation. He would simply put it to the House of Commons whether that was a proper thing to do; whether, when litigation was going on, it was a proper thing for people who had the power and the money to introduce a Bill into that House for the purpose of overriding the results of the litigation? It was perfectly clear, from the statement of the case which had already been made to the House, even by the supporters of the Bill, that that was what had taken place, and that those who had been relied upon by the parishioners to fight their battle in the Courts of Law, and who ought to have carried their opposition into the House of Lords, had been successfully squared by those who were promoting the Bill. There was one fact which, he thought, ought to have considerable weight with the House. It was this—that Christchurch Hospital had been squared for the very small sum of £100 a-year upon the amount of property in the parish held by Christ's Hospital. He presumed that although there would be this small increase in the contribution of Christ's Hospital, the effect of the Bill would be to relieve the property of Christchurch of an enormous charge, which it might otherwise be called upon to pay, provided that it paid in due proportion to the rest of the parish. With such facts as this brought to the notice of the House, surely there was sufficient to justify the opposition which had been raised to the Bill, or, at any rate, in making out a case for delaying the confirmation of the decision of the Committee upon the question. He hoped the House would assist his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) in the endeavour he was making to have the question referred back again to the Committee.

Mr. RAIKES observed, that if this were merely a matter of abstract right, he should be of opinion that the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) had made out a fairly strong case. He was entirely of opinion that the claim put forward on behalf of St. Bartholomew's Hospital was one which fully deserved the expressions used with regard to it by the Master of the Rolls when the case was brought under his notice. For a long series of years the Hospital had been content to compound with the parish for a fixed sum in lieu of tithes; and it was only now, after the lapse of a great number of years, that the Commissioners put forward another claim, which very largely increased the sum hitherto payable. But, at the same time, there were other considerations which must weigh upon the House, as well as those which had been put forward by the hon. Member for Derby; and he would advert for a moment to a matter mentioned in one of the clauses of the City Tithes Act of 1864, which appeared to him to bear upon the subject, and which he thought would have considerable weight with the House. In the 19th section of the London City Tithes Act, there was this provision—

> "With respect to the parish of Christchurch, Newgate Street, it shall be lawful for the parishioners of the said parish assembled in vestry, of which and of the special object thereof notice shall have been given, in the accustomed manner, to agree with the lay impropriators of the tithes of the said parish for the commutation of the said tithes or sums of money, instead of tithes arising or growing due therein, under the provisions of the said Act and decree, into an annual fixed tithe or sum to be paid by the said parish, and to be raised by tithe rates to be assessed therein."

That was the mode in which the parish had endeavoured to meet the case. A suit, as they were told, had now been proceeding for some years. Considerable costs had been incurred on both sides, and the parties to the suit had now been willing to effect a compromise. That compromise would be carried out by the present Bill; and, under those circumstances, the House was asked by two or three Gentlemen, who declined to assent to the compromise, to reject the decision of the Select Committee, and to send the Bill back to them for further consideration. He was bound to say that, in his opinion, it would be an inconvenient course for the House to take upon itself, in the present case, to set aside what was really the legitimate expression of the views of the parish, especially when an Act of Parliament passed in 1864 had made a special provision for such a case. He was unable to see that sufficient grounds had been stated by the hon. Member for Derby to induce the House to take a course which was not only unusual, but which would be opposed to the wishes of the parish and of those most interested in the question, and would be contrary to the express stipulations of an Act of Parliament, by which an arrangement of this sort was contemplated. There was no allegation of improper influence having been brought to bear at the time of the passing of the Act, and it certainly appeared to have been in the minds of the framers of the Act that some such arrangement as that now proposed was likely to be made and sanctioned. Under these circumstances, it seemed to him that the House would probably make a mistake, if they sent back the Bill to the Select Committee. He quite admitted that there might be a hardship in individual cases. He quite agreed that a smaller sum might have been fixed, and that the promoters of the Bill seemed to have gone upon their legal right, and had shown that they were fully alive to the nature of their claim. At the same time, the Commissioners had a perfect right to make what they deemed to be a fair compromise with the parish, and that compromise had been accepted by the persons who were parties to the suit before the Master of the Rolls. All the persons interested in the matter had, he understood, been before the Select Committee, and the Committee, after a full hearing, had decided against the opponents of the Bill. Under these circumstances, he thought it would be undesirable, upon the whole, to send the Bill back to the Select Committee.

Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS hoped the House would consent to the proposal made by his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) for the re-committal of the Bill. He had paid some attention to the course of litigation in regard to this matter; and he was bound to say that it appeared to him this was one of the most monstrous attempts he had ever heard of on the part of the owners of a tithe to take advantage of an anomaly in the law. He would tell the House what the point in the matter really was. For more than 200 years the property in the parish of Christchurch, Newgate Street, was rated at 1½*d.* in the pound for tithes. Property within the parish had for that length of time been bought, sold, settled, and disposed of on the footing that it was liable to a fixed rate for tithes of 1½*d.* in the pound. But some ingenious person had recently discovered that under an old Act of Parliament, by which the rate was originally levied, the case of this tithe commutation was not provided for by the Statute of Limitations, and that there was nothing to prevent them, notwithstanding the lapse of 200 years, from re-asserting their old claim in the language of the ancient Act of Parliament. They accordingly put forward a claim to raise the rate from 1½*d.* in the pound to the enormous sum of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound, and, in order to enforce that claim, the suit to which reference had been made was brought before the Master of the Rolls. The House had already heard that the Master of the Rolls expressed his astonishment; he (Mr. Watkin Williams) had almost said his disgust—at any rate, it was as near that as possible—at such a claim being made. He further expressed his amazement that there was no such thing as a Statute of Limitations applying to the case. He was anxious to discover whether he could find, among the ancient authorities, anything that would bear upon the case, or whether the old Statute which formed the foundation for the claim had not become obsolete. The learned Judge, however, scarcely found his way to arrive at that conclusion, and he ventured to recommend that some arrangement should be come to in order to put a stop to litigation. He (Mr. Watkin Williams) thought the compromise which had been come to between the promoters of the Bill and the two litigants in the suit was unjust and unreasonable to other persons in the parish. The proposition now made to the House was not to negative the scheme, but to give further time for consideration. Having regard to the fact that the Select Committee were equally divided, and that the Bill was passed through the casting vote of the Chairman, it would, he thought, do no harm to give an opportunity for further consideration, and he hoped the Bill would be re-committed for that purpose.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 130; Noes 74: Majority 56.—(Div. List, No. 249.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered;* to be read the third time.

## QUESTIONS.

### ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE—EXAMINATIONS.—QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true, as stated, that the usual examination for the Army Medical Service will not take place in the month of August this year; whether this is due to contemplated changes in the conditions of the Service likely to arise from the inquiry now being made; and, whether, if so, he is as yet in a position to indicate for the information of intending candidates the general direction of such changes?

Colonel STANLEY, in reply, said, it was true that the usual examination would not be held in August, which was due to some possible changes in the Service which had not yet been fully decided upon, and which he was therefore not in a position to indicate for the benefit of intending candidates, as requested by the hon. Member.

### NAVY—CHIEF ENGINEERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. GORST asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to make any change in the arrangements as to the chief engineers of the Royal Navy, so that those officers may be no longer required to serve eleven years in that rank, whatever may have been the length of their previous service as engineers and assistant engineers, before attaining the full pay and position of chief engineers?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, there is no intention on the part of the Admiralty to make any change in the arrangements as to counting junior service of chief engineers for increase of pay, &c. The present scale is not of recent adoption; but was recommended to be continued by the Committee which sat in 1876. This principle applies equally to other ranks—paymasters, chaplains, &c.—and the Admiralty are not prepared to apply a different rule in the case of the chief engineers.

## TURKEY—UNSECURED CREDITORS.

### QUESTION.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in view of the diminished area from which in future the Ottoman Empire can draw revenue, and in view of the recognized claims of Russia, which appear to rank with those of the ordinary creditors, not covered by hypothecations, Her Majesty's Government will extend their friendly offices to bring under the consideration of the Russian Government some scheme for an equitable adjustment of the claims of all the unsecured creditors of Turkey, and for the liquidation of such claims, on terms which may be practicable for the Ottoman Government to carry through; and in favour of which creditors holding hypothecations, who are nevertheless interested in Ottoman credit, may be likely to make some sacrifices?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, if the hon. Member will refer to pages 268 and 269 of "Turkey," No. 39 (Protocols), which has been laid upon the Table, he will find that all questions concerning the indebtedness of Turkey, and her financial capacity for meeting it, have been referred by Congress to an International Commission. It is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to anticipate the decisions at which that Commission may arrive by making any proposals of their own.

## JUDICATURE ACT—LEEDS CIVIL ASSIZES.—QUESTION.

Mr. BARRAN asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to give three Civil Assizes a-year to Leeds?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker), in reply, said, that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to do so.

## METROPOLIS—ST. JAMES'S PARK.

### QUESTION.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE asked the First Commissioner of Works, If his attention has been called to the state of St. James's Park, which in the daytime is made the playground of all the dirty children and roughs, and at night is reported to be the scene of the greatest profligacy?

Mr. GERARD NOEL: Sir, in answer to the Question of my hon. Friend, I have to state that I have observed the condition of St. James's Park during the last few days; but it is only what occurs invariably at this period of the year. At this time the schools in the Metropolis have their holidays, and the consequence is, the parents of children turn them out into the Park from early in the morning to late at night; they breakfast, lunch, and dine there, and do everything but sleep in the Park; but I do not see how this can be avoided, and I would remind the hon. Member that St. James's Park is intended as much for the recreation of children as it is for their parents and grown-up persons. I have been several times into St. James's Park during the last few days, and I have seen nothing unseemly or disorderly in their conduct—nothing but what is generally observed when hundreds of children are congregated together. I was in communication last week with the Inspector of Police, and we have stationed four additional policemen in the Park during the holidays to maintain proper order. With regard to the latter part of my hon. Friend's Question, I can only say that no Report has been made either by the Superintendent or Inspector of Police to the effect that the Park at night is the "scene of the greatest profligacy."

## THE INDIAN TROOPS CONTINGENT—PAYMENT—RATES OF EXCHANGE.

### QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Secretary of State for War, To supply the details, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated could then be best furnished, as to the rates of conversion used for issuing the coins in exchange for the rupee, which is the coin in which the pay of Native troops brought from India to Europe is fixed; and explain the rates of conversion used, also the conditions on which settled; and, whether the Indian Governments at Home and in India have taken any and what part in fixing the rates?

Colonel STANLEY, in reply, said, according to the terms of agreement with the Indian Gevernment, the Native troops would receive pay at the rate of 2*s.* per rupee, as was the case in the Abyssinian War, and the British officers at the rate of 1*s.* 9*d.* per rupee. The adjustment of the rate of conversion is settled annually by the Treasury in due concert with the Indian Office.

### ARMY ENLISTMENT—THE POLICE.

#### QUESTION.

Mr. WAIT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether recruiting parties are authorized to enlist members of police forces at all times, even when such members are actually on duty; and, if so, whether, having regard to the inconvenience and danger to which communities may be exposed by a number of the police officers enlisting for the purpose of avoiding punishments and engagements to which they may be liable, he would take into his consideration whether some regulation may not be made so that such recruits shall not be entitled to be billeted or attested until after the expiration of the calendar month's notice which they, as constables, are by Act of Parliament required to give before withdrawing themselves from their duties?

Colonel STANLEY: Sir, no one has any right to enlist a police constable if it is known that he is such. I do not know of any case in which a constable has been enlisted whilst on duty; and if the fact that a member of the police force had been enlisted whilst still a member of the force became known, I believe the enlistment would be cancelled.

### PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACTS—THE COUNTY OF CORK.

#### QUESTION.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether, considering the absence of all serious crime in the county and city of Cork, as testified to by the going Judges of Assizes and County Judges for the present and last year, the said county and city ought not to be relieved from the operation of the proclamations to which they are subject under the Peace Preservation Acts?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Sir, the Government will fully consider the Report of the remarks of the learned Judges to which the hon. Gentleman refers, and the case of all the districts to which the Act applies will be fully considered. I cannot now say what decision may be arrived at.

### POOR LAW—REMOVAL OF IRISH PAUPERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he can explain the delay in making the Returns with regard to the deportation of the destitute poor from England and Scotland to Ireland, for which an order was obtained six months past; and, whether he can say when it may be laid upon the Table of the House?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, the Returns relating to the removal of destitute poor from Scotland to Ireland were only received on the 17th of July, but they were now in the printer's hands. The Returns for England were already in print before that day. The whole Return was now in proof, and would be submitted to Parliament next week.

### THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION.—QUESTION.

Mr. FAWCETT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, considering that in the second paragraph of the first Article of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, the Sultan

> "promises to England to introduce necessary reforms, to be agreed upon later between the two Powers, into the Government and for the protection of Christian and other subjects of the Porte"

in Asiatic Turkey, the Government will undertake that this agreement shall not be finally concluded until Parliament has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion on these reforms, and on the guarantees to be provided for their execution?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, the Government will be anxious to give the earliest and fullest information to the House upon this subject; but I cannot undertake to make such a promise as the hon. Gentleman asks for, because it is not probable that we shall be able to complete this agreement before the end of the present Session, and a promise to put it off till the beginning of the next Session would, I think, be unduly delaying the matter.

MR. FAWCETT gave Notice that before the House went into Committee of Supply next week, he would move that, in the opinion of the House, before any agreement was finally entered into between England and the Porte for the introduction of reforms into Asiatic Turkey, and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Porte, Parliament should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon such agreement, and upon the guarantees provided for its execution.

### FISHERY INSPECTORS—THE ESTUARY OF THE THAMES.—QUESTION.

MR. W. H. JAMES asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether any Report has been made by the Fishery Inspectors upon their inquiries, held at various places in the estuary of the Thames, into the alleged destruction of the fry and spawn of sea fish by trawling fishers and others; and, if so, if there would be any objection to lay it upon the Table before the close of the Session?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, no separate Report had been made on the subject referred to by the hon. Gentleman; but the Inspectors were engaged upon a much larger inquiry, and the moment their Report was made it should be laid before Parliament.

### COAL MINES—THE HAYDOCK ACCIDENT.—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. MACDONALD,

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he appointed a lawyer of eminence to send to him a Report upon the case. He received the Report yesterday, and had submitted it to lawyers of experience to consider whether any proceedings should be taken or not.

### MAIL CONTRACTS—THE CONTRACTS AND CORRESPONDENCE.

QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. RATHBONE,

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the tenders for the Royal mail contracts and the whole of the Correspondence with regard to the various tenders would be laid on the Table at the same time.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

### EASTERN AFFAIRS.—RESOLUTION.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FOURTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [29th July],

> "That, whilst this House has learned with satisfaction that the troubles which have arisen in the East of Europe have been terminated by the Treaty of Berlin without a further recourse to arms, and rejoices in the extension of the liberty and self-government of some of the populations of European Turkey, this House regrets:—
>
> "That it has not been found practicable to deal in a satisfactory manner with the claims of the Kingdom of Greece, and of the Greek subjects of the Porte:
>
> "That by the assumption under the Anglo-Turkish Convention of a sole guarantee of the integrity of the remaining territories of Turkey in Asia, the Military liabilities of this Country have been unnecessarily extended.
>
> "That the undefined engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the better administration of those Provinces have imposed heavy responsibilities on the State, whilst no sufficient means have been indicated for securing their fulfilment:
>
> "And that such engagements have been entered into, and responsibilities incurred, without the previous knowledge of Parliament."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

And which Amendment was,

To leave out from the first word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the

Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learned with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire,"—(*Mr. Plunket,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Lord ELCHO: Few Members of this House have felt more strongly upon the Eastern Question than I have done; but I have kept silence in the midst of all the discussions we have had on the subject, in the belief that while negotiations, at once delicate and intricate, were going on, "silence was, above all things, golden;" and having faith, latterly, at all events, in the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government, I felt that the best support I could give them was to avoid lengthening unnecessarily the debates. Now, my noble Friend the Leader of the Opposition (the Marquess of Hartington), on Monday night, when there was a question of adjournment, suggested to us that we should confine our remarks to one or two points. He has not given us a programme of the points to which he wished us to confine ourselves; but I venture to think it is impossible to deal properly with the Motion which the noble Lord has submitted to us, without entering, to a certain extent, into a review of the main transactions of this great tragedy, of these great events that have taken place. Now, the first thing that strikes us is the change of policy which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have undergone on the Eastern Question. Their conversion has been as complete and sudden as that of St. Paul, but differs from it in this—that it was one of the characteristics of St. Paul's conversion that at the time he was in the plenitude of honour and in the enjoyment of office. That conversion from the traditions of their Party, from the policy of Lord Palmerston and the policy of Lord Clarendon was, I think, not calculated to lead to a satisfactory solution of the great problem which had to be solved. I will say no more upon this point, and only remark that, looking to the endless Motions we have had in this House, not intended or calculated to help the Government, it is not surprising that some Resolution should have been proposed on the present occasion; the only wonder is that the Motion before the House is not of a more criminating character. In considering this Motion and the acts of the Government, it will be necessary to pass under review the origin of the late war, the objects of the war, and the real scope of the Treaty of San Stefano. For my part, I have from the first held but one opinion with regard to the war, and I think it is the opinion now generally held by the mass of our fellow-countrymen—namely, that the origin of that war was the result of the action of a great chronic Slav conspiracy, and that the object of the war was to give effect to the traditional policy of the Russian Empire. What is that policy? It is simply the struggling of a Northern race towards the sun and in search of empire in the South. We see the analogy of this in everything in Nature. We see it in plants, which throw out their leaves and branches towards the light and sun; we see it in the masses of men from the wintry North, who in winter seek the bright and genial shores of the Mediterranean. I do not, therefore, object to the traditional policy of the Russian Government. It is obeying a natural instinct. But what I do object to is that that policy should have been pursued under the guise of humanity and religion. It is a policy which has landed us in one of the most terrible wars which the world has ever witnessed. The flight of the Turkish people towards Constantinople, the women slaying their children that they might not fall into the hands of the enemy, or suffer still worse evils by the road, and the other horrors of those scenes, find almost their only parallel in the siege of Jerusalem and the pages of Josephus. In fact, the horrors and sufferings caused by this war must have satisfied the most bloodthirsty humanitarian Christian amongst us, be he layman, or be he priest. I would, in the strongest language of which I am capable, enter my protest against this new doctrine—that our foreign policy is to be guided by our religious feelings and views, and that the Christian faith is to be propagated by the sword. To those who advocate that doctrine, I would point out this matter, which is not unworthy of consideration—that, unhappily, the Christian faith is not, as regards numbers, the predominant faith of the earth; and if ever a time should come when the followers of Buddha should be thoroughly civilized—and by civilized I mean organized militarily on the Prussian system, armed with Krupp guns and Henry-Martini breech-loaders, China alone would have an army of 20,000,000 men on the German model, and we might, as Christians, run the risk, in a religious war with the Buddhists, of being swept, as some fanatics among us wish the Mussulmans to be, from the face of the earth. But the question to which I will address myself is this—might not this war, with all its horrors, have been prevented? [*Cheers from the Opposition.*] I know what those cheers from hon. Gentlemen opposite mean. They mean that by joining with Russia against Turkey, and, by following the strategy of the right hon. Member for Greenwich, and cutting off her supply of men from the other side of the Bosphorus, you could have coerced Turkey, and there would have been no war. That possibly might have been the case, but it was not at all certain; for it is by no means clear that even under these circumstances Turkey would not have resisted; but you tried last year to get that modified policy adopted in the form of the diluted Resolutions of the right hon. Member, and you were signally defeated by a majority of 130, thereby showing that the country would not sanction that way of stopping the war. Now, we have recently heard from the Prime Minister that, in his opinion, from what he learnt at Berlin, as the Crimean War might have been stopped, so also the late war might have been; and I myself have always held the same opinion. But how stopped? Not by the policy of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but by a totally different one. By England putting her foot down firmly, and declaring that, even if the other Parties to the Tripartite Treaty were not willing to do their duty, and to honour the bond to which they had attached their signatures, she had undertaken to defend Turkey, and was prepared to do so if a single Russian soldier crossed the Pruth. If that had been done, I feel confident there would have been no war. But it is said that this could not have been done—that the feeling of the country would not have permitted it. That feeling, however, was never tested. The Government seemed to believe in the agitation got up in the country by partizan wire pullers, and sacerdotal cliques, by Party irregulars, and a section of the Press. They believed in St. James's Hall, where, at the evening meeting, when the wildest men spoke, Lord Shaftesbury, the First Commissioner of Lunacy, was wisely put into the chair. [*Laughter and* "Oh!"] I simply state a fact, and hon. Members can draw their own conclusions. The Government believed in the power of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich upon this question out-of-doors. I do not speak of this House, where the influence of his eloquence is so greatly felt. But notwithstanding the great eloquence he brought to bear upon this question, which I would be the last to dispute, my own firm conviction is that if the Government had then laid down a clear and definite policy, and if the country had then had anything like Lord Salisbury's despatch to rally round, the right hon. Member for Greenwich would have found himself as powerless out-of-doors as he has since proved himself to be, when, instead of holding public meetings and pleading in public, he has been reduced for the last three months to argue in chambers before judges of his own selection, and when the last manifestations, the extra-mural manifestations, of the orator, come to us wafted across the Thames from the tripod of a Southwark Drill Hall. Upon this point I do not speak without book, for, in September, 1876, the hon. Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. J. R. Yorke) and myself spoke at an agricultural meeting in the great county of Gloucestershire, not assembled by ticket, but free and open to all; and there was not a dissentient voice from the views we then advocated, defending Turkey and denouncing Russian aggression. There is another reason given why the Government could not have taken that decided course, and I will admit that there is much in that reason. It is said that at the time to which I refer they were not united among themselves, that there was rottenness in the bones of the Government, there was *caries* in the Cabinet. What the extent of that rottenness was we now know; there have been a series of successive disclosures given to the public as to what passed within the Cabinet, and I do not know that those serial revelations have yet all come to an end. Even now hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite are anxiously waiting for the August number. But even here I cannot altogether acquit the Government; for I venture to think that if the navigating lieutenant of a ship were not to steer the course laid down by the captain—if he was disposed to steer to a Russian, instead of a Turkish port—the duty of the captain in such a case—and I appeal to my hon. and learned Friend opposite (Sir William Harcourt), who has sat with me this Session in the Committee on the Mutiny Act, whether he does not agree with me in this—that the duty of the captain, in such a case, would be to put the lieutenant who had so disobeyed orders under arrest, and have him cashiered. These are the reasons given—and I do not think they are sufficient—for the course which the Government, up to a certain time, pursued. But the result of all this was the Treaty of San Stefano. No line was drawn between the Danube and the Balkans, no line between the Balkans and San Stefano. We found ourselves suddenly with the San Stefano Treaty to face, the Russians having, by force of arms, and by what I will only call very able diplomacy, got within the Tchekmedje lines, which strategically defend Constantinople. Now, the Treaty of San Stefano opened the eyes of many people to the real objects of the war. That Treaty not only brought Russian power to the shores of the Bosphorus; but, by means of the New Bulgaria that she constituted, which must have become virtually a Russian Province, to the shores of the Ægean; and, therefore, it mattered comparatively little whether the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles were, or were not, held by Turkey, for her flank was turned by Russia having access to the Ægean. This Treaty of San Stefano, I say, opened the eyes of the people of this country, and showed them that humanity had been made a plea for plunder, and Christianity the apology for a filibustering crusade. I have ventured, I hope not in any hostile spirit, thus to criticize the conduct of the Government down to the conclusion of the Treaty of San Stefano. With regard, however, to their action since that time, I am here to express my heartfelt thanks for that action, and my approval, in the main, of the course they have adopted. I shall not enter into the consideration of that grand document—for grand it was—the despatch of Lord Salisbury. I shall not trouble the House with details as to the other measures which were taken—the voting of the £6,000,000—a matter which I had myself last year urged upon them; the calling out of the Reserves; and the bringing upon the European stage of a contingent, and, if need be, the mass of our Indian troops. That last step seems to have driven some hon. Members out of their propriety, and tempted them to appear almost as the advocates of a breach of the Constitution and of mutiny in India. I have heard similar sentiments before from the same quarter, while the question of the title of Empress of India was being discussed. Recently, too, an unpatriotic attempt has been made to excite against England the enmity of France and Italy; whereas we have recently heard that there is no hostile feeling towards us in those countries. But, be this as it may, the result of the measures of the Government to which I have referred was—that Russia was forced to lay the Treaty of San Stefano before the Congress. I know it is said that this was the result of a secret Agreement with Russia, and hon. Members find great fault with it. Well, I must confess that I was rather taken aback when I first heard of it. A friend of mine met me at the time in St. James's Square, and asked me what I thought of that Agreement; and my answer was, that it entirely depended on whether the other Powers knew of it or not. I said that if the Government, having placed themselves before Europe as the maintainers of Treaties, had privately, so to speak, sold the mangle, I had no words to express my contempt for them; but I had not yet learned that they had done so, and the whole thing turned on the knowledge of the other Powers. Within 24 hours afterwards, I met a foreigner who is well versed in these affairs, and he told me that there would have been no Congress at all, if there had not been a previous understanding between Russia and England; and that, if they had not shown each other their hands, Germany would not have issued the invitations to the Congress, and the whole project would have been given up. That satisfied me, and I think it ought to satisfy all reasonable and rational men. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen may sneer, but I wonder what they themselves would have done? I think that, in like circumstances, they would probably have done a like thing; but I know very well what they would have done if the Government had acted differently, and the Congress had, in consequence, never met. There would then have been a continued state of that great tension prevailing on account of the feeling, half-peaceful, half-warlike, on the Continent, which was so injurious to our commerce; and if that position of affairs had continued by the Government frustrating the Congress, I do not know what the language of hon. Gentlemen opposite would have been. They would have found no terms sufficiently strong to denounce the action of the Government; and, what is more, many of the warm supporters of the Government would have given them their countenance in so doing. I therefore maintain that we were justified in this Salisbury-Schouvaloff Agreement, if it was necessary to bring about the Congress; and in bringing about the Congress, it brought peace. And after all, there is nothing given up in the Agreement for which any sane man would be prepared to fight. We should not have fought for Bessarabia, and most certainly not for Batoum. We have lately heard much respecting the value of this latter place, and within the last hour I have had an opportunity of seeing Hobart Pasha in the Lobby, and of asking him what he thinks of it. He told me that his views on Batoum had not been completely expressed in the letter which was read lately in "another place," and he has complied with my request to put down on paper his opinion of that port. This is what he has written—

> "As to the value of Batoum, 12 or 13 ships could be lodged in its harbour safely from bad weather, lashed together by many chains; but it would take six hours to remove them from the port; and they can always be bombarded by a Power commanding the sea; while the ships in harbour, from their position, cannot return the fire. Thus Russia could not use Batoum for warlike purposes without an enormous expenditure in altering the character of the port."

What I wish, however, to urge is, that this country would never have been prepared to fight for Batoum or Bessarabia. As for Bessarabia, if the Roumanians have lost it, it serves them right for their rebellion. Having rebelled, why should they not suffer like other people? Such is the view I take of the agreement which certainly brought us into Congress. With regard to the results of the war, we may disapprove many of the things done, and many of the concessions made; but, looking broadly at the action of Her Majesty's Government in the Congress as a whole, and comparing the Treaty of Berlin with the Treaty of San Stefano, which was the key to all the transactions of the Congress, I am only thankful that the result is a Treaty which places Turkey, Europe, and England in their present positions. As regards British interests in the East, they have been secured by the Anglo-Turkish Convention. We hear a great deal of the losses sustained by Turkey—about her having lost this, and her having lost that, and about her position being damaged; but I well recollect hearing military men discuss the prospects of the late campaign, the way in which it should be conducted, and how Turkey could best defend her country. Some held that her best way to fight was as she did fight; and in so fighting she nearly won, as but for the timely help of the Roumanians, the result might have been very different for Russia. Turkey, looking to the feeling of her people, could not have given up Bulgaria to Russia without a fight. The tactics laid down by others were these—that it would be wise for Turkey to confine her defence to the line of the Balkans, Adrianople, Tchekmedje, and Boulair, and thus to concentrate her armies. By so doing, she would, moreover, have more men available for defence in Asia. That is precisely the position in which the Berlin Treaty places her—she has the strategical line of the Balkans, the seaboard being under her own control, with England as her Ally, and with a good seaboard and a good Ally, her position ought to be impregnable, if only, as I hope and believe, she will fortify the strong places and use her forces properly. Chiefly, as the Home Secretary stated, it was necessary to secure a good strategic line for the safety of Constantinople from menace, and that has been done by the Treaty. Possibly, it might have been better to have left Turkey more control over Eastern Roumelia, and to have taken something from the other side and ceded it to Greece. Let me now turn for a moment to Asia, with regard to which we have obtained what some time ago right hon. Gentlemen opposite used to contend we ought to obtain—a chance of better government for the people who live in those Eastern districts; but somehow or other, since the Government has obtained this, "Gallio cares for none of these things." It is a matter of perfect indifference to them whether there is good government or not, because the British Government in power have taken steps to bring about that state of things which the Opposition professed was required for the downtrodden races for whom on public platforms they so eloquently pleaded. But looking to the strategical line left to Turkey in Asia, I remember saying in the House last year that our main object was to keep Russia away from the harbour of Iscanderoon, and from descending the Euphrates Valley; because the plan of campaign supposed to have been drawn up for her by Count Moltke assumed a march down the Euphrates Valley to Bagdad. Well, the present strategic line, as settled by the Congress, does protect and control the line of the Euphrates Valley; and even more than that; but I go further, and say that I care not whether this line is a strong line or not. We hear a great deal of impossible strategy in this House, and I wish to remark that anything I may say is not my own view, but that of the best military authorities in this country. They say that it does not follow that if Russia were to step across the boundary she must necessarily be fought there. When we declared war against Russia, in 1854, we did not go to St. Petersburg, but to the Crimea, one of her weakest points, and there are now 50 weak points where she could be attacked without reference to the Turkish strategical line. I say I do not care what that line of frontier is in Asia. It would be sufficient for me that it should be a sandy plain, because the line which is not to be passed by Russia has been drawn by England's sword, and that I believe to be sufficient. A great deal has also been said of the increase of our responsibilities, and we have had speeches from the hon. Baronet the Member for Maidstone (Sir John Lubbock), and my hon. Friend the Member for Orkney (Mr. Laing), who, I observe, is always put up as an Indian bogey to conjure up Indian calamities as the necessary result of the Government policy. The hon. Member cited Lord Napier of Magdala and Lord Lawrence as holding certain opinions opposed to the Government in reference to these frontier lines; but I would point out to the hon. Gentleman that they have not spoken upon the subject and given no opinion in respect of them. I have, however, heard another noble Lord (Lord Napier and Ettrick) make two speeches—I will not say where—on the subject, and they were statesmanlike and to the point. But perhaps it will be as well, before giving his opinion, to inquire who is Lord Napier and Ettrick? He has been Ambassador at St. Petersburg and Constantinople, and Governor of Madras; and his view is this—that the only way of meeting the covert, systematic, traditional approaches of Russia is by drawing a permanent line and then putting down your foot. Not only that, but the noble Lord approved the line which the Government had laid down, and which he believed was a guarantee for the effective defence of India. He would also go further and draw a similar line to the North of our Indian Empire. ["Oh, oh!"] That, it appears, is not the opinion of the hon. Member for Burnley, who says "Oh;" but it is the opinion of a statesman whose opinion is based upon experience both local and Imperial. I would point out further to hon. Gentlemen opposite that the present Government have only done, with a bold hand, what the late Government never had the courage to do. The late Government did not go forward in the matter, because they say they were not supported by public opinion; but, Sir, it is those who go boldly forward and put down their foot who make public opinion. Is the Government then to be frightened by these hobgoblins of responsibilities, or is the country to be bribed out of the Convention? It is said that we are to have the income tax, the malt tax—I am not sure that we are not to have the match tax—put on. Such is the opinion of the hon. Member for Orkney. He takes the terrorizing line. The hon. Baronet the Member for Maidstone, on the other hand, tried the bribing line. "Only let us not have the Convention, and see what you will be saved in the way of taxation. We shall be able to take off the tea duty, to diminish the malt tax, and I do not know what all." [An hon. MEMBER: The income tax?] Well, Sir, I should have thought that this dodge of bribing the British people from a policy which they believe to be right by promising them remission of taxation was not one which would have found favour at the other side of the House. Four years ago, the biggest bribe which was ever offered to a nation was offered by the late Prime Minister, who said—"Return a majority to support me, and you will have no more income tax." And what was the reply of the country? Why, they returned a majority adverse to the right hon. Gentleman, and which, I am happy to say, has enabled the Government to so satisfactorily settle the Eastern Question, and draw the line which has so completely upset hon. Gentlemen opposite. Then, Sir, as to Cyprus. Part of the arrangement objected to is the occupation of Cyprus, the policy of acquiring which has been much criticized, and I have heard Crete mentioned as the Island which England ought to have occupied. Well, I wish one could speak in this House as counsel speak in a Committee-room up-stairs, with one side of it hung with huge maps. Let any hon. Member take a map and study the position of Cyprus, and I believe he can only come to one conclusion—namely, that of all the spots in the Mediterranean, it is the one most commanding and best situated for the protection of Asiatic Turkey and British interests in the East; and for this reason, that Cyprus commands Iscanderoon, the best harbour on the opposite coast, and also the outlet of the Suez Canal. I say, then, it is sound and wise policy that we should occupy this Island, and not for warlike purposes only, but for the promotion of commerce, the development of latent resources, and the promotion of good government, not only in Cyprus, but also in Asia Minor. But, Sir, every possible question has been asked about Cyprus; the depth of its harbours, the nature of its climate, and the supplies; but if the *Eucalyptus Globulus* were planted, Cyprus could be made as healthy as Hyde Park. Indeed, I am rather surprised that it has not been asked whether it is true that Cyprus wines are healing to the blood and hurtful to the liver, more especially as I think it is Shakespeare who says so? [*Laughter.*] That, at all events, is as serious a question as many that have been put. But I pass from Cyprus to another branch of the question. Throughout these transactions we have heard much of Bulgarian atrocities, respecting which hon. Gentlemen opposite have shown an immense amount of indignation, and have even tried to bring those atrocities home to the British Government; but, Sir, although their catechism of the present Session includes questions as to the climate of Cyprus, the height of its mountains, and the depth of the sea, no questions have been asked in reference to the ghastly desciption of horrors in Turkey which have appeared in recent issues of the newspapers—atrocities of which Mussulmans are the victims. I will not read them to the House, they are so horrid, and, to use the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, they are so full of lust and cruelty. But it strikes me with astonishment when I remember that not one hon. Gentleman opposite has raised his voice to ask a single question about them—to utter a single word of indignation concerning horrors in which it is even said in the Reports received from Consuls that Russian officers took an active part. I can only draw one of two conclusions from this fact—either that the humanity of hon. Members opposite in 1876 and 1877 was assumed for Party and partizan purposes; that it was not a genuine humanity, but a weapon which they thought would serve their purpose against the Government; or else it was but skin deep in its character, and that now when the horrors are even greater, it has evaporated under the heat of a summer sun. Then, Sir, as to Greece. I have heard a great deal of sympathy expressed for her. Well, we all admire her literature, her culture, and her art; and in old days, Englishmen who did not properly appreciate the teachings of the literature of Greece found their way to the block; I mean, of course, in the days of their boyhood. Our simpathy with Greece is natural. But, Sir, there are Philistines abroad. Even in the present day, in reference to Greece, I hear these Philistines say that they do not think it a sound principle that whenever a war takes place between the Great Powers, the little Powers should assert their right to snatch a morsel of the prey. They say that is bad precedent and policy. They have also been heard to say that until a stranger going to Athens can visit the Acropolis without a guard, and until Corfu, which was, unwisely, as I think, given over to Greece in perfect repair, is prevented from crumbling into the sea, as it has rapidly done since it was handed over to Greece, perhaps it would be better that these things should be mended, and that until Greece learns to govern what she has, it would be unwise to give her more. Her Majesty's Government, however, have not taken this Philistine view. Notwithstanding the statements referred to by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, which he, doubtless, derived from *The Chelsea Informer*, or some such paper whose currency is confined to Chelsea, it appears from the Protocols that the Government have done all that was possible on behalf of Greece. One word more, Sir, and I have finished my review of the situation. The last paragraph in this series of Resolutions of the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition, touches upon the question of so-called secret diplomacy. Now, I trace in that paragraph the hand of "Jenkins"—[*Laughter, and* "Oh, oh!"]—I do not use the word in an un-Parliamentary sense, because I do not use it in the singular number; I use it as a noun of number; I use it collectively; for it must be within the knowledge of hon. Members of this House, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee never speaks in his own name, but uses the word "we," and says—"Those who act with me object to this system of the Crown ratifying Treaties;" "We object to these things being confined to the Cabinet." "We think they ought to be submitted to the decision of the House of Commons before they are ratified by the Government." The new Constitution we are to have from the hon. Member when his "we" becomes sufficiently numerous will certainly be a new one as far as the system of diplomacy is concerned; but until that time comes, I cannot but think that the Government will do well to walk in the old paths of the Constitution and to act upon the precedents, of which there are any number in the Statute Book, which they have followed in the present instance. Against the authority of the hon. Member for Dundee I will quote another, which shows the difficulty of the situation and the divergence of opinion which exists concerning it. The authority to whom I refer said—

> "It is a choice of inconveniences and difficulties. You must, on the one hand, trust the Executive Government in these matters very largely; or you must, on the other hand, run into a greater mischief still—namely, that of committing the transaction of foreign affairs and the conduct of difficult foreign negotiations to bodies—the Houses of Parliament—which are essentially, from their own composition, unfit for the discharge of such tasks."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxl. 1410.]

The authority I quote is the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greewich, and the ink is hardly dry in which it is recorded; for the speech from which I quote was delivered in the present Session of Parliament. Therefore, I maintain that in what they have done the Government have acted according to their right and their duty. In conclusion, I wish, as an independent Member of the House, to offer to the Government my heartfelt thanks for the ability and courage with which they have maintained the sanctity of Treaty rights by forcing Russia to lay the Treaty of San Stefano upon the table of the Congress at Berlin. They have not only maintained Treaty rights, but they have secured peace, and they have united in loyalty and in military sympathy the vast scattered portions of our Empire. Two nights ago I met an American gentleman, who said—"You are a great country, but you are a scattered Empire. I do not know what will come of Lord Beaconsfield's policy; but he has certainly done this—he has given you an Imperial character that you never had before." The conduct of the Government has not only evoked a loyal feeling among the people of Canada, Australia, India, and our scattered Dependencies, but it has evoked a feeling of sympathy among a great portion of the Anglo-Saxon population of the United States. I give all credit to the late Government for creating the feeling which exists towards us in the United States, and I have good reason for believing that if there had been war between England and Russia you would have found Americans making their way by the "underground railway" from the United States to the recruiting offices in Canada, and enlisting in great numbers in defence of England—for they believe that "blood is thicker than water." Not only does this kindly feeling exist among the English-speaking and Indian Dependencies of the Crown, but it is to be found among the Mahomedan races throughout the world. The inhabitants of Mahomedan countries meet annually at Mecca with Mussulman subjects of the Queen from India, and from them they learn that, under English rule, they enjoy complete religious toleration, and also perfect security as far as their properties and lives are concerned. This knowledge is carried back by these pilgrims alike to the sunny shores of the Bosphorus, the fertile valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile, and the arid steppes of Asia; this knowledge, so spread, has caused a kindly feeling to spring up towards us among the Mahomedan peoples who are not subject to our rule. This, too, is not the work of any one, but of many successive Governments, who have, each in turn, thus wisely administered our Indian Empire; but it is the present Government which has now evoked this feeling, and I thank them for the policy which has led to these good results. I know that policy is opposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite; but in running counter to it they are also running counter to the national sentiment of this country, for the policy of the Government is one which has struck a chord in the heart of the nation. It appeals to the proud traditions of an Imperial race, and it speaks to the instincts of the people which so often, and certainly in this case, are more statesmanlike than the Party criticisms of statesmen in Opposition.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I have only one remark to make in the way of criticism of the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho), and that is that I do not think he was justified in making a charge against us that we did not join with him in sympathizing with the sufferings of the Turks in Constantinople, and their sufferings at the hands of the Bulgarians, and more especially in what has been stated as to the doings of Russian officers. I read those accounts with great pain; but I confess that having tried, as far as I could ascertain, to see what truth there was in the reports, I do not think the statements in regard to the Russian officers are proved to be true. There is reason to suppose that the Bulgarians have shown great cruelty and great revenge; but I think when the noble Lord reproaches us with want of attention to these things, he should remember that the strongest rebuke made to the Bulgarians was made by the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone). We have not much right to complain of the noble Lord in other respects. He began with a complimentary comparison that we were like St. Paul; only St. Paul had been in office some time, and we are not. But, although complimentary to us, I do not think he is complimentary to Her Majesty's Government. I do not remember the exact words he used to express his contempt for the Government, if they had not informed the other Powers of the secret Treaty.

LORD ELCHO: You are putting it too strong. I said without the knowledge of any other Powers. Communicating is another thing.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I quite understood my noble Friend to say that he would have felt great indignation if the secret Treaty had not been made known to the other Powers. Does he know whether it was kept secret or not? The point is this—not that the other Powers should be told a day or two before the Agreement came out, but whether the other Powers were told of the Agreement before they were persuaded to come into the Congress? They were certainly told that our Government was going to have the Treaty of San Stefano left to the full discretion of the Powers. Did the Government then determine whether the secret Treaty should be communicated or not? Were the other Powers informed of that Treaty? The Government has never told us that they were. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer tells us to-night that they were informed, I will retract every word. If not, I think the noble Lord might have spared his appeal about the sanctity of Treaties. But the noble Lord, after that, appears to have turned round in his views with regard to the Government. Up to that time, he does not appear to have viewed their conduct with anything like favour. In fact, I do not think we have heard a stronger condemnation of their Eastern policy made by any but one man. I do not think his condemnation was equal to that made by the Prime Minister himself. The noble Lord quoted from that speech; I need not give the quotation, but, in a moment of candour, the Prime Minister a few days ago stated that he had come back from Berlin with the conviction that this late terrible and desolating war might have been prevented by Her Majesty's Government if they had acted with decision. The Prime Minister said—"I take my share of the responsibility." He has taken his share of a very great responsibility—so great, that I can scarcely conceive he has realized it to himself. Does the Prime Minister really believe that if the Cabinet had acted as he thinks they ought to have acted, this desolating war might have been prevented—that very likely, if he had had his own way, it might have been prevented? If he had had that conviction he would have said—"Either I must have my own way and prevent this war, or I must cease to be responsible for the government of the country." Well, the noble Lord, I dare say, and the Prime Minister, both thought that the Government ought to have said—"We will undertake that there shall be good government in Turkey, and, therefore, Russia shall not interfere." Well, this is a strong Government, but I think it has overrated its strength in saying that that undertaking could have been fulfilled, and that the Russians could thus have been prevented from crossing the Pruth. I agree with the noble Lord in this respect that I believe the war might have been prevented. But the very morning I read that speech, I read in the same paper—*The Standard*—a letter from Constantinople. Now, these letters from Constantinople in *The Standard* are not the mere letters of an unknown Correspondent. The gentleman who writes them is very well known; he is an English gentleman of great experience; and certainly his opinions, though I do not agree with them all, have been arrived at from great experience. Now, if the House will allow me, just let me see how that gentleman ends his letter.

He gives his opinion as to how the war might have been prevented. He says—

> "Turkey could not have resisted the united will of Europe, and Europe merely wanted the concurrence of England to be united."

Sir, the noble Lord says that we were in favour of a special alliance with Russia. We were not. What we did desire was that European action should be brought to bear upon Turkey, and man after man in every capital in Europe is now coming to believe that that, if specially urged at the Conference, might have prevented war. But I am not going further into the past. This debate has been very long and exhaustive, and any contribution which I can make to it must be short. Dividing the subject into the two great heads that have occurred to every hon. Member who has spoken—namely, a review of the past, and an examination of the future policy of the Government, what little I have to say will be confined entirely to the future. But, before I do that, the Chancellor of the Exchequer must allow me to ask him one question. Yesterday there was a letter in a paper—*The Daily News*—with regard to another secret Treaty. I do not pretend for a moment to attach any weight or credence to the writer of that letter—to the literary gentleman who was able to spare time from his avocations to copy secret documents at 10*d.* an-hour. But the statement made in that letter is that there is another secret Treaty. I should have thought very little of that statement; but when my hon. Friend the Member for Poole (Mr. Evelyn Ashley) asked the right hon. Gentleman a Question about it, and especially whether it related to Greece, the right hon. Gentleman did not at once reply—"There is no such secret Treaty." He merely stated—"It is not a Treaty relating to the affairs of Greece."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I did not say it is not a Treaty. I said there was no Treaty relating to Greece.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Well, it is just the same thing. I do not ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there is a Treaty, and still less, if there be, what it is—though I should like to know. But I do ask him to tell us this; whether there is or is not any secret arrangement with Turkey or Russia, or any other Power which affects this Convention that we are now considering between England and Turkey, because, if there be any such arrangement, we are debating in the dark, and if we are debating in the dark, then let us know where we are? Well, then, I come to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The line that has been taken by the supporters of the Government is not to deny the responsibility which we have incurred under that Treaty; but we are asked what less we could have done. They ask us—"What else could you have done, except this Treaty?" My noble Friend the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon), in his eloquent speech, took that line; so did the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Assheton Cross); and, in fact, it is the line taken by Lord Salisbury in his despatch. The statement is this—With Russia in Kars, Ardahan, and Batoum, what else could you do but have this Treaty? You cannot take Kars and Ardahan and Batoum away. Well, I must demur to that mode of statement. I do not know that we are bound to say what we should have done under the circumstances. Of course, it is open for us to reply in accordance with what more and more persons are thinking every day — that Kars and Ardahan and Batoum never would have been handed over to Russia, if England had not thrown obstacles in the way of an European concert. Therefore, our reply might be, that we did not bring about this state of things, and it is not for you to ask us what we should do when it did come to pass. But we must take the facts as we find them, and I wish very fairly to meet this question. "With Kars, Ardahan, and Batoum in the hands of Russia, with Turkey defeated, demoralized, and decayed, what else would you have done, except make this Anglo-Turkish Convention?" I do not know that the question has been better put in the House than I saw it put out of the House in the columns of that leading journal which is now a great supporter of the Government. It says—

> "You, the Opposition, are bound to show that the overthrow of Turkey in Asia by Russia is not an injury, an essential injury to English interests, or that this Anglo-Turkish Convention is not the best means of avoiding that difficulty."

Will the House allow me to try and meet that question. I do not think I am unfair in saying that that is the question which is put to us by the Government. There are two assumptions—first, that Russia wishes to overthrow Turkey in Asia; and, secondly, that she can do so. I am not so sure as many hon. Members are that she wishes to do so. Supposing that she does; supposing that she wishes to do so; can she conquer Turkey in Asia without a sacrifice and cost far beyond any advantage she could hope to obtain? My belief is that she cannot do it. You must recollect that Asia Minor is mainly a Mahomedan country. There are no Bulgarians in it to sympathize with Russia. There are several Armenians on the border; but Russia would mainly have to conquer a people essentially warlike, and having a hatred of her generations old. And you must remember that France and Italy, to say nothing of Austria, are Mediterranean Powers, and you have no right to suppose that France and Italy would throw no difficulty in the way of Russia endeavouring to obtain a paramount influence over Turkey in Asia and Syria. But your reply is, that they did not join you in any such attempt, and that you had to manage things by yourself at the Congress. Well, they might not have been willing to join you in what you were proposing. I do not suppose that if you had asked them to join you in this Convention, they would have done so. They had not the same confidence in Turkish reforms. They did not believe, with my noble Friend the President of the Board of Trade, that Turkish wisdom is increasing day by day. But it does not follow that they would have put no difficulties in the way of the overthrow of Asiatic Turkey. It is my opinion that they would have given Russia no *carte blanche* to exercise sway over Asia. But granting, for a moment, that Russia might not only wish, but be able, to take part of Asia Minor. As to taking it altogether, that seems to me to be a contingency too improbable to be taken into account. But making this concession for the sake of argument, that Russia wishes to take this country, and that she can do it, and that we could not prevent her, where is the proof that our interests would be greatly endangered? My first query upon that point is this—If the interests of England are to be greatly endangered by Russia obtaining power over Asia Minor, and especially Armenia, what were the Government doing during the war? Why did they not warn Russia that our interests were greatly in danger? In the famous despatch of last May—it was, it is true, written by Lord Derby; but I take it all the Ministers will recognize it—the conditions of neutrality were laid down. Why did not you add a fifth condition of neutrality? There was hardly a man who had studied the question who believed that Turkey would have been able to make the resistance in Asia she did; but we had no allusion to Armenia in the conditions of the despatch of May. There was something about the Persian Gulf; but Lord Salisbury soon afterwards gave us a disquisition on maps, and he told us how far the Russian Forces were from the Persian Gulf, and how far the Persian Gulf was from Armenia. But then we are told that new facts have turned up during the war, and that thus our interests are greatly endangered. First we were told by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs that Russia wants Asia Minor as a recruiting ground. But whom is she to recruit from? We are told the Armenians have many fine qualities; but fighting is not said to be one of them. Then there are the Kurds. They make good irregular cavalry; but I should have thought that Russia had enough Cossacks. Well, there are the Mahomedans in the middle of Asia Minor. But does anybody suppose that Russia wishes to increase her Mahomedan contingent? I do not think the Government, however, seriously entertains the idea broached by the Under Secretary. Well, then the Prime Minister gave us a reason that the Suez Canal was in danger; that we had incurred the responsibility of protecting it, and that Russia might march her troops through Asia Minor to Syria. But is that anything like a danger for which we should have incurred anything like this great increase of our heavy responsibilities? I suppose if Russia is to go to the Suez Canal it must be by going through Palestine, and making Jerusalem a halting place. If she did this, she would have France to deal with as well as England. France has never concealed the fact that she still keeps her interest in the Holy Places. Well, then there is the route to Persia. We are told this route is in danger; but you have by Treaty got Russia to give up the places she held on the route to Persia. But the other argument of Lord Salisbury is the prestige that we shall lose if the influence of Russia becomes strong in Turkey, and if the influence of the Porte in Asia become less strong than it is now. Well, we have had a great deal of controversy about prestige. I am one of those who say—"Let facts be right, and opinion will take care of itself." I do not agree with those who say—"Get a good opinion by any sort of persuasion, and the facts will follow the opinion." Remember this is not a direct prestige; it is an indirect prestige, a sort of second edition of it as it were. It is not the prestige of England; it is the prestige of Turkey over its own subjects; and our own prestige over India is to be injured because the prestige of Turkey over her subjects is injured, and perhaps it may be if we tie ourselves to a falling Power. However, I am going to make a great concession to the Government. I will grant for argument's sake that Russia wishes to overthrow Asia Minor; that she can do it; that it is against our interests that she should do it; and that nobody would try to prevent her but ourselves; and then I have to ask you in what possible way will this Treaty help you to avert that danger? What help does this Convention give you against Russia? The Prime Minister said it gave us an alliance with Turkey—a defensive alliance with Turkey to guard her against further attack from Russia. Well, this may be a comfort to Turkey, but what advantage is it to us? Surely we do not want a pledge from Turkey that in the event of her being at war with Russia and wanting our help, she will accept it and become our Ally? We all knew that before. If Turkey means to resist Russia and we want to help Turkey, we surely do not need a promise that she will accept our help? But if she does not wish to resist Russia, we may be quite sure of this, that no Convention that you may make will bind her to resist. And then what the Under Secretary alluded to appears to me to be a very ominous fact—namely, that the ground why Parliament was not informed of this Convention—why this new departure, as the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade called it, was taken without consulting Parliament—was because there was a fear that the Sultan would not sign it. Certainly that throws considerable doubt upon the Convention, because if Turkey does not mean to resist Russia, no pledge she makes to us will induce her to do so. Well, then I am told that it is absolutely necessary to make this Convention in order to give notice to Russia; to give her a warning, and to tell her, as I believe Lord Napier has said, that we have marked a boundary line which she is not to cross. But why do you want a Convention with Turkey to give her that notice? I hold that you have already given her that notice. At all events, you have got an assurance from Russia that she will make no further attack upon Turkey. That is contained in the Salisbury-Schouvaloff Agreement; and I wish to make just one more remark in reference to that Agreement in connection with what the noble Lord the Postmaster General said. He pooh-poohed that Agreement, and called it merely the record of an amicable conversation. I should like to ask him or any of his Colleagues, could Lord Salisbury have told Count Schouvaloff, either before he went into the Congress, or at any time during the Congress—"Don't pay any attention to this Agreement; it was only an amicable conversation, there was nothing binding in it." Can the Government, for one moment, adopt the Postmaster General's representation? It was not so regarded at Berlin. We know how Prince Bismarck regarded it. What did he say about Batoum to *The Times* Correspondent, with reference to that Agreement? He said—"England goes in rather in a difficulty with regard to Batoum, because Russia has two bonds in her pocket, one from Turkey and the other from England." He evidently thought it was rather more than an amicable conversation of which there was a record. I have alluded to this, because I do not think you ought to have disparaged that Agreement or the assurance you thereby got from Russia—namely, that the Russian frontier will be no more extended on the side of Turkey in Asia. Well, I daresay there are hon. Members who do not think much of Russian assurances. But how does this Convention help you, if you do not think much of them? It would really seem to me as if the Government, in giving this notice and warning to Russia, not feeling sure that Russia would give any weight to this warning, had felt it necessary to give some sort of adventitious authority to it, by saying that we had given Turkey the right to demand our assistance. It appears to me that that is a course of policy which is as humiliating as it is impolitic. If the Government really thought it necessary, in order to make themselves believed by Russia, to tack on to the assurance of Russia this Convention with Turkey, well, then, I think this Convention is too humiliating to dwell upon. Let me now say one word with regard to the impolicy of the Government. My first objection is that you have put the foreign policy of England out of your own control. You have first given Turkey the right to control it; and, next, you have given Russia the power to control it; and you need not have done the one or the other. Now, first, with regard to Turkey. We have been told over and over again that we have not increased our responsibilities, and the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary said—"Oh, there was the Tripartite Treaty. That was 10 times stronger than this." Well, it is not much comfort to Turkey to be told that, because if that Treaty, which was 10 times stronger, has not been kept, they can hardly expect that this will be kept. Lord Salisbury has not taken the same line. He has called the Tripartite Treaty a misty and shadowy guarantee. I do not adopt either interpretation; but I cannot concur with the noble Lord the Postmaster General, when he says you have not increased your responsibility. The Tripartite Treaty was no guarantee to Turkey by this country, and this Convention is, which makes a very great difference. The Tripartite Treaty was an arrangement between three Powers; that if one wished to resist Russia, she might call upon the others to join her; but what you have now done is, that you have entered into a positive undertaking to Turkey, binding yourselves to defend her, and Turkey will call upon you to fulfil your undertaking should she be attacked. You have been promised consideration for what you have undertaken. You have—first, the promised reforms; and, in the second place, there is the Island of Cyprus. The promises of reform by Turkey are rather cheap, but the Island of Cyprus is a material guarantee. Under these circumstances, I think the Postmaster General can no longer persist in his statement, that the Government have not increased their responsibility. The noble Lord who preceded me (Lord Elcho) sneered at what was said by the hon. Member for Orkney (Mr. Laing); but there has been no answer given during this debate, or attempted to be given, to the fact that you have enormously increased your military difficulties by this Guarantee, if it is ever to be fulfilled. Instead of waiting for Russia coming to you at the Himalayas, you go to her in the Caucasus. The Home Secretary says I have used strong language in saying this act of the Government was reckless and unwise. I certainly did use those words, and as I do not wish to use stronger words out-of-doors than I do in the House, I will tell you why I used those words. On the occasion to which the right hon. Gentleman refers, I asked why it is that France and Germany are obliged to keep up such large standing Armies? and I said that the reason was because when the frontier of Germany was France, and when the frontier of France was Germany, they were, therefore, obliged to watch each other. Up to the present time, England has had her frontier at the sea; whereas now, by the action of the Government, it has been advanced to the Russian frontier on Asia Minor. That was why I said the conduct of the Government was unwise and reckless. It has been pointed out over and over again, and there has been no answer, that Russia may come upon us at any moment, and it will be open, henceforth, to her to choose her own point of attack, and select her own time; and whenever we are involved in difficulties, Russia may seize the opportunity of compelling us to go to war with her. But we are told that it is our duty to reform Turkey. Well, I do not think we have any special duty to reform Asia Minor. I do not wish that we should in any way shrink from the performance of our duties; but I do not see that this particular duty is in any way cast on us. There never was a country with such large duties to perform as England, and we cannot perform those duties properly unless we realize their extent, and not take upon ourselves new obligations without sufficient ground. We have duties to perform to 250,000,000 of people in India, who are enormously increasing, and whom we have to reform, protect from famine, and otherwise look after. Then, see what we are doing at the Cape, and in the South Sea Islands, where the Native races are dependent upon us for government. Doubtless, our Colonial and Indian responsibilities are very great, and England will suffer, and will probably be greatly punished, if she does not strive to fulfil them. There is a proud future before us in maintaining union and friendship amongst the English-speaking nations, as well as peace and order amongst those barbarous and semi-barbarous nations that are not English; but I hope I shall not be thought unpatriotic, when I say that there is even a limit to the power of England. The noble Lord asks why we, who cared so much about the Bulgarians, do not care for the people in Asia Minor? Well, I will tell him. I have travelled in Asia Minor, and I have felt sorry for the people. They appeared to me to be very badly treated, and both Mahomedans and Christians looked upon their Government as their natural enemy. But there is a difference between them and Bulgaria. The condition of Bulgaria weighed heavily upon us, because we were keeping up the country which misgoverned her. That is the reason why we felt so much was due from us to Bulgaria. I entirely admit, if you intend to guarantee the rule of Turkey over her subjects in Asia Minor, the duty will fall upon you of seeing that those subjects are properly governed; but this only shows how you have increased our responsibilities, because, besides having entered into an engagement with the Turkish Government to defend them against Russia, you are now bound to see that she governs her subjects properly. The Home Secretary told me I had no right to make use of the argument that the misgovernment of Turkey was checked by the fear that her rebels would be assisted by Russia; and he asked me why I assumed that Russia would be a better reformer of the Provinces of

Asia Minor than we ourselves should be? I do not think that Russia is likely to prove herself a better reformer than we should be of those Provinces; but I do think that, in freeing Turkey from the fear that her rebels would be assisted by Russia, we have relieved her from the chief restraint that existed upon her misgovernment in Asia Minor. Well, if I felt sure you were going to take steps to abolish misgovernment in Asia Minor, however great the responsibility, and however weighted we are now, I might be tempted to let you try the experiment. But what reasons have we to suppose you are setting about the work in a way at all likely to be successful? The Prime Minister says you must treat the Sultan as an independent Sovereign. If you do so, I say, you have not the remotest chance of acquitting yourselves of your responsibility; and if you attempt to govern Turkey through the Pashas at Constantinople, your efforts to introduce reform into that Government must utterly fail. I had, to-day, a note from Constantinople, and as the Prime Minister evidently thinks good advice will be accepted by the Sultan, I hope the House will allow me to read an extract. The letter is from a merchant of great experience, who has been in Turkey many years, and he knows the condition of Asia Minor, his commercial operations having taken him into the heart of that country—

> "All right-thinking Turks, whether great or small, hope England will not leave their Government to carry out the needed reforms. They know, only too well, that, in such case, no reforms worthy of the name will be effected. England must treat Turkey in Asia exactly as she treats the Indian Protected States, if she is to produce reform and progress, and this means occupation in force."

Anything short of this means, he says, meddling and muddling; and he therefore looks upon this Convention with Turkey as something which will bring upon us immense charges and costly responsibilities. The hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. Balfour) last night made a most able speech, and it struck me as being the best defence of this Convention that has yet been made—namely, that it was a temptation to the Porte to reform; but I doubt very much whether anybody outside the Government—any man of experience and impartial views in Turkey itself—has the slightest belief that this Protectorate will bring good Government unless there be annexation, and annexation, we are told, you do not intend. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs says—"Do not alarm yourselves. This is a conditional Guarantee. We merely call upon Turkey to introduce the reforms, and if they are not carried out, our responsibilities come to an end." Then what becomes of the policy that Lord Salisbury says it was necessary to pledge the country to? I suspect the Under Secretary is much more likely to be right than Lord Salisbury in this matter, though I do not expect either will be exactly right. What I do expect is this—that there will be a sort of attempt, more or less energetic on the part of the Government, to get the Porte to introduce the reforms; that there will be any amount of promises to do so; but that it will be stated there are great difficulties in getting them carried out, and that the hopes of the Christians that they will be carried out will be bitterly disappointed. In fact, the expectation that anything will ever come out of this attempt at reform will never be fulfilled; but the Government will be left with two excuses—first, an excuse to desert Turkey in the time of need, and, secondly, an excuse to keep the Island of Cyprus. This appears to me to be the most favourable interpretation that can be put on this transaction. One word now as regards the closing clause of the Resolution—that is, the concealment of the Treaty from Parliament. The noble Lord the Postmaster General made some very hard remarks about my right hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe). He charged him with revolutionary agitation and talk. I must say I saw nothing revolutionary about his remarks, or in the very serious warning which my right hon. Friend gave to the Government. But I would ask hon. Members, whether they do not consider revolutionary action is a more serious thing than revolutionary talk? And what I maintain is that the action of the Government is practically revolutionary. I shall be told that it is nothing new to sign and ratify Treaties before they are laid before Parliament. We do not deny that this is the custom; but our assertion is that there has been a departure from the usual practice, because a new policy has been introduced both in the East and West without any opportunity having been given to Parliament to consider the propriety of that new departure, as the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon) rightly called it. That is what I call revolutionary action. It is pitiable—it is almost absurd—to talk about this Great Council of the Realm, if a perfectly new policy is to be undertaken, and perfectly new responsibilities are to be incurred, without our ever being consulted. A step is taken by the Government which, if it is not a sham or a mere flash to persuade their friends to forget the surrender of Batoum, is practically an annexation of the whole of Asia Minor; and as that has been done without giving Parliament any previous hint, I say that is revolutionary conduct. The noble Lord who spoke yesterday told us we ought to have known all about it, because there had been a good deal of it in the newspapers; but the Government take a curious line about newspapers. When we ask a Question founded on what appears in a newspaper, they tell us not to pay the slightest attention to the newspapers; but now we are told we ought to have taken the information the Government refused to give us from the newspapers of the day. But it is not a question so much of the Treaty-making power, it is a question of the power or impotence of Parliament. The real point is, whether Parliament is to have any control over the foreign policy of the country—that policy upon which the future interests, and so much of the taxation of the country depend? It may be said, why dwell upon this?—there is an enormous majority in favour of what has been done. Well, in taking that line, I venture to say hon. Gentlemen opposite are forgetting their own dignity. Surely it is as much their business, approving of this Act, as it is ours disapproving of it, to preserve the rights and privileges of Parliament; and I hope they will consider that even a minority has some rights. Is it a good thing for the country, does it tend to the preservation of Parliamentary freedom, or to the security of English interests, that when there is to be a new policy, it should be undertaken before the minority have been heard regarding it? It is not enough to say that this act is sure to be approved, therefore we need not have consulted you. That argument would go far to justify dispensing with Parliament altogether. The Emperor Napoleon said—"I need not consult Parliament—I need not have a Parliament to consult. I prefer putting a question to the people, 'Yes,' or 'No.'" But in this case you do not give Parliament the possibility of saying no. I really appeal to hon. Members opposite, whether, in their calmer thoughts, they will not feel it is their duty to preserve the power and privileges of this House of which they are Members, and to secure that the people, represented through Parliament, should have some voice in the settlement of these matters? The Earl of Beaconsfield tells us that he learnt in Berlin that the late war might have been prevented by more firmness on the part of the Government; and he said, after what had happened in his own Cabinet, it was extremely important that this country should take a step beforehand which would intimate what the policy of England would be, and not have your Ministers meeting in the Council Chamber, hesitating, doubting, and considering the contingencies, and then acting at last, probably too late. But I ask hon. Members opposite what right has the Government or the Prime Minister to pledge the country to this policy beforehand, because the country may not be in favour of the policy hereafter? For my part, I entirely disapprove of this policy, especially when resorted to in order to support a Government as weak as it is wicked—I mean the Government of Turkey—a Government to uphold which, I believe, it would be necessary to have recourse to conscription. I am well aware that there are sometimes great necessities in which the Parliament of a country may have to enter into engagements for the future; but there have been no arguments attempted to be brought forward to prove that this is one of such cases. All we have been told is that the Prime Minister thinks it is a fit and wise thing to pledge the country beforehand—that is the ground upon which he and the Foreign Secretary have justified themselves; but whatever may be the majority in this House, and for a time out of it, I am quite content to rest my political conduct on a protest against thus fettering and burdening the future policy of the country.

MR. HAMOND said, he regretted very much that the noble Marquess who moved the Resolution (the Marquess of Hartington) should have referred as he had done to the remarks of the Prime Minister with regard to the right hon. Member for Greenwich. Did not the noble Marquess remember that the words which had called forth the well-merited and severe castigation of the Prime Minister had been uttered by one who also had been a high Servant of the Crown, who was now a Privy Councillor, and who, if he had had anything to say, ought to have said it in his place in Parliament? Again, the noble Marquess twitted the Prime Minister for using the words—"Thus far shalt thou go, and no further"—and said—

> "He was not surprised at the Prime Minister, assuming to be omnipotent, should also assume to be omniscient."

But if the noble Marquess had looked a little further in the same Book, he would have found the following significant sentence:—

> "The sons of the strangers from the Isles afar off shall build up thy walls, and their Kings shall minister unto thee, thy gates shall be open continually, so that men shall bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and thou shalt be made through them an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations;"

and, therefore, there was nothing either omnipotent or omniscient on the part of Lord Beaconsfield—only a little more research than the noble Marquess had made—and which fully justified him using the expression. The right hon. Gentleman said at Bermondsey—

> "That no Government, not the most despotic in Europe, had dared to enter into any such engagement, binding hand and foot the people, and doing it in the dark and behind their backs. One only epithet can I apply to it, which I do calmly, that it is an insane covenant, an act of duplicity of which I am ashamed. Other statesmen would never have put their names to such an arrangement as that which has now been made, and I rejoice to think that these most unwise, extravagant, unwarrantable, unconstitutional, dangerous proceedings have not been the work of the Liberal Party."

He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that it was only on the 31st of March last year that the Representatives of the Great Powers, including Russia, drew up a Protocol by which they agreed among themselves to settle the affairs of the Turkish Empire. But scarcely had the ink of that Protocol been dry, when Russia, the most despotic and treacherous Power in Europe, entered into a secret engagement with Roumania on certain conditions to invade a country with which, a few days before, she had signed a Treaty of Peace. This was on the 4th of April, and in this very Convention, bad as it was against Turkey, Russia guaranteed Roumania the independence and integrity of her possessions, and bound herself, if necessary, to defend the same by force of arms; and yet within two months after—on the 8th of June—Count Schouvaloff, unknown to the Roumanian Government, proposed to England to rob Roumania of Bessarabia—that very Roumania whose possessions Russia, only in the April last, had solemnly bound herself to defend. Had the proposal not been concealed by Lord Derby, and communicated to Roumania, as it ought to have been, no Gravitza would have been taken, no Plevna captured, and the whole campaign altered. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, therefore, should have been a great deal more cautious when he alluded to such things. It was with great pain that he had heard the right hon. Gentleman say that England had stepped in between France and her historical associations in the hour of her weakness, and that that would be remembered by her in the days of her prosperity. Those were ungenerous words. But he would call the right hon. Member's attention to the 62nd Article of the Treaty of Berlin; and if he had read it, he would not have been so ungenerous in his remarks, for that Article expressly reserved the ancient and historical rights of France by all the Great Powers. He regretted that France, owing to peculiar circumstances, had not taken that prominent part in the settlement of the Eastern Question which she ought to have done. But it was greatly to be deplored that hints should have been thrown out, the tendency of which was to sow dissension between the two great Western Powers. We owed much to the Representatives of France, for peace had been obtained by the generous emulation of French and English Plenipotentiaries working in harmony. Again, the right hon. Gentleman says—

> "The Treaty power of this country is a great anomaly. It has been endured because it has been used with regard to precedents, to the rights of Parliament, and to the sense and convictions of the people; but when not so used, becomes intolerable. The Royal Prerogative, instead of being, as it has been, the admiration

of the world, will become its derision, if it be used for the disregard of its legal rights."

Those were strange, ambiguous words, and might mean much or little. Could it be that they shadowed forth, with the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman at Bermondsey, the programme of the future policy of the Radical Leaders? The right hon. Gentleman said that the County Franchise was to be won; that a great change ought to be made in the Land Laws; that there was to be a Disestablishment—whether of the English or Scotch Church it did not seem to matter—and he had now indicated a necessity for limiting the Treaty-making Prerogative of the Crown. He (Mr. Hamond) could only say that if that was to be the future programme of the Liberal or Radical Party of this country, he, for one, was ready to meet the Leaders of the Party on that platform; and he felt certain the country would not accept it, and would decide, most unmistakeably, that it would be most unwise, unconstitutional, and undeserved, to attack the Prerogatives of one of the most Constitutional Monarchs that ever sat upon the Throne. He would next allude to the immediate subject before the House—namely, the Treaty of Berlin and the Anglo-Turkish Convention, respecting which it was only fair that before passing judgment upon either, they should remember in what circumstances both had been made. The Treaty of Berlin was the work of the Great Powers who were signatories to the Treaty of 1856. The Convention was an instrument in which Turkey and England only were engaged, and, therefore, it stood on a different footing. With regard to the Treaty of Berlin, the Emperor of Russia declared from the first that the only and sole object of the war was to ameliorate the condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte; and day by day, in the despatches from Lord Augustus Loftus, was this country assured that not one inch of territory did Russia covet. In a despatch dated the 3rd of November, Prince Gortchakoff wrote Count Schouvaloff, reminding him that—

> "Under the Russian form of government the word of the Emperor was not like a vote of Parliament, which could be annulled by a subsequent vote. It seals an unalterable and personal loyalty. If these assurances require to be repeated, repeat them, my dear Count, in the most emphatic manner."

It was not till last June, when the propositions of peace were sent through Count Schouvaloff to Lord Derby, that, for the first time, the cloven foot appeared; and, in the proposals of peace then made, the retrocession of Bessarabia and a rectification of the Asiatic frontier were first mentioned. He was sorry Lord Derby did not deem it his duty then and there to call the attention of the Russian Ambassador to the fact that those proposals were contrary to the Emperor's repeated and solemn pledges. Those proposals were repeated in August, through Colonel Wellesley, and were to continue the same so long as England preserved her neutrality; and it was not until the Turks suffered reverses of fortune, after the battle of Plevna, that the great demand for the spoliation of the Turkish Empire was made, and the Treaty of San Stefano—the result of the unwise withdrawal of the English Fleet from Turkish waters to avert the resignation of Lord Derby—was a proof of that fact—a Treaty which he was not afraid to call an infamous one, because it was signed in the dark and behind the back of others, the persons concerned in it being shut up in a room which they were prevented from leaving until the dark and disgraceful deed was done. Full right had England, feeling herself deceived by the Emperor's broken word, even if she stood alone, to protest, in the most solemn manner, against this Treaty; and he admired the spirit of independence that pervaded Lord Salisbury's despatch, when, with emphatic indignation, he denounced it. And all this while Russia was goaded on by a certain Party in this country who professed to be her friends, and who, repudiating all their own antecedents, were trying to paralyze, in every point of view, the just and legitimate influence of England, touting about the country, debating questions that ought to have been left only to the responsible Executive of the Government. And, in making these demands, Russia believed that she had a powerful Party in England, and she sustained these terms in consequence. Therefore, it was right that England, through Lord Salisbury, should speak out, so that, when entering the Congress, the exact state of affairs should be known. The whole matter was a warning to England, and one of the lessons which the country had learnt was not, for the future, to place any confidence in Russia, by whom she had been deceived; and the gain of this country was the Anglo-Turkish Convention. He deplored several Articles in the Treaty of Berlin, and considered that England ought to have made a better stand in regard to unfortunate Bessarabia, which he considered was given to England, France, and Italy in exchange for the conquests in the Crimean War, and by them presented to Roumania, under the guarantee of all the Great Powers, in 1856, and the three Western Powers ought not to have assented to the retrocession of Bessarabia; and he deeply regretted the course of events which had taken place, and was of opinion that if those three countries had been firmer, Russia would not have insisted upon her demands. Had he been a Member of the Government, he would not have consented to the abandonment of Batoum to Russia—a port she had not conquered; but had she insisted, then England should have demanded and obtained the cession of Trebizonde instead of Cyprus, thus becoming a Black Sea Power, as an equivalent to Russia having her frontiers advanced to the Danube. But the Congress of Berlin had met, and they had settled, to the best of their powers, the great question of the East; and he was now in hopes that peace had been secured. He had not much faith in Russia, and never had, for he had rested his faith on her actions. Ever since he could remember, he had found Russia one of the most despotic and aggressive Powers in Europe, for ever seeking her own interests; so that he, for one, would never believe in her. Until he saw the last of the Russian soldiers across the Danube, then, and then only, would peace be secured, not only to European Turkey, but to the world. With regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, some hon. Gentlemen seemed to think that it would be of a permanent and lasting character. He (Mr. Hamond), however, only looked upon it as a Convention made with Turkey really to give Russia one more chance in the eyes of the world to prove that her intention was simply the object she at first stated—namely, the amelioration of the Christian populations of the Porte. He believed the Convention was merely to place upon record that if Russia chose to restore the territory she had obtained in Armenia, the Convention would end; because the last paragraph distinctly pointed out that the Convention was to cease when Russia gave up her conquests in Armenia. Therefore, all the twaddle which had taken place with regard to this subject was unnecessary, seeing that at any moment it was in the power of Russia herself to put an end to it by relinquishing her ill-gotten gains which she had so unjustly taken from Turkey, and so prove to the world, according to the despatch of Prince Gortchakoff of November 3, 1876, that the word of the Russian Emperor "seals an unalterable and personal loyalty." With regard to Greece, he had heard a great deal more in that House than anywhere else about the Greek claims. He had been unable to discover what claims Greece had on England or Europe. He had taken some pains to look up the question, and he found that years ago the Emperor Nicholas—who, of course, was the fountain-head in everything—declared to Sir Hamilton Seymour, in April, 1853, that he would never permit Greece to become a powerful Kingdom. Therefore, those who advocated the claims of Greece had better apply to the Russian Emperor, and then, if they got his consent, all the rest would be easy. He remembered some years ago that Lord Palmerston had to deal very severely with Greece with regard to a certain Don Pacifico. Brigandage was very prevalent, and many of the brigands were in the habit of laying traps for unwary travellers, and demanding ransoms before they were given up; and, if the sum demanded was not paid within a certain time, they were cruelly and brutally murdered. A few years ago he remembered the case of the brother of an English Nobleman, who was cruelly and dastardly murdered by those brigands. Was that, he asked, a circumstance which should appeal to Europe on behalf of the alleged claims of Greece? Before Greece made any claims on the sympathy of Europe, let her show herself worthy of it, and prove that she was able to govern her own subjects. He believed it was in 1825 that Greece negotiated a small and contemptible loan of £1,800,000, and had afterwards shown her contempt for her moral obligations and good faith by not paying either a farthing of the capital or interest to this present day. He, therefore, hoped hon. Members in that House who supported the claims of Greece would duly consider the various circumstances he had mentioned in regard to her. Before she applied for any advantages to herself by depriving her neighbour of his lawful property, let her prove in the eyes of the world that she deserved their sympathy and support. They had been asked what, on the whole, would be the result of this Treaty of Berlin, and also of the Anglo-Turkish Convention? When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich presented his famous Resolutions last Session, which were so soon swept into the waste paper basket, he spoke in warm terms of the aid that should be given to the Christian populations of Turkey, of the great and glorious prize and of the crown of immortal fame which this country would obtain by joining Russia in her holy, civilizing mission against the Porte; but he (Mr. Hamond) was thankful that the country had not listened to the voice of the charmer. When he considered the cruel barbarities and horrible atrocities that had been committed in Sorgra, Kezanlik, and other places in Bulgaria and Roumelia, he was indeed thankful that England had not been misled by the wild talk of the right hon. Gentleman; for, in his opinion, England would have gained nothing but a crown of eternal infamy. He hoped that there was still a future for Turkey; and he was quite aware that this was her last chance of redeeming herself. He trusted she might yet retain, and deservedly retain, her position as one of the European Powers; but, if so, she must be let alone, and no longer be subject to the constant intrigues of foreign countries. Under a Constitutional Sovereign, with Ministers responsible to a Parliament, with her security and power increased by the Austrian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina—thus preventing foreign intrigues and internal disorders—Turkey had a fair chance of peace and prosperity in Europe; and, with regard to Asia, commerce, capital, and civilization would, under the fostering care and advice of England, go hand-in-hand to establish once again untold blessings to those regions, where the Gospel of peace and brotherly kindness was first inculcated. And if he were asked what would be England's reward for this—he would say for his own country that her greatest reward would be gratitude and thankfulness that the Great Disposer of all things had chosen her from amongst all the nations of the earth to be the pioneer of peace, civilization, prosperity, and contentment among so many peoples in the five portions of the globe.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he should have been very happy on that momentous subject of foreign policy, if he had been able to give his vote in favour of the Resolution of the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington), but he could not. There was not a rag of foreign policy on the front Opposition Bench. There was philanthrophy, humanitarianism, and a generous denunciation of atrocities when committed on the friends of Russia, but not a shred of foreign policy. He had been placed in early possession of the facts of the Bulgarian insurrection, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had courteously acknowledged the fact that it was from his (Mr. O'Donnell's) pen that the first description of that insurrection was contributed to any English journal. Three weeks before any question was raised in Parliament on the subject, his article appeared in *The Spectator*. In that article he wrote of the atrocities that were committed upon the insurgents; but he could not close his eyes to the fact that the insurrection was real; that it was a planned insurrection; that it was planned by agents from outside; and that there was a very large amount of provocation for the horrible and inexcusable excesses of Turkish irregulars. From that day it had been his duty to follow the progress of events in the East, and he had observed on the side of the Opposition remarkable blindness and deafness to all that did not fall in with certain views, and an apparently fixed resolution to see and hear as little as possible that tended to expose the character of Russian machinations, provocations, and conduct in the Christian Provinces of Turkey. Voting, as he intended to vote, against the Resolutions of the Leader of the Opposition, he did not by any means wish to be understood as giving anything like a hearty or general approval to the whole policy of the Government on this question. Far from it. Even with regard to the good points in the present policy of the Government, he could only hope that we should not be found to have wriggled out of them by this time next year. Among other things, he might complain that for too long a time the policy of Her Majesty's Government was too largely influenced by the agitation raised in the country by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. They might have dared more, and they might have dared earlier; and if they had done so, this country and Europe would not be in the position they now were. At the same time, he was ready to confess, as he believed a great many Conservative Members were also, that there was a good deal of just ground for the denunciation of what occurred in the Turkish Provinces; but what Power was it which ever since, as before the Crimean War, had sedulously devoted itself to setting race against race, and creed against creed in the Turkish Provinces? We were not bound to go about redressing the injuries of everybody, especially when it was at the expense of our own interests, and when the results of our exertion on behalf of universal philanthrophy were very doubtful. Had we nothing to redress nearer home? He had carefully, and for a long time, studied the speeches that had been delivered on the subject; but neither in the eloquent speeches of the right hon. Member for Greenwich, nor in the batch of Platonic regrets the Leader of the Opposition asked the House to support, he was able to discover any trace of what he should call foreign policy, or even sound domestic policy. He referred especially to the last of the proposed Resolutions—the extraordinary regret that the Anglo-Turkish Convention was not, before its ratification, submitted to Parliament, and made the subject of unmeasured discussion by hon. Members possessing every degree of information from considerable to the minimum sometimes displayed in that House. The noble Lord regretted that it was not made the subject of contemporaneous agitation out-of-doors—that, in a word, two or three years were not spent in wrangling over the details before the Convention was finally settled. To express regret that such a measure of foreign policy was not submitted to Parliament before ratification was one of the most extraordinary misapprehensions that could be fallen into, he would not say by any Member of that House, but by the most unpractical and visionary of Parisian working men's clubs that ever professed to establish a Utopia. Reference had been made to the American rule of referring Treaties to the Senate; but, in many respects, the Senate of the United States was better adapted for discussing matters of that kind than the House of Commons. It was a smaller body, with longer experience on the part of its individual Members, and greater facilities for securing the secrecy of its deliberations; but, even so, the discussion of Treaties preceding ratification now imposed by the American Constitution would descend quickly in American estimation if the United States were an Imperial Government, like ours, governing Colonies and Dependencies, and dealing on every side with interests and complications of all descriptions. Supposing the United States ever occupied a similar position, it would soon be found absolutely necessary that the Government should have the power of pledging the national faith without requiring communication to the Senate before ratification. It was perfectly certain that treaty-making would be impossible if every clause and provision of a compact between England and another Power had, before ratification, to be subjected to the ordeal of Parliamentary criticism. He entertained very strong democratic principles; but he ventured to say that, were democratic institutions established in this country, the previous discussion of International Treaties would have soon to be laid aside in the Government in such a State as this. Government must be responsible; but Government must have the power of meeting pressing emergencies by the necessary Conventions and Agreements. With regard to the regret expressed by the noble Lord that Greece had not received more, he could only say that if all the regrets which hon. Members might entertain were to be embodied in a Resolution of this kind, and introduced into a criticism of the Government, the noble Lord might just as well have regretted the condition of Poland, and a hundred wrongs of a similar description, which probably the action of Her Majesty's Government might have been directed towards redressing. One thing was quite evident—that as far as a large portion of the Treaty of Berlin was concerned, it only too fully and faithfully represented the amount of coercive influence exercised upon Her Majesty's Government by the Opposition, and the disastrous contagion of the ideas of philanthropism and trust in Russian generosity which had penetrated the ranks of the Opposition. He did not think there was any necessity for the introduction of Party feeling in this matter; and Conservatives, recalling the past influence of Lords Derby, Carnarvon, and Salisbury, and considering their own narrow escape from treading in the ways which they now condemned, might well abstain from heat in the discussion. Returning to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, he hoped that some of the expressions and explanations which had proceeded from hon. Gentlemen opposite might be susceptible of being explained away. He trusted that the resolution of this Empire to bar Russian aggression in Turkey did not depend upon any question of the good or bad government of Asia Minor. He should be sorry to imagine that, supposing the Turkish Government failed to improve its Administration, we should retire a single step from the position we had assumed; or that we should allow Russia to move a step forward, because the Pashas of Stamboul were still incorrigible. He earnestly hoped that this was a conditional Agreement only for the purpose of giving an answer to opponents in Parliament, and that the resolution was firmly taken at all hazards, whether there was good government or bad government in Asia Minor, not to allow the Russian to step in to improve the state of that or any other territory in which British influence or power could be exercised to prevent the appearance of that emancipator. He should support by his vote not so much the Government, for, in his opinion, they had committed only too many faults; not the Liberal or Conservative Party; but, as an Irishman, he was happy to support the National British Party on this question. As an Irishman who still believed in the union of Ireland and Britain, and who sincerely hoped that before long one would take as much pride as the other in the glory of the common Empire, when it would have as much reason to take that pride, he had much pleasure in contributing as far as he could in supporting the governing policy that had made the Empire what it was, and that must be faithfully maintained and handed down from generation to generation in order to keep the Empire what it was. He had often been compelled to speak, and would have to speak often again, in not too complimentary terms of the British Government; but it had never occurred to him, in any moment of hostility against any Government of the Realm, that any spot of earth could be improved by withdrawing it from the protection, from the authority, or even from the despotism, of the British Government, for the mere purpose of substituting the rule of Russia. The present question was Russia as against Britain in Asia, and on that question the most irreconciled Irishman, and the most captious Englishman, should unite in recognizing that when the option was between Russia and England, it was exclusively England that should obtain their earnest and unfaltering support.

Mr. CARPENTER-GARNIER, after complimenting the hon. Gentleman who had last spoken (Mr. O'Donnell) upon his thoroughly patriotic speech, pointed out that the Treaty of Berlin, which had been hailed with general satisfaction by the people of this country, was a settlement in which many interests were involved; and which must, therefore, be of necessity in the nature of an acceptable compromise. It was a matter for regret that better arrangements could not be made with respect to Bessarabia, Batoum, and the Indemnity; but those were not matters upon which the Government would have been justified in entering into hostilities, or could even have been expected to do so, when no other Power was prepared to support them. He believed that if it had not been for England, Greece would not have been heard at the Congress at all, and there was no evidence in the Protocols to support the charge that England did not take as much interest in Greece as France and Italy did. When a resolution was proposed by the First Plenipotentiary of France, no opposition was offered on the part of England. According to the Protocol, the First Plenipotentiary of France said—

> "With regard to Greece, it is not, of course, the object of the Congress to afford satisfaction to the extravagant aspirations of certain organs of Hellenic opinion; but M. Waddington thinks that it would be an equitable and politic act to annex to her populations what would be for her a source of strength, while they are but one of weakness to Turkey. . . . The First Plenipotentiary of France believes that he is equally furthering the interests of both countries in asking leave of the Congress to point out, in a general manner and without infringing upon the Sovereignty of the Porte, the limits which

he should wish to see assigned to Greece. The authority of the High European Assembly would impart to the two Governments—Ottoman and Greek—the moral strength necessary for the former to consent to opportune concessions and for the latter to abstain from exaggerated pretensions. But to accomplish this object, his Excellency considers it necessary, on the one hand, not to demand from the Porte impossible sacrifices, on the other, to appeal to the moderation of Greece. The First French Plenipotentiary has, therefore, thought it of use to trace, as a basis for negotiations, a general line, indicating, at one and the same time, to Turkey the measure of the intentions of Europe, and to Greece the limits beyond which she cannot be allowed to go."

That was the line of the Peneus and Calamas. He had travelled in Epirus, and was in a position to give an opinion about it. He supposed that a good deal more than the ancient Province of Epirus was desired by Greece; but, at any rate, the people in the North did not desire to be joined to Greece. The Albanians were a wild people, not easily controlled, and would be anything but a useful addition to the Kingdom of Greece; and, indeed, they would not live under Greek rule peaceably. More than half the people of Albania were Mussulmans, and a considerable proportion were Latin Christians. The Albanian language was as different from Greek as from Turkish. The Southern part of the Province, no doubt, was to a great extent Greek. On the whole, he agreed with the Prime Minister that it would be best for Greece to be patient, to wait and consolidate her resources; but, at the same time, he hoped that Turkey would not refuse to grant to Greece some such moderate extension of territory as that recommended by the Congress of Berlin. With regar dto the Anglo-Turkish Convention, he noticed very considerable contradictions running through the speeches of hon. Members opposite. They said Russia had no intention of invading Asia Minor, and then that we had undertaken very serious responsibilities in preventing her doing so. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the London University (Mr. Lowe) said that Russia had no wish to encroach upon Asia Minor. But suppose she should do so, some hon. Members thought she ought not to be checked. He, however, did not think it desirable that she should be allowed to enter the country. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) had said it was not our duty to reform Turkey. Why, then, was it our duty to reform Bulgaria? He did not quite understand the answer to that question. With regard to Asia Minor, it was not desirable, and would not be for the interests of this country, that that territory should fall into the hands of Russia. He quite admitted that reform in Asia Minor was a secondary consideration, and that to keep back Russia was a primary consideration, and it would be a fatal policy to allow the Turkish Forces to be again shattered in Asia before taking any action to resist aggression on the part of the great Northern Power. But, while the keeping back of Russia was a primary consideration, hon. Members on both sides of the House must desire that peace, tranquillity, and good government should prevail in Asia Minor; and it was partly because he believed that result would come from the policy of the Government, and partly because he believed it was quite necessary that a stand should be made against Russia in that region, that he gave a cordial support to Her Majesty's Government.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN thought the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) in his remarks had taken up a rather strange position, for he had confined his criticism to the narrow terms of the Amendment on the Paper instead of discussing the great Eastern Question. He (Sir Patrick O'Brien) was one of those who, upon that question, had for a time separated himself from hon. Members with whom he had been long in political union. He had supported, so far as he could, the exertions of the Government to carry out this matter to an honourable, a safe, and, if possible, a peaceable conclusion; but he asked the House this question—If the grand proposition embodied in the map which was now in the Library had been presented some two months ago to hon. Gentlemen opposite—who, to do them justice, had encouraged all kinds of warlike sympathies in an humble supporter like himself — was there one amongst them who would not have derided anyone who was bold enough to put forward the idea of such a settlement on the part of a Conservative Administration? Hon. Members knew what enthusiasm was excited in this country when a great man said that Russian aggression had been carried to such an extent that in the interest of European peace it was necessary that it should be stopped; but it would have been better to accept the Berlin Memorandum, which would have prevented an effusion of blood and treasure, than to let war break out between Russia and Turkey, considering the settlement which Her Majesty's Government had assented to. And yet that was the settlement which had led to a noble Earl and a noble Marquess being received on their return from Berlin to London with all the triumph of Roman conquerors, and amid the festive plaudits of the nation. Those statesmen gave it to be understood that Russia had been checkmated by their having acquired a little Island in some remote corner of the Mediterranean, our possession of which was to dazzle the British public, from whose gaze the Ministry sheltered themselves by their mad, their most insane Convention. Was it strange that he spoke in this fashion, when, from a feeling of mistaken patriotism, he had supported those with whom he had previously been in no way connected, only to be told, after having done yeoman service and marched with many hon. Gentlemen opposite, who, once warlike as himself, were now as silent as mutes at a funeral, that the Ministry had achieved a great success? Let them not call it a success. Let them say it was the best that could be done to satisfy the British taxpayer. If it was really thought that the aggressions of Russia must be one day resisted, then the course pursued by the Government in entering upon the Anglo-Turkish Convention was not one which could commend itself to the House or to the country. The Convention bound us to we did not know what. If it was important to fight Russia, the Convention would hamper us; if it was not important to fight Russia, the Convention was an idle wind intended to humbug and hoodwink the British public. He relied upon the Government and the hon. Gentlemen opposite to carry out a policy, which by taking now a bold—call it a warlike course if they pleased—would in the future checkmate Russian aggression; and that we should take that course at a time when, were we to credit Government's assurances, we were well, and Russia ill-prepared to dispute with us a fair and honourable European solution; but he found they had departed from the promises and protestations which they had permitted to be made in every hole and corner of the land in their name. It would have been better for the Plenipotentiaries to have accepted and eaten their pudding at Berlin in silence, in which case he would have said nothing; but he could not help protesting when this Berlin Treaty was brought in with a flourish of trumpets, and the noble Earl and the noble Marquess with an effete Treaty in their hands—yet permitted themselves to be made the heroes of a triumph, such as he read of in the case of a Roman conqueror.

Mr. ONSLOW said, in answer to the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Patrick O'Brien), that he had paid great attention to all the discussions on this subject, and he contended that no Member of the Conservative Party had advocated, either in the House or out of it, a warlike policy with regard to this Eastern Question; but had, by every possible means, endeavoured to avoid war that was at one time impending over us. He knew that it had been a favourite topic for platform oratory for Members of that House, sitting on the Opposition Benches, to accuse them of being anxious to go to war, and the greatest criminal in this respect had been, in their eyes, the Prime Minister himself. But he defied any hon. Member to point out a single instance where he or any Conservative Member had ever advocated a needless war on the part of this country. The policy that Her Majesty's Government had pursued during the past two years had now reached its climax, and in his (Mr. Onslow's) belief, the result had been approved of by the nation, and there had not been two more arduous or more anxious years in the history of any Ministry than those which preceded the end of that policy which had secured the Treaty of Berlin. They had had to contend in the midst of serious complications, the result of which it was impossible then to foresee, with an unprecedented agitation, which he might truly say had been the cause of the Russo-Turkish War. Seldom had any Ministry had to encounter more arduous difficulties, for the agitation had been very embarrassing, though its supporters had never carried with them the confidence of the country. He would not at that hour recapitulate the history of that agitation—it was well-known to everyone in this House and to the country. So violent had the agitators been, that Ministers had actually been charged with complicity in the massacres of Bulgaria by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, who had stated in a celebrated pamphlet that the Government had winked at those horrors. He thought such statements, coming from a Gentleman who had once been an Adviser of the Queen, should not have been used, especially when the country was in the direst of difficulties. That was the beginning of these violent attacks against the Government, and was it to wondered at that when such a consummate orator and such an able writer gave vent to such loose assertions, that those who admired the policy of the right hon. Gentleman were more violent still in their language; until, at last, Russia herself believed that this country approved more of the words of the right hon. Gentleman than of the action of the Ministry in the crisis? But that same right hon. Gentleman, now that the Bulgarian atrocities, which he denounced with such force of language, were over, had not uttered one word of condemnation of those fearful atrocities that had been committed by the Russians on the Mahomedan population of Bulgaria. The country had now before it Papers recently issued, describing the ravages committed by Russians and Bulgarians; but where, he asked, were those who were so loud in their professions of humanity two years ago? Not one who was then so prominent had come forward to denounce Russia and her Allies. To them the conduct of Russia was still God-like and holy. There was no "national conference" now convened, and hon. and right hon. Gentlemen were not now stumping the country to point out to the people the doings of this "holy" nation—they were looking on in breathless silence. The atrocities committed under a so-called Christian Government were infinitely worse than those committed under a Mahomedan Government. Now, he was bound to remind the House that the accusation he had mentioned was not a solitary one, but was one of many that had been made at different times, and, in particular, at the so-called conference that had been held at St. James's Hall, when the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had emulated the right hon. Gentleman by stating that the Prime Minister would never be forgiven by the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich himself might very possibly stand in greater need of forgiveness; and he would venture to say that when the history of these transactions was written by some unbiassed historian, his verdict would be what he believed was now the verdict of this country—namely, that the nation had not to forgive the noble Lord at the head of the Government, but the quondam Prime Minister. By the speeches and writings of the right hon. Gentleman, he had hampered the hands of the Government in every possible way, and had it not been for this unpatriotic Opposition they would never have had the Russo-Turkish War; but the acts of the noble Earl had been such as to reflect the greatest honour on his Government during a period of agitation utterly un-English and unexampled in the history of the present century. The right hon. Gentleman had avowedly done his best to thwart his rival, and had, at all events, sympathized and acted with those who had called the Prime Minister a "political mountebank," a "fearful Mephistopheles;" and who, like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, had made use of the somewhat vulgar phrase that the Prime Minister had not a drop of English blood in his veins. As an Englishman, he had always learnt that it was the pride of this great country that politics gave scope to the talents of all men who had a seat in that House, no matter what their ancestors were. That had been the proud boast of hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House; and it was indeed somewhat remarkable that one so loudly professing Liberal principles should make use of such illiberal language to vilify one of England's greatest men. The country was, indeed, proud of the Prime Minister, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham ought to have been the last man to have made such a remark. Such strong language as that of the right hon. Member for Birmingham was very unfortunate. It looked as if the Opposition had been directed, not against the whole Ministry, but against a single Minister, and against the one man who had, above all others, earned the gratitude of the country. He (Mr. Onslow) was very much afraid the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had, for the past two or three years, been whistling for the balmy Zephyrs to bring him once more back to Office; but instead of the soft warm breezes answering his call, a rude Boreas had sprung up, dissipated his hopes, and scattered the great Liberal Party to the four winds. The right hon. Gentleman, having once been returned to power with such an unexampled majority, and by this means having been accustomed to make his own views paramount, must, naturally enough, feel somewhat chagrined at the present position of affairs. He, therefore, thought he might apply to the right hon. Gentleman the words of the poet—

> " . . . Dark Spirit! what must be
> The madness of thy memory?"

He had endeavoured, as briefly as possible, to call the attention of the House in the remarks he had made to the great difficulties Her Majesty's Government had had to contend against—difficulties serious from without, but far more serious from within, and he would not dilate any longer on that part of the subject, as he knew there were still many hon. Members who were desirous of addressing the House, and as he believed it was the general wish that this debate should be concluded to-night. He would only remark that it was his sincere conviction that the outcome of all that agitation had strengthened the hands of the Government, both in the House and in the country, and that the vast majority of the English people were perfectly satisfied with the attitude of Her Majesty's Ministry, and fully appreciated their line of policy conducted amid such vehement opposition. Now, as to the Treaty of San Stefano, the country had heartily supported the policy of the Government, especially when it was clear that the Treaty would not hold water for a moment. That Treaty, in almost every clause, affected directly or indirectly the interests of this country; and this was clearly pointed out in that memorable Circular of Lord Salisbury, in which he plainly told the Russian Government that England would never be a party to such a Treaty. It was an arrangement by which Constantinople would be wholly at the mercy of Russia, and not even if a Liberal Government had been in Office would the country have allowed such a Treaty to pass unchallenged. Under that Treaty Bulgaria was to form one large Province touching the waters of the Mediterranean, and practically to be under the Government of Russia; but against such a proposal Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury had set their faces, and the result was that Bulgaria was divided into two Provinces, the more Southern of which was, under the name of Eastern Roumelia, to be under the direct authority of the Porte. That he looked upon as being a wise precaution to take against the advance of Russia to the Mediterranean. But if we sanctioned what he might call the Russian Bulgaria, it required no words from him to show that at any time, and on the slightest pretext, Constantinople would soon be in the hands of Russia. Was there any Englishman who could silently look on and not view with intense alarm such a contingency. To provide against this, it was the aim of their Plenipotentiaries to throw Russia as far back as possible, in order that her presence might not jeopardize that, to her, much coveted city. In this, thanks mainly to the firmness of Lord Beaconsfield, they had succeeded, and the coasts of the Mediterranean were by this Treaty no longer directly or indirectly to be under the rule of Russia; and were it only for this, he maintained, that the best thanks of the country were due to them. As to Greece, she was not, in his opinion, at the present moment, in a position to undertake the government of any more territory, inasmuch as she was still in her infancy. She had still much to learn before she could rule an extended Empire. With regard to Asiatic Turkey, there were, of course, a great many hon. Members who were anxious that Batoum should not be annexed to Russia; and he was one of those who much regretted that the Conference sanctioned this. At the same time, he did not believe that, in order to preserve Batoum to Turkey, this country would have gone to war. Europe, in this instance, was against them, and though, evidently with great reluctance, their Plenipotentiaries were obliged to give way. Yet he could not see what other course was open to them, notwithstanding anything Russia would say to the contrary. He feared Batoum would soon be a great military and naval arsenal. Those concessions in Asia having been made to Russia, however, it became necessary to see how, so to speak, she could be countermined in that quarter of the globe; and the Government had, in his opinion, adopted a very wise course for the purpose. It was all very well to speak of the question as a purely European one; but it should not be forgotten, as many hon. Gentlemen who had spoken on the subject of the Turkish Convention appeared to have forgotten, that there would always be, to a certain extent, discontent in India, which was a conquered country; and that if Russia were seen by the Mahomedan population to be advancing still in the direction of India, in Asia, even in Turkey in Asia, it would very likely be the means of fomenting discontent and possibly rebellion among the Mahomedans in India. He denied that in annexing Cyprus we had undertaken fresh responsibilities. No one who had studied the subject would express his concurrence in the foolish phrase, "Perish India," and, whatever happened, we must do our utmost to protect our interests in the East. They had already a fearful responsibility in maintaining India and in governing it in a proper manner. They could not in this respect add to their responsibility. What their duty was, in his opinion, was a national duty, not a mere Party obligation, and if they were to maintain India loyal and true to them, they must let her inhabitants know that they would not permit any Power to gain, what he might call an Asiatic advantage, over them. By this Convention, he looked forward to a speedy good government in Cyprus, and in course of time a good government in Asiatic Turkey. Wherever English rule had had its sway, wherever the advice of England had been taken, there nations were more prosperous, and people more content. As a more convenient basis for future operations, if need be, against Russia, Cyprus had been ceded for keeping Russia in check in Asia, and thus diminishing the fear of Russia among their Indian subjects, and for the better government of Asiatic Turkey that Convention had been signed; and he, for one, most firmly believed that the policy was a wise one—wise, because it would, in his opinion, attain both those objects, and because, too, it would have the advantage of enhancing the prestige of this great Empire, both in Europe and in India. That being so, he hoped hon. Members would think twice before they gave a vote to-night against the Treaty of Berlin and Her Majesty's Government. That Treaty had obtained a peaceful solution of the Eastern Question, and he hoped hon. Members would give their cordial support to the Government.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, there was much in the Treaty of Berlin for which he was disposed to feel grateful, and he regretted that Her Majesty's Government had not been more successful in reducing still more the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano. It was true that the Government had boasted that they had restored to Turkey a territory as large as Ireland; but then it must be borne in mind that in Eastern Roumelia Turkish authority was extremely limited, and that before long, in all probability, that Province would follow the example of others which had become entirely free, and that it would be reunited with Northern Bulgaria. As to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the way in which they had been dealt with afforded, he believed, the only practical solution of the difficulty which existed in their case; and nobody, he supposed, for a moment imagined that they would not ultimately be annexed to Austria. By the Treaty freedom had been given to all the Slav races, and absolute immunity from the Turkish rule. Those were great results; but they brought into still stronger relief the fact that the Greek Provinces of Turkey had been left undealt with, and that, according to his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), the French Representatives would have made more liberal proposals on behalf of those Provinces, if they had not met with opposition from Lord Beaconsfield. The hon Member for Hertford (Mr. Balfour) had said that the real difficulty of dealing with the Greek case was that there was no real power for dealing with it—referring, no doubt, to the difficulty of inducing the Turkish Government to give up the Greek Provinces. But how was it that this difficulty could not be overcome in the case of the Greek Provinces in the same way as it was overcome in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina? How was the difficulty overcome in regard to those Provinces? Why, Prince Bismarck in the Congress told the Turkish Representatives that they ought to be very well satisfied to give up the Provinces; that they had a large tract of territory restored to them, and that, if they did not assent to Austrian occupation, they must fall back on the San Stefano Treaty. Might not the same argument have been applied to the case of Greece? While England was negotiating with Turkey for the accession of Cyprus, might she not have told Turkey in the same way that if she did not give up the Greek Provinces, she would have to go back to the Treaty of San Stefano? It appeared to him to be the attitude and interest of England to uphold the cause of Greece in the Congress irrespective of any prior covenant. The promises on the part of our Government consisted of two different kinds. The first was made in July last year, at a time when no outrage had been committed in the Greek Provinces of Turkey. The Greek Government had then gone beyond its international duties, and used its influence with the Greek Provinces of Turkey, on the understanding that the British Government would take care that the claims of the Provinces were properly and fairly considered, and that they would receive the same administrative reforms and advantages given to any other race. Now, did the Treaty of Berlin secure the Greek Provinces the same advantages as it had secured to Eastern Roumelia? If not, the promise of the British Government had not been fulfilled. He did not find that the British Government had lifted their voice during the Congress on behalf of the Greek Provinces in this direction. Another promise was made to them at the beginning of the present year, and a third in April last. In April, although the Greek Government had withdrawn its troops from the Greek Provinces, the insurrection still continued, and a deputation of two Consuls was sent to the insurgents to persuade them to lay down their arms, on the assurance of Lord Salisbury that if they did so their case would be fairly and fully represented in Congress. That was certainly not a pledge that Government would support a cession of territory, but it held out an expectation in that direction. Well, one was very much surprised to hear on the very best authority that the English Plenipotentiaries had been behind the French Representatives in reference to conceding to Greece Thessaly and Epirus, and, he believed, also Crete. They had a right to expect that England would have been the first to urge the claims of the Greeks. What they appeared to have done was to content themselves with asking for the admission of Greece to a hearing, and then, when any real question was before the Congress, they were opposed to the claims of Greece. It was matter of notoriety upon the Continent that the French Representatives were anxious to propose in Congress that the full claims of Greece to Thessaly and Epirus should be conceded; but that they were deterred from doing so by the opposition of Lord Beaconsfield, not inside the Congress, but outside, and that they were compelled to propose only the reduced and most miserable proposition which was suggested by Lord Beaconsfield. Thus Greece was left entirely at the discretion of Turkey in any future negotiations. Well, that being so, had the promises of the British Government been fulfilled? He ventured to say they had not. How had Members of the Government met the statement? The Home Secretary stated that he had sent over to Lord Salisbury, whose private secretary said that he knew nothing about it. But why did he not send over to Lord Beaconsfield, who was then in town? So, again, the hon. Member for Hertford gave a most qualified contradiction. He said, as far as had personal knowledge, no such negotiation took place; but it was not alleged that Lord Salisbury was the medium of these negotiations. They had a right to know whether it was true or not that France was desirous of doing more for Greece, and whether England was the real difficulty in the way of doing justice? When England was negotiating with Turkey for herself, was acquiring Cyprus and giving a guarantee for all time to come for the Asiatic frontier of Turkey, surely that opportunity of doing something for Greece might have been taken? It would have been nobler and grander, and have awakened much sympathy in Europe, if England had insisted upon terms for Greece as part of this bargain. They had a right to know why no effort was made in this direction. But he did not put it merely on the question of promises. He believed that the strength of the case rested on this—that no permanent settlement of this great question could be a lasting one which did not deal as successfully with the Greek question as with the Slav question. It seemed to him that the case of Crete was harder than any other part of the Greek question; for Crete, at least, had earned its independence. The Island was in complete possession of the Christian insurgents, with the exception of three seaports. Surely the Congress could have recognized this fact? If force were needed to secure the permanence of this fact, surely the word of England might have been used? If England were to say no more Turkish troops should be sent to Crete, the Cretan question would be settled at once and for ever. He could scarcely believe his senses when, a few days ago, the Under Secretary of State, in a short debate on Crete, gave as reasons for not urging the union of Crete to Greece that it had always been a cardinal point of British policy that Crete should not be so dealt with, and that the Cretans did not wish it. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had shown them, and he now repeated it, that some of the wisest and best of British statesmen — Lord Palmerston, Lord Russell, Sir James Mackintosh, Lord Holland, and others, among whom they now might add Lord Derby —had been in favour of the union of Crete to Greece; and, as to the wishes of the Cretans, it could not be denied that the Cretans had represented their case in every possible way to Her Majesty's Government and to Europe as favourable to that union. There could be no doubt that it was the general wish of the Cretans that they should be united to the mother country; and, in short, the only one who appeared to hold a different opinion was Sir Austen Layard, who, from an early period, had taken a view adverse to the cause of the Cretans, and the union of the Island with Greece. Greece had been sacrificed to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, and the plunder of Cyprus had been preferred to the freedom of Crete. Metternich, in 1826, when asked to join other Great Powers in intervention on behalf of Greece, said he disapproved of insurrection, no matter who the people were, or how bad the misgovernment of them. It could only be such a spirit as this which refused to deal with Crete at Berlin. Crete was now as much out of the hands of Turkey as Bulgaria was in the hands of Russia; and it would not be difficult to apply force to Turkey, by saying that she should send no more reinforcements to Crete. He could not believe that Europe would permit Turkey again to subdue Crete. He was firmly persuaded that we should yet see that Island added to the Kingdom of Greece, and he only wished it could be said that we had taken some part in the matter. With respect to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, he had little to say beyond what had been said by his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich. He would assume that Cyprus possessed good harbours, and that the Island would make a good depôt for future operations in Turkey. But even on that assumption, and if it were all we could wish, was it worth the consideration we had to give for it in the loss of our reputation for disinterestedness, and in the guarantee of Turkey for all time to come? If there had been difficulty in persuading us to go to war for Turkey, why were we to bind ourselves now for the future? Lord Salisbury had given as a reason for entering into the Convention, that he thought it desirable our Guarantee to Turkey should be of a more specific character than those into which we had previously entered. He desired to pledge the country absolutely in the future; and, in his (Mr. Shaw Lefevre's) opinion, that was one of the greatest dangers of the Agreement. Turkey, no doubt, had promised to reform her government in accordance with our recommendations; but no one could believe that those promises would be carried out. We had lost our title to be reckoned the defenders of national sentiments; we had incurred the charge of acting with secrecy and duplicity; while, in the Guarantees we had given Turkey, we had laid the foundation of future complications. The history of Turkey, and especially that of the last 20 years, seemed to indicate that Turkey was suffering mainly from the interference of the European Powers, and that her only hope was to be thrown back more and more upon herself for the government of Turkey, to be relieved from the rule of other races, and to be relieved at the same time from external supervision. He was not prepared to shrink from any proper responsibility; but he did not think that this country ought to have been subjected to such a responsibility as she was now labouring under. The Convention was bad, and involved greater dangers than doing nothing. Popular as it was at the present time, he was sure the time would soon come when it would be denounced, even by Conservatives, as vehemently as it was now applauded. Whether it was conditional on reforms in Turkey or not—whether it was a reality or a sham—whether it would end in our annexing Asia Minor or in nothing—it was equally opposed to the true interests of the Empire, and to those principles of honesty, truth, and straightforwardness which, in the past, had been the tradition and boast of British statesmen.

Sir GEORGE ELLIOT said, he desired to look at the question not in any Party spirit, but simply as it affected our commerce in the Mediterranean, through the Dardanelles and the Suez Canal, and to give a practical opinion on it. Looking at the immense commerce which England had passing through the Straits of Gibraltar to the Dardanelles, the Bosphorus, and the Black Sea, on the one side, and the Suez Canal on the other side, the unrestricted freedom of that commerce vastly concerned the manufacturing interests in this country, and anything which interfered with it must always be resisted by the English people. Putting aside the discussion as to the origin of the war, whether it was Bulgarian atrocities or Russian intrigues, England found that, at the end of the war which Russia forced on Turkey, Russian influence was, by the Treaty of San Stefano, extended to the Ægean Sea. By that Treaty it would have been in her power to have fortified and taken possession of the whole sea line from the Mediterranean to the Sea of Azof. That was the position which our Government had to face. We could realize the importance of that by imagining, as a parallel case, that any Power had obtained equal power in the Suez Canal and the Red Sea. The Government protested against that Treaty in the interests of British commerce, and ordered the Fleet to be on the spot, as an earnest of its sense of the danger to British commerce which the Treaty involved; and we maintained our protest until the Congress met at Berlin to settle the question. The long preliminaries, ending at last in the assembling of the Plenipotentiaries at Berlin, were anxiously watched by every thoughtful man. It was not for him to say what was due to Greece or Roumelia, or any part of European Turkey; but what he looked at was this—According to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, the effect of the Treaty had been greatly to reduce the power of Turkey, withdrawing from her about one-half of her population, while Russia was proportionally strengthened. But during the long negotiations it must have been apparent to the Foreign Office that the Treaties of 1856 and 1871 were likely to be considerably altered, if not annihilated, and the question primarily presented to the mind of the Government must have been what was to become of Constantinople under the new order of things? If it was necessary for the United Powers to give some protection and assistance to Turkey before, it was still more requisite now that she was crippled and Russia aggrandized. What would otherwise become of Constantinople and the great highway from the Mediterranean to India? We could not allow Russia to take Constantinople; but no one could doubt that, unless some protection were given, Russia might march up to the walls of Constantinople against her almost defenceless enemy. That protection had been given by the Convention. True, our responsibilities were thereby increased; but our interests absolutely required it. Single-handed, and in her crippled state, Turkey could offer no adequate resistance to her ancient foe. The secret Treaty thus became necessary, and Cyprus would, undoubtedly, be of the greatest use to the British Government. Ten years ago, when he was at Port Said—and he spoke with some experience of that part of the world—he was struck with the advantage of possessing Cyprus. Irrespective of the advantage of the Island itself, the establishment of the British system of government would have the best influence in the East. He was not insensible to the responsibility of identifying ourselves so far with Turkey; and we should, above all, be most careful to avoid any financial operations with her. But still he looked to the cession of the Island as most important, and he could not help thinking that if a similar policy had been carried out in Egypt it would have added greatly to the value of the property of Englishmen and Frenchmen in that country. For the present, the maintenance of Turkey was essential for the peace of the East; and he believed that the steps taken by the Government would insure the good government of Asia Minor, and open it up to commerce and civilization.

Mr. COURTNEY said, he was not indisposed to accept the statement that, for defensive purposes, Turkey was stronger now than before the war broke out; but, if that was so, he wanted to know why the Government could not have seen its way 18 months ago to assent to a policy of coercion upon Turkey, which would have attained the same result without shedding blood or wasting the wealth that had been consumed by the war? The results might be considerable; but what a price had been paid for them. How many hundreds of thousands of men had been sent to a premature grave in order to lead Her Majesty's Ministers to a conclusion they might have seen last year. It was said the policy of coercion would have involved war; but if the words of Lord Beaconsfield were true, war would not have been necessary. He believed it was almost impossible to think that Turkey would have been so insane as to have resisted the will of united Europe. Even had she done so, however, the contest would have been sharp but short, and what had now been secured after a long and sanguinary war might have been obtained with a comparatively small sacrifice. If that was an accurate statement of the case, how could they be expected to express satisfaction with the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government? His right hon. Friend the Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) said last night that he was not displeased with the Treaty of Berlin. Neither was he (Mr. Courtney); but he owed no thanks for it to Her Majesty's Government. The Treaty was got, not through them, but in spite of them. If they had been wise in time they might have secured all that was given by the Treaty of Berlin without cost. And how had that Treaty been obtained? It had been obtained, as the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had said, by Her Majesty's Government leaning always against freedom, always in favour of servitude. All through Her Majesty's Government had made this cardinal mistake—they had supposed they could keep Russia back by upholding a feeble Turkey, instead of letting Turkey be replaced by young, powerful, and vigorous free States. That horror of war which seized them last year when for the world they would not have thought of coercing Turkey, did not seize them at all with reference to the Treaty or the action they took in regard to it. Why bring over the Indian troops, call out the Reserves, send the Fleet to the Sea of Marmora? In order to persuade the world that we were ready to go to war. For what purpose? To re-establish the domination of the Porte; the alternative being a large, powerful, and free Bulgaria, a free Servia, and a good large Montenegro. He asked them whether the doctrine and practice of Her Majesty's Government were to be approved? The noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington), in his Resolution, regretted that nothing more had been done for Greece. He, too, regretted it; but he was not disappointed. Her Majesty's Government, in consistency with the doctrine they professed or the policy they pursued, could not have done anything for Greece. It was much to be regretted that Greece had listened to Her Majesty's Government. Greece had made a great mistake. The Greeks had passed through one of those moments in the history of a nation when the worth and character of a people could be determined, and they had failed. There was a moment when Greece might have done what Servia did, what Montenegro did; but she relied upon the promises of Her Majesty's Government, and abstained from doing it. It was thought that Lord Salisbury was sure to do something for Greece. He was sorry the course of recent events had taught us to estimate anew the character of Lord Salisbury. We had found out Lord Salisbury. At one time he (Mr. Courtney) respected him, and he respected him so highly that he felt a touch of personal regret when he joined the present Ministry. What a pity it was that before he took that step, he had not had some good genius at his elbow to say to him what the Prime Minister had said to the Greeks—" Be patient; you have a future; wait." If Lord Salisbury were now an independent Member of the other House, and had not been drawn on step by step by an astuter intellect, what power and authority might he not have. Lord Salisbury issued a famous Circular on the 1st of April—a very appropriate day. It was said the Circular was written in hot haste between 12 o'clock at night and 3 in the morning, and the indiscretion of the position taken in it made the statement most credible. It was astonishing that any man with the knowledge of affairs Lord Salisbury had could have committed himself to the principles laid down in that Circular. He did not find fault with the arrangement made with Count Schouvaloff; but what a commentary it was upon the Circular! Why, it was necessary to do away with the Circular before we could go into the Congress at all. The effect of the Schouvaloff Memorandum was that certain portions of the Treaty of San Stefano were to be withdrawn from discussion, while the Circular insisted everything should be considered; but yet an agreement was come to, as to which he would like to see what interpretation would have been given to it in a Court of Law by a strong Judge like the Master of the Rolls. The Anglo-Turkish Convention was an agreement with England, who undertook separate duties of protection of Turkey in Asia, and it was directly at variance with the Treaty of 1856, as it was entered into by two of the Powers without the consent, or even asking the opinion of the other Great Powers. The object of the Crimean War was that the Christian subjects of the Porte should not be exclusively under the protection of Russia. The Treaty of Paris destroyed that exclusive protection; but under the Anglo-Turkish Convention, the rights claimed by Russia in Turkey in Europe would be defended by England in Turkey in Asia, and therefore it was directly at variance with the Treaty of 1856 and with the cardinal principle of Lord Salisbury's Circular. Then, again, our taking possession of Cyprus would include control over some parts of Syria, including the Lebanon; and that, also, would be a direct violation of the Circular, and that protection would be exercised without consulting France, who had always possessed considerable influence in that part of the world. He would not enter upon the policy of the Convention, as those who heard the masterly speech of the hon. Member for Orkney last night would come to the conclusion that this country could do everything that was necessary without it. We had bound ourselves to an Ally who could not be trusted, and had engaged to protect him in all circumstances, although we should not be able to enforce on his part that action in his Dominions which justified our taking up his cause. Russia might have a perfectly fair ground of complaint against Turkey, and might attack Turkey; but we should be bound to defend Turkey whether the complaint were good or bad. If our entering into the Convention were at all genuine, we must defend Turkey whether she were reformed or not, as our defence would not be for the sake of the Turks, but for the sake of our own interests. With a magnificent want of logic, Her Majesty's Government had intimated that they did not regard this as an unconditional Guarantee. The last word was not said when this was described as an insane Convention. If we were going to effect the regeneration of Asia—and especially of Asia Minor—if we were going to establish Residents, District Judges, and Commissioners throughout the country, we might indeed be undertaking a work which would prove too great for us; but still it would be a noble and a generous work; and if, in undertaking such a work, this country was destined to perish, there would be some consolation even in such a disaster. But there were clear indications that the Government had no such intention, and the non-fulfilment of what we had undertaken would be a blemish on our honour. Therefore, the Convention was a sham. Three falsities were involved in it. We had received an assurance that Russia would not be more aggressive. Russia must be, and could not help being, more aggressive. We had been assured that Turkey would reform; Turkey would not reform. We had been assured that we were to defend Turkey. We should not defend Turkey. Therefore, much as he should deprecate the assumption of such a responsibility as would be involved if the Convention were real and genuine, he regretted still more that we should have suddenly entered into a Convention to do that which he did not believe even Her Majesty's

Government themselves ever thought could be carried out. This Convention had been started on us by surprise, and the noble Lord's Resolution condemned the unconditionality of the proceeding. He recognized on the opposite Benches many hon. Members who were Conservatives in a much higher and better sense than being Members merely of a political Party, and he would beg their earnest attention to the few remarks he was about to make on this part of the subject. On the Opposition side of the House there had been a talk about enlarging the Prerogative of the Crown. What was meant in these days by the Prerogative of the Crown? There was a time when it meant the self-will of the Sovereign exercised against the people; but that chapter in our political history had long been closed, and he had not the remotest apprehension of a revival of it. The Prerogative of the Crown in those days did not mean the personal will of the Sovereign, but of the Minister of the Crown, who happened to possess a majority in that House, and that House only. The Crown had long since lost the power of keeping in its service any Minister who did not possess the confidence of the House of Commons. He would go further, and say that practically the Crown could not exercise the power of dismissing a Minister who possessed the confidence of that House. In these days an extension of the Prerogative of the Crown meant an extension of the power of the Minister who possessed the confidence of the House of Commons. He need not possess the confidence of the other House. He was one who deeply regretted the way in which the Royal Warrant for the abolition of Purchase was recommended. It was an exercise of arbitrary power on the part of the Minister of the Crown. If, then, the power of a Minister of the Crown were enlarged in order to do what was now being done wantonly and without excuse, might not a Democratic Minister hereafter use the Prerogative in order to work his own will, even although he might find the other House against him? Thus they would diminish the authority of the other House of Parliament, and also public opinion, and all the other forces outside the House; therefore it was most perilous on the part of the Conservative Members to support a precedent which would some day be turned against them, in approving the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in enlarging the Prerogative of the Crown when it was quite unnecessary to do so. And what were the excuses offered for the exercise of the Prerogative of the Crown in the case of the Anglo-Turkish Convention? It was said by the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade, and others—"Oh, if the House of Commons had been consulted, all sorts of obstacles in the shape of discussions and Motions would have been raised." Well, what did that mean? It meant this—"Let us get rid of Constitutional Government; it is too cumbrous. Parliamentary checks impede the freedom of action of the Imperial Ministers; let us do away with them." If hon. Gentlemen opposite would reflect for a moment upon the course they were pursuing, they could not fail to perceive that they were digging a pit into which they would fall themselves; for should a Democratic Minister happen to come into power, the weapons they were now forging might be turned against themselves. He considered that Parliamentary Government was the best possible; but he was bound to confess there was among some persons of growing importance considerable impatience of it. He had heard outside people say what wonderful strokes these things had been on the part of the Minister, and that it was getting rid of Parliamentary Government for something more simple. Could the Conservatives of England approve of such a prospect? One more word only had he to say, and it was not a light one. It appeared to him that they had not yet heard the last word which ought to be spoken in reference to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. He submitted that it was not intended to be put into motion. It was a bill drawn upon posterity which would never be honoured. The Convention would never be ratified; therefore it was their duty to repudiate it at once, and to say that the country ought not to be bound by its obligations. Whenever the question arose whether or not the obligations sought to be imposed on us should be carried out, he for one, at all events, would discuss it totally irrespective of the Convention. He said, again, he repudiated that Convention altogether, and reserved to himself the right to discuss the questions of the future untrammelled by its provisions.

Mr. ROEBUCK: I feel, Sir, the House is tired, almost entirely tired, of this debate, and I feel also that I myself have very little power to add anything like spirit to it. I feel myself weakened and overpowered, and almost unfit to appear before the House; and I must, therefore, beg its indulgence and patience upon the present occasion. It has always been my habit through life to judge of measures and of politics, not by the persons who propound them, but by the politics themselves; to ask whether they conduce to any interests of my country, and whether, if I support them, I shall be doing my duty to my fellow-countrymen? That is the question I have asked myself on the present occasion, and what has happened before, I suppose will happen now—that when I have chanced, in consequence of this my habit, at various times, to oppose both sides of the House, from one or other of them, upon almost every occasion, I have incurred some mark of displeasure, and even, sometimes, Sir, scant courtesy. But I fancy that I am now about, in what I am going to say, to maintain all the great principles which it has been my fate through life to support, and I believe that now, if I do what I intend to do, I may again incur something of displeasure; but still, I hope, when I come to consider what I have done, that I shall feel in my own conscience that I have done my duty, and, having so done my duty, I care not what may be the consequence. I would first of all say I think the country ought to regard this debate, and the manner in which it has been conducted, as one which has very little contributed to the high honour which ought to attach to this House. We have not had broad questions broadly put; but we have had a case such as is entertained, every now and then, by some celebrated advocate speaking from a brief drawn up by an attorney. It appears to me that if we were to get an advocate from Westminster Hall, and to put a brief into his hand, there is no policy whatever that you would not find him capable of carping at in this way. Something would be said against it, much might be implied by way of vituperation, and if you chose to throw into it some little sarcasm, a good deal of heat, and a great deal of, I may say, quibbling, then it appears to me you would have before you pretty much a picture such as has been drawn during the last four days. Now, Sir, the question before us is the policy which has been pursued by the Ministers of the Crown upon this great Eastern Question, and what we have got to inquire into is whether that policy, as it has been conducted, was conducted in a way to be contributory to the interests and welfare of this country for the future—because it is for the future that we have got to consider it, and not for the past—whether the policy pursued by Her Majesty's Ministers will contribute to the safety, the honour, and welfare of this Kingdom? Now, Sir, I am here to say, and I say—knowing all the consequences involved as far as I am concerned—that I think Her Majesty's Ministers, in very difficult circumstances, have pursued a course boldly, bravely, sagaciously, and, I think, successfully. The difficulties in their course have not been simply those which attached to the circumstances themselves, but have been increased by the manner in which their conduct has been criticized by this side of the House. When Gentlemen, and Gentlemen of great authority, great power, great capacity, and also of great reputation, undertake to criticize the policy of any Government, they of necessity bring upon themselves the eyes of the surrounding countries—and do you not believe that every country in Europe is listening to what is said in this House; and that by criticizing, as it has been criticized, and by the spirit in which the Goverment has been criticized, there is danger to this country in the effect produced abroad? Will you not believe that every party in foreign countries which hates England—and there are many parties that hate England—that hate England for the very good she has done, and for the qualities she has displayed—is listening to the attacks that have been made upon the Government? I say that these parties so listening to the attacks upon the Government, and the spirit in which they have been made, would be very much inclined to believe that the time has now come for them to look for the weakness of England. ["Oh, oh!"] I speak what I believe, and I speak without authority, and in no official sense; but I would say merely what I believe have been the principles that have guided the policy of the Government, what they have sought to obtain, and the means they have taken to obtain it. I believe that the main-spring of the policy of the Government is that they believe, as I believe, that Russia is a dangerous Power in Europe, that she is ambitious, and that there is one thing which she has always before her eyes, and which she will ever attempt to attain—and that one thing is the city of Constantinople. I do not pretend to infallibility; but I believe that, from the time of Peter the Great down to the present hour, the aspirations of Russia have been to seize on that Southern capital, so that the Russian Imperial power may be placed in a far better position than at St. Petersburgh, and that, as she changed that capital from Moscow to St. Petersburgh, she might again change it from St. Petersburgh to Constantinople. Now, the support of my belief is in looking at the conduct of Russia. In the first place, look at her untiring acquisition of territory in the Northern part of Asia. She never ceases to press forward towards India. She does that for two reasons—first, she may hope to possess India some day or other; and next, whilst doing so, she hopes to terrify England. Besides this, on every occasion she is attempting to come down on the South, and to stretch her power over Constantinople. Her ambition, her intrigues, and every aspiration of her policy, have been directed steadily to that end. She takes every opportunity of sowing dissensions among the peoples under the dominion of the Porte, and I believe that those Bulgarian atrocities which so stirred up the minds of the people of this country some two years ago were the result of the intrigues of Russia. Those intrigues were subtly conducted at the time, and, I fear, attained the end for which they were invented. No doubt, they stirred up the people of this country. They resulted in this—that they made the people of this country believe that a certain policy should be pursued, and they at once crippled the hands of the Government. The Government opposite—I speak plainly of them, as I do of everybody else—were frightened by the exclamations that were made with regard to those atrocities. [*Laughter.*] Yes, they were frightened. At least, they did not do then what they ought to have done, and what I believe they would have done, if they had been left to themselves. They should have interfered, and at once have said to Russia—"We will not stand this any longer." But as the people's eyes became clear, and the scales fell from them, they saw through the policy of Russia, and never did I know in the course of my somewhat prolonged political life so sudden, so marked, and so great a change in public opinion as took place on that occasion. What was the consequence? Why, the consequence was that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was, I may say, dismissed from power, the majority passed from him to the Government opposite; and though the continuance of that agitation was expected to restore power to the right hon. Gentleman, a few months' experience on the part of the country rendered his return almost impossible. He has done everything in his power to stir up the popular mind in this matter. He has failed. He may recover his position; but there is no mode of distinction in political life except by death. The right hon. Gentleman may recover his political power; but I do not expect to live to see it, and I do not think he will live to see it himself. Then, when the Government saw the intentions of Russia—when they found that the people had changed their opinions, and, by-the-bye, that change of opinion was first marked at a great meeting in the town I have the honour to represent—they began to see they might adopt a policy that would check Russia. They called for soldiers from India. That, I say boldly, struck terror into Russia. It was not the mere 7,000 troops brought over, but that Russia saw there was an enormous field from which we might draw troops to assist us in our battle in the day of trouble. Then, in order still more to show Russia what was the feeling of this country, the Government asked for a Vote of money from this House, and money is always a touchstone of opinion. It was readily granted; and still more the opinion of the country was shown by the Reserves being called out; and still further, to mark our determination to act, we sent a Fleet into the Dardanelles. The immediate consequence of these steps was a check to Russia. If it had not been for the entrance of our Fleet into the Dardanelles, the Russian Army would have been in Constantinople; and if they had got into that great city, I want to know who would have got them out? If we had followed the advice and policy of the right hon. Gentleman who leads on this side of the House, what would have been the consequences? We should have had the Russians in Constantinople, and we should have been in a most ignominious position. And when the country and the Government alike saw that Russia intended what I say she intended, and when the Treaty of San Stefano still further made it clear what their intentions were, there came these great, most difficult, and dangerous negotiations. There was not a thinking man in Europe that did not look with anxiety for the results. The danger to be expected was, first a war between England and Russia, and it is impossible to say where it would have stopped. The whole of Europe would have been in a blaze, and instead of being, as we now are, in a state of peace and security, with commerce and wealth reviving, we should have been in all the terrors of a bloody struggle with a great Power. It is not that I fear a struggle of that sort as regards England; but still, I hold it to be a terrible calamity when England is forced into war. It is a calamity we ought to endeavour to avoid by guarded language, and by care in our conduct. What has been the result? Instead of war, we have peace. Instead of trouble, we have rejoicing. [*Cries of* "No, no!" *from the Opposition.*] But I say "Aye, Aye;" you may say "No;" and I daresay there has been very little rejoicing on that Bench. I feel that I speak the opinion of the country. I have met with large bodies of my countrymen in free and open meetings in that great industrial centre of Yorkshire which I represent. I spoke there as plainly as I am speaking now, and I was received with shouts of acclamation and with praise of the Government. I left that meeting under more auspicious circumstances, and with a greater feeling of the power I had wielded over a multitude, than I ever did before. Why was it so? Because the people of this country, who met me on that occasion, felt that the Rulers of the country had appreciated the interests of the country, that they were a bold and sagacious Administration, and that they did not bear down the honour and dignity of England, but brought her before the world in that position which she ought to hold as a great nation. Now, I have heard some most remarkable arguments on this question during the last week. One comment on the conduct of the Government was that England for the first time had made a great possession of territory. Why, I want to know what has been the whole history of modern England? Has she not conquered by arms the whole of India? Did she not conquer the whole of North America? Is she not now conquering by her arms South Africa? Have we not conquered the Aborigines of Australia? If we had been a weak Power, we could not have done that. We have always been avaricious of dominion, and have acquired it by conquest in every quarter of the globe. Yet we are now told we have falsified all that is said of our past history, every consideration that England has before borne in mind, and that we have hitherto been a modest and unacquisitorial Power. It is said that the Government have made us an avaricious people, and that we shared in the plunder of Turkey; but the result of it all is we have merely got possession of a small Island in the Mediterranean. We have got it, and we hope to make use of it in the interest of mankind. It is said that in doing this we are in a very different position from that which we occupy in India—that we have in India no Power that can control us, and no Power that can oppose or disobey us. That is true now, but our power in India was not built up in that way. In the time of Warren Hastings, of Clive, and of Wellesley, there were great Powers opposing us in India, but in spite of them we conquered. We ran risks, but every Imperial people must run risks, and we do it now. I do not hesitate to say that we now run risks by this Guarantee with Turkey; but I hope the Government will not lightly give up that Guarantee. I hope they will maintain Turkey against Russia, even if Turkey be somewhat backward in the matter of reform. I hope Her Majesty's Government will hold Asia Minor, and, if necessary, that they will bring it to the condition of India. If we do that it will be a gain to Asia Minor. Instead of being, as they are now, badly governed, the people will be a happy people, governed by an honest Government. There is now one further observation I wish to make about Turkey. It is constantly said that Turkey is a Power for which we ought to have no regard whatever. I draw a great distinction between the Government and the people of Turkey. Travellers tell us that the Turk is an honest gentleman, that he is a person whom you can trust, and that when you find him mixed up with other nationalities, he is the one you can trust and with whom you can deal. I have a great sympathy and interest in the people of Turkey, and I can understand the saying of a Russian diplomatist at Adrianople the other day, that he had every Turkish Pasha in his pocket. So I believe he had, from the Emperor downwards, for the Government of Turkey is corrupt—almost as corrupt as Russia. Turkey is a fierce, Russia is a fierce and powerful despotism; that is about the only difference between them. The misery of the people of Asia, if they were transferred from the government of Turkey, bad as it is, to that of Russia, would be so great as to be almost unspeakable. Therefore, I cannot understand that sort of humanity which wishes that the despotism of Russia should supersede that of Turkey. This is my view of the policy of the Government, and, in expressing it, I have not attempted to go into the minute, and in many respects contemptible, details of the subject. The policy is one which has been conducted with great sagacity, and—I am going to employ a term which may, perhaps, occasion some laughter—originality of thought. It has shown a knowledge of our resources, and a mind fully capable of understanding and acting up to the wants and necessities of this country. One step in the Congress, which showed in a marked degree the wisdom and courage of our two principal Plenipotentiaries, was that which had reference to Bulgaria. If they had not done as they have, Austria would have fallen away from us. If they had not shown that England would go to war in the event of Russia continuing her demands about Bulgaria, they would have had to leave the Conference baffled, dishonoured, humiliated. Those two Plenipotentiaries showed that they knew the people of England were ready to go to war if the concession they demanded were not made. They showed themselves bold men, who thoroughly understood the wishes of the people whom they represented. On all these grounds, and believing that I am simply doing my duty, I shall, fearless of any results that may follow upon my action, give my vote in support of the Government.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, it is quite true that on both sides of the House we have often, and particularly on questions of foreign politics, experienced the misfortune of incurring the disapprobation of the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck). In fact, although the hon. and learned Gentleman favours us with his company, he seldom gives us his support, especially in foreign affairs. The last great question, which more agitated this country than any other, and more divided political Parties than any other, arose when the Northern States of America were fighting for freedom and the Southern States were fighting for slavery. The great mass of the Liberal Party, as might be expected, were on the side of emancipation; but the hon. and learned Gentleman was consistently on the side of the Southern States. I remember, also, that in the old days of struggling for Italian liberty against the yoke of Austria, and when the Liberal Party supported freedom, the Austrian Government, in its blackest days, found not only an apologist, but a panegyrist, in the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield. Therefore, I do not complain, nor am I surprised, that upon any question which divides the opinion of the Liberal and Conservative Parties, the hon. and learned Gentleman should be found taking sides with the Conservatives. I am sorry that the hon. and learned Gentleman should have to complain of the scant courtesy shown to him; but he must remember that courtesy is a thing which is essentially reciprocal, and I, for one, cannot forget the language he used when the Leader of the Opposition, in replying to him, said that no man, whatever his age or position, had a right to tell any Party or Gentleman in that House that they did not conduct themselves as honest men. That is what I complain of, and not of the fact that he spoke against the Liberal Party. I believe, with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W .E. Forster), that so much has been said about the Treaty of Berlin, that I do not think it necessary to carry the discussion upon it further; but one thing I would say, the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield says we do not rejoice at that Treaty. Rejoice is a strong term, and I should prefer to say of the Treaty what was said of a former document of the same kind—the Treaty of Amiens—by your late Foreign Secretary, whom at one time you so greatly praised, and whom you now so unjustly condemn, that it is a Treaty of which every man was glad, but of which no man was proud. The reason why we do not entirely, or to a large extent, disapprove the Treaty of Berlin, is, that it, to a great extent, embodies and carries out a principle of policy which we have always advocated, and to that extent we are satisfied with it. Ever since 1876, we have maintained that the clause in the Treaty of 1856, which guaranteed the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, could not be maintained. It was not for us to interfere with and use coercion towards Turkey; but the policy of those who sit on this side of the House has been for the last two years, that Her Majesty's Government ought not to interfere to prevent the coercive action of Russia. The Treaty of Berlin has accomplished all the demands of Russia and more, and without it it would never have been brought about at all. Has the result of that Treaty been beneficial or not? I say it has been beneficial, and on your side of the House you may, to use an old phrase, "detest the sinner, but approve the sin," because you, as well as we, approve the settlement arrived at by that Treaty. But none of these results would have been gained without the Russian War. Without that, would Herzegovina and Bosnia have been handed over to Austria, would Servia have been aggrandized, would Montenegro have been freed, would Bulgaria North of the Balkans have been established, and the Quadrilateral destroyed, and Turkey removed from the Danube? These are the results of the war, and you approve of all these things. There are also provisions for Armenia in the 61st Article of the Treaty, and for Greece, and for the protection of all the Christian Provinces generally; and not one of these things would have been accomplished without the Russian War. How, then, can you complain of us? The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) says war is a very terrible thing; but we judge of all wars by their results, and we say that that the results of this war are beneficial, and so do you, because you concurred in the Treaty of Berlin. Terrible wars have led to all the best settlements of modern Europe; there was a very bloody war before Greece was emancipated, before Belgium was freed, before Italy was freed, and before Germany was consolidated. It is very easy for us to explain why we approve this Treaty. It is not quite so easy for you to say why you admire it. We contend that the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire should no longer be part of British policy. Has the Treaty of Berlin affirmed that policy? I think not, and I do not know what has become of the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire. I will not quarrel about words, nor use the term "partition;" but no one can say that breaking up of the Turkish Empire has not been effected by the Treaty of Berlin. One-third of the dominions of Turkey in Europe has been removed from the sway of the Sultan, and I observe this morning that Lord Salisbury has taken credit for the Congress having removed from the power of Russia a country as large as Ireland, which she had annexed by the Treaty of San Stefano. But did Bulgaria South of the Balkans belong to Russia? If it did, I suppose that Bulgaria North of the Balkans is Russian also. What an indiscretion on the part of the Foreign Secretary! That, at least, is his statement; and if that is true, then you have given the Quadrilateral and the Danube to Russia, and that is the step which you approve, according to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite. Now, if the integrity of the Ottoman Empire is gone, what has become of its independence? It is impeached at every point, and there is not a line in the Treaty of Berlin which is not inscribed with the declaration of the incapacity of the Turks to govern. In the whole of the dominions of Turkey, both in Europe and in Asia, you have impeached the independence of the Ottoman Empire. The Home Secretary said that under the 61st Article of the Treaty, Turkey is to be the judge of the changes to be made in Armenia, and that the Powers are to superintend their application. I contend that there is no doubt that Turkey undertakes to make certain changes according to the local requirements; but does the right hon. Gentleman argue that that Article does not give the Powers the right to see them carried into effect, and to ascertain whether or not they are sufficient? If, as I said, the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire are impeached by every Article of the Treaty of Berlin, then the principle for which we have contended is ratified in that Treaty. There was one thing in particular which was promised by the Government, and that was a final settlement of the difficulty. Now, is this a final settlement? Does anyone believe that it is a final settlement? I do not blame the Government for not having made such a settlement, which was very probably unattainable in the state of Europe; but I think that if Russia had had magnanimity enough at the time of drawing up the Treaty of San Stefano, she might have made a final settlement. Had she made provision for the demands of the Greek Provinces—had she offered to the Governments of Europe a reasonable arrangement in reference to Constantinople—then there might have been a final settlement on the only basis on which the question could ever be finally settled, and that is by a dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. But Russia made no such proposal, and I dare say it was impossible for the Governments of Europe to agree amongst themselves as to how that best could be done. What is the consequence of not having made a final settlement? We have severed, it is true, one-third of Turkey from the Sultan; but how have we left the rest? Will Eastern Roumelia be satisfied? Will she not always be longing and expecting to be placed in the condition of Bulgaria North of the Balkans? Why, of course she will. Eastern Roumelia will remember that Russia offered her freedom, and that we took it away from her, and will always be endeavouring to recover it. Then as to the Greek Provinces, how have you left them? I have no desire to embitter the Greek controversy at all. I know I speak with great responsibility upon a question of that kind, but still it is necessary, when these matters come before us, that we should consider them, and consider them seriously; and I do ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he comes to speak upon that subject, to give us some definite information upon the point referred to by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Sheffield, as to whether it is true, as stated by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), that Greece would have had better terms if the English Plenipotentiaries had not opposed their claim in the Congress? A very insufficient reply came from the Home Secretary to what my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich said upon that subject. The Home Secretary said he had not inquired into the matter. He said he had asked the Private Secretary of Lord Salisbury; but we want some better information than that. The noble Lord the Postmaster General has spoken since, Lord Salisbury has spoken since, and referred to other matters in this debate; but they have not referred to the question. Now, I did not understand my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea to speak on the authority of a newspaper alone. I understood him to say —in fact, he has authorized me to say so—that his information comes from persons of the highest credit and authority. ["Name!"] No; I shall not give the names. And what is their statement? The Government have their secret documents and I have mine; and the information given is that, in conversation before the meeting of the Congress, proposals more favourable to Greece than those which were ultimately brought forward in the Congress, were made by France and Italy, and that they failed in consequence of the opposition of Lord Beaconsfield. That is the statement that has been made, and it ought to be answered. But whether that is so or not, it is certain that the condition of the Greek Provinces is not, and cannot be, a final settlement of the question. You have the declaration of Prince Gortchakoff, that he is willing on the part of Russia to give the same autonomy to Greece as has been given to the Slav Provinces which have obtained freedom. How have they obtained freedom? By insurrection, and by the assistance of Russia. Well, how can you complain if the Greek Provinces follow the example of the Slav Provinces, if they follow the example of Italy, which obtained its freedom in the same manner as Belgium? There is no excuse that their continued subjection to Turkey is necessary to defend Constantinople. That might be a very good reason for you, but it is a very bad reason for them, and they are not at all likely to be content or patient. But then the Prime Minister gave Greece the same advice as he said he would give to a young man who had a future—to be patient. Well, the Prime Minister is probably the best judge in the Universe of what ought to be done by a young man who has a future. His future has been greater than that of his early ambition, great as that may have been; but that future was not obtained by being patient, but by a very different method. It was obtained by vigilance, and by—I was almost going to say audacious—restless activity. Therefore, when Lord Beaconsfield offers advice to Greece to imitate the example of a young man with a future, I think Greece is much more likely to follow the example of the Prime Minister than that which he recommends. Then, the Treaty of Berlin has not been a final settlement. You will have a second Treaty of Berlin, and that before long, which will finish what you have begun. But you have established a precedent in the Treaty of Berlin, and you have settled the principles on which you have chosen to deal with Turkey, not once for all, but on future occasions. You have set up three competitors—I do not complain of that—for the inheritance of the Turkish Empire. Austria has been placed on the road to Constantinople. I have no objection to Austria going to Constantinople; but that is not very satisfactory to the Turks. It is perfectly plain that what the Treaty of Berlin has done is to provide that, when the dissolution of the Turkish Empire arrives, it shall be partitioned to Austria, Russia, and England. You give the Turkish Government one more chance. By all means let it have one more chance; but, if it fails, then, like the parable of the figtree, at the end will come forth the sentence—"Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" Then I think the Treaty of Berlin is not the best settlement that could have been made. But it is a fair settlement. It is one with which nobody has occasion to quarrel, I think. Russia must be satisfied, because she has accomplished the objects that she had professed before the war. We are satisfied; and I do not see anybody who is likely to be dissatisfied, except, perhaps, Turkey, and Sir Austen Layard, who, in commenting on the terms of the Treaty of Berlin, said it would lead to the overthrow of the Ottoman Empire. But you say "You have, at all events, brought peace from Berlin." That is not a correct expression, for there was no war when you went to Berlin, though there were some people who were very clamorous for war; and, therefore, you are not entitled to say that you have brought peace from Berlin. What was done was, the Plenipotentiaries modified the conditions of the Treaty of San Stefano—a totally different thing from making peace. Passing to what I would term the Asiatic policy of the Government, I would observe that it appears to me to be presented in two forms. In the first place, it is said that the policy of the Government is to civilize Asia; and, in the second place, that it is essentially a policy for the protection of the interests of England. I observe that in the journals of this morning it is reported Lord Salisbury has stated that the Opposition are in favour of a small England, while he is in favour of a great England. I cannot accept that as a correct representation of the view of the Opposition. The civilization of Asia, I freely admit, is a great and noble object, worthy of an Imperial people. We are not adverse to a policy because it is a great policy, but we want to know whether yours is a real policy; whether it is a policy that you have duly considered the manner of carrying out; and whether you are resolved so to carry it out? because we are for a great England, but we are not for a sham England. We are not for a policy for England which professes a thing which it does not intend, and which it makes no preparation to carry out. That is not a great, but a mean and a shabby policy. Therefore, we ask, what is this policy? And when we get an answer to that question, we find that in the Government there are two voices—one, which I may call that of the maximizers, and the other, that of the minimizers of this Convention. My noble Friend the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon), in his interesting and eloquent speech, spoke with the inspiration derived from the famous lands in which he had travelled. I do not possess that advantage; but I also cherish the same hope of the regeneration and rejuvenescence of the East—of the restoration to life of those countries which have been the nursing mother of nations, and of that cradle of the Hope and Faith of mankind. That great Asiatic country has traditions the most famous which history records. There, *stratum* upon *stratum*, lie the historical deposits of 4,000 years, as decipherable as the geological records. [" Question ! "] It is the question. Depend upon it you cannot govern Asia unless you know something about its past. You are not going to tumble into an Asiatic policy one fine morning by a secret document. You must see what has happened in Asia before you know how it is to be governed. You will find there one great race following another, and victor succeeding victor, and that as one race decayed another brought vitality with it. It is not a question of religion, but of race in Asia—Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks, Romans, and Parthians, succeeding each other. What is the way in which Asia has always been civilized? It has never been civilized at any time, except by conquerors. I defy you to show me, from the earliest times of these successive Monarchies, any instance in which civilization has been brought to Asia, but by conquest. It is the unchangeable character of the East that makes it necessary for you to take account of these things. There is not that mobility and flexibility in Eastern which you find in Western civilization. You have got Cyprus, and I have no doubt that you will civilize it. And why? Because you are going to occupy it, and to displace the Government which previously held it. Then the question is—are you going to do the same thing with Asia Minor? What is it that you contemplate doing in Asia Minor? My noble Friend the President of the Board of Trade said the question he was always asked in Asia was—" When are you coming? " That is the very question we want to have answered by the Government. I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, after the announcement of my noble Friend—" When are you going, how are you going, and what are you going to do when you get there?" The noble Lord's friends in the East saw him only in the guise of a pilgrim; but they expect him back in a very different capacity, with the Red Cross of the crusader, and he has got as far as Cyprus already. In these days of surprises, there would be nothing very astonishing if the Chancellor of the Exchequer were to tell us that he had got in his pocket the patent of the noble Lord's appointment as Viceroy of Cyprus, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia. Should he go there, I have no doubt we shall have good government under my noble Friend. He will be able to bring to bear the resources of the Board of Trade—the steam plough, the railways, and the canals; and, from his experience in his previous Department, I have no doubt he will admirably administer the Revised Code in Mesopotamia, and apply the Conscience Clause in Kurdistan. We want to know whether this is what the Government mean? The main object of the debate is to ascertain what it is the Government intend. My noble Friend asks us to gird up our loins for a noble enterprize; but, before girding up our loins, we want to know what the noble enterprize is? The noble Lord was followed by the Home Secretary. I always listen with attention to everything that falls from that right hon. Gentleman, who has a strong commonsense and business-like way of dealing with things which, in the midst of all this Arabian glamour, is positively refreshing. He always knows what he means, and says what he means. He knows, also, what the Cabinet means—at least, what it means to-day; no one knows what it will mean to-morrow. But the Home Secretary answers the question of " When are you coming? " by saying, " We are not coming at all." He said that we have undertaken to protect Asia Minor from Russian attack, with the express condition that Turkey is to reform herself; we did not intend to reform her. Now, it is quite plain that the Home Secretary has no intention of girding up his loins, or, indeed, of entering upon any novel enterprize whatsoever, for this is not a novel enterprize to let Turkey reform herself; it is a very old one, which has been undertaken for many years past, with results with which we are perfectly well acquainted. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that we are going again to embark upon the same policy; that we are going to advise Turkey; that we are to confer with her as to what is to be done, and that she is to give us some more of those waste-paper promises of a few years ago. Now, I have no doubt that she will sign any amount of such bills and acceptances as we may present to her; but what will become of them when they arrive at maturity we all know. There is a simplicity about the language of the right hon. Gentleman which I certainly did not expect, but which I cannot help admiring, when he asks why Turkey, knowing the great gain she is to get by our assistance, should run the risk of losing that assistance simply by refusing our advice? Why, indeed? Why did she do it at the Conference, when the Russian Armies were on her frontier, when Europe was pressing her with advice, and Lord Salisbury was telling her she would lose the support of England if she refused it? The Home Secretary says it is an incredible thing that she should refuse our advice. But certain things are indicated as requiring to be done in Turkey, but these are the very things which were refused by the Turks on that occasion. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs says—"Oh, we must keep the Pashas for a certain time in office." How is that to be done, if Turkey is to be reformed? How are we to be defended from the intrigues of the Seraglio, unless the Seraglio is itself put down? It seems to me, then, that if we are to accept, not the version of my noble Friend the President of the Board of Trade, but that of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, to be the correct one, we shall have the old miserable story over again. As to the civilization of Asia, do not misrepresent us. We do not complain of you, because your conceptions are so grand, but because your methods are so miserably inadequate. But then you say, apart from this, that the civilization of Asia is necessary to British interests, and that the position there constitutes such a danger because of the apprehended advance of Russia that you must defend it. That is the point of the argument of the Government, and what their whole case depends upon. Well, I challenge the Government on the subject, and I venture to say that they do not believe in the danger to guard against which the Convention is said to have been signed. And I will show that the Government do not believe in it. Why, at the time when the war began, when the Government laid down the landmarks, and pointed out the dangers affecting British interests, not a word was said about the advance of Russia in Asia Minor. Right hon. Gentlemen opposite talked about Egypt, the Suez Canal, and Constantinople and the Straits, and there was, I think, in a despatch, something said about the Persian Gulf; but there was not, in the celebrated speech made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, defining what constituted British interests, a single word about Armenia. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, too, made a speech about our routes to the East; but he was careful to say he did not mean the land, but the sea routes. There is another speech which was made by the late Secretary for India, who must be assumed to be conversant with the subject; and which, I think, furnishes clear evidence of the views which were entertained by the Government in respect to it. The speech to which I allude was made when Russia was advancing into Asia Minor, and when some alarm was felt in England because of that advance. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), on that occasion, said—

> "It is an anxiety which those who are connected with India feel especially, because, rightly or wrongly, on that policy circumstances have riveted the attention of the world on what is supposed to be connected, directly or indirectly, with the destinies of England. I am far myself from seeing many of the apprehensions which I hear around me. I have a Colonial friend who is very much exercised in his mind, and is in an anxious state as to the Cape of Good Hope. He points out that Russia is in Armenia, that Armenia is the key to Syria, and that Syria is the key to Egypt, and by that length of keys long drawn out, he shows that the present victories of the Russians seriously menace South Africa. I have done my best to re-assure him; but I feel that his anxious feelings are only characteristic of the apprehensions which I constantly hear expressed around me. It may be our duty to put forward our strength to defend those indirect interests; but when I say this, I would recommend you, when anyone comes to you with a tale of these indirect interests being in danger, to cross-examine them before you believe their statements. It has been generally acknowledged to be madness to go to war for an idea; but, if anything, it is more unsatisfactory to go to war against a nightmare. I will not say we have no enemy. Though it is generally supposed that this has been conducted against English interests, I believe it may be looked at in another light; but

assuming that is so, what is the course? To allow your enemy to choose his own ground; to follow him through his deserts and impassable mountain chains, or to wait till he comes within your own range, where your armies will be able to deal with him?"

That is the deliberate language about Asiatic dangers held by the very man who signs this Convention. What can we say of the man who deliberately addresses such language to the nation, and 12 months afterwards signs a Convention founded on the very policy he has thus denounced? Who was the first man to denounce such a policy as that to which the Government are committed as "insane?" It was not the right hon. Member for Greenwich, it was the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), who said that any Government which entered into it would be mad. But that is not all. In the month of August following that speech, in the very height of the war, it can be shown that the Government had none of these apprehensions about Asia. The Government received from Colonel Wellesley the account of his interview with the Emperor of Russia, in which the latter said that in entering into the war, he had no idea of annexation. [*Cheers from the Ministerial side of the House.*] Hon. Members opposite should wait until I have finished my sentence before they cheer. The Emperor of Russia said he had no idea of annexation, beyond acquiring the territory of which Russia had been deprived in 1856, and certain territory in Asia Minor. Well, all that Russia then demanded has been conceded to her by the Treaty of Berlin. And what was the answer which Her Majesty's Government gave to Colonel Wellesley? They said—

> "We have considered the communication brought from the Emperor of Russia with all the attention its importance deserves. We have received with satisfaction the statement made by His Majesty as to the objects of the war in which he is engaged, and his disavowal of any extensive ideas of annexation."

Thus the Government had full knowledge that the Czar intended to annex a portion of Asia Minor, and their action corresponded to their language; because, although they sent the Fleet to prevent the Russian Armies from entering Constantinople, they took no steps to prevent Ardahan, Kars, and Erzeroum from being captured, and not a single word was said in their despatches respecting the Russian advance in Asia Minor. This means that if they really entertained the view that the advance of Russia in Asia Minor endangered the position of England, their conduct was insane. Why, in preference to allowing Russia to take Kars, and Ardahan, and Batoum, did we not fight ourselves, instead of leaving it to posterity? The fact is, in my opinion, this zeal for the protection of Asia Minor is nothing but an afterthought, that has been introduced into the Convention merely to cover the acquisition of Cyprus by ourselves, and that has been proved by the language and conduct of the Government. I do not complain of their acquiring Cyprus; but it would have been far better if Her Majesty's Government had boldly declared their intention to annex that Island, instead of pretending that they are going to administer it on behalf of the Sultan, considering the difficulties they will experience in doing so. It is part of the same system that induces Austria to take Bosnia and Herzegovina; but does any man believe that she intends to return those Provinces to Turkey? They intend to do that no more than we intend to give back Cyprus. If we really intended to govern Asia Minor in accordance with the terms of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, we should, indeed, be undertaking a tremendous task. But I do not believe that Her Majesty's Government have any such intention. One of these days there will be an outbreak in Armenia. I saw the Bishop of Armenia the other day, when he was in England, and he told me the following:—"We don't like Russia, but we would do anything to get rid of the Turk. The brutality and cruelty of his government, of which you have heard so much in Bulgaria, are nothing to what he has committed in Armenia." When that outbreak occurs, the dismissal of the Pasha in command will be demanded, and the Porte will pay as much attention to the request as she did on the last occasion. What will you do then? You will re-consider your position. Do not you think you had better re-consider it now? You will throw over the Convention of 1878, just as you threw over the Treaty of 1856, which you constructed. ["Oh!"] You do not disapprove of that Treaty? Then, why quarrel with what I say? It was constructed by an English Government, and when the time came for its use, it was disregarded. So it will be with your Convention. The Home Secretary said the Tripartite Treaty was ten times more important than the Convention. What has become of the Tripartite Treaty? There was no difficulty in calling on France and Austria to help you in defending the integrity of Turkey. Why did you not do it? I will tell you. You know France and Austria would not join you, and you knew the English people would not allow you to act in the matter. Then why should the Convention of 1878 meet with a better fate? You say it was our agitation which tied your hands. That excuse does not lie in your mouths, because you determined the matter before the Bulgarian atrocities. You laid on the Table, on the 25th of May, before they occurred, a despatch, saying that England had changed her mind since the Crimean War, and Turkey must not expect anything but moral support from England. Do not tell us, then, that the Bulgarian atrocities' agitation had anything to do with it. The fate which came to the Treaty of 1856 will come to the Convention of 1878. It must be so. No guarantees can bind posterity to go to war, and risk the loss of the Empire; you cannot compel any generation to stake its reputation. What, then, does this Convention come to? If England wants to go to war, she can do so without the Convention; and although that is not exactly the same as the Treaty of 1856, it must eventually be set aside in exactly the same manner. My belief about it is, that after your failure to induce Russia to give up many of the things she had claimed and obtained, you found it necessary to bring back something, and that something was Cyprus. It would never have done to have bought Cyprus without Cyprus being wrapped up, and you wrapped Cyprus up in this Convention. We are told not to be afraid of this Convention. It is said—"After all, it is not half so onerous a thing as you suppose it to be. It is a conditional Agreement—an Agreement never to come into operation. It is dependent on two conditions; one is that Russia gives up the fortresses, and the other is that Turkey is well governed. Russia will not give up the fortresses, Turkey will not be well governed." From this point, it seems to me that if this Convention were a serious thing, the burden would be intolerable. I am not so much afraid of that. I do not complain so much of the burdens, as that this Convention is utterly delusive. It puts forward conditions which are not intended to be fulfilled; and, therefore, I regard it as a transaction unworthy of English statesmanship and beneath the dignity of English statesmen.

MR. BUTT: At this period of the debate I do not intend to take up the time of the House by entering at length into the general question; but I am unwilling to give a silent vote, and if the House will bear with me, I am ready to state the reasons which induce me to vote against the Resolution of the noble Marquess. I must say that if I were disposed to enter on a debate, I cannot but think that the speech of my hon. and learned Friend who has just sat down offers me some tempting opportunities. I scarcely think the allusion to the supposed separation of the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield from the Liberal Party on the question of the American War was a happy one, when we recollect the expressions used in favour of the Southern States by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone); and I believe that it would not require a great deal of argument to show that there is a very great difference between accepting the conditions of the Treaty of Berlin as the best that could be obtained under the circumstances without going to war, and entirely approving of those conditions. But I proceed at once to the question, whether, assuming the Treaty of Berlin to have received the approval and acquiescence of all parties, as stated by my hon. and learned Friend, the Ministers have done right in concluding the Turkish Convention? I think we may admit that the Berlin Treaty was wisely assented to, for I believe it could not have been resisted without war. Therefore, accepting the Treaty of Berlin as an accomplished fact, with the large accessions to Russia, of territory in Asia Minor, and with the Euxine converted into a Russian lake, I ask, was England to have retired without preventing further encroachment on the part of Russia? What would have been the effect of the retirement of England without any practical protest, but that Russia would have had the command of Constantinople at any time, while the Sultan would have been nothing more than the Emperor's vassal? It is said—and I believe truly said—that the Agreement with England anticipated but by a few days the offer to Turkey of a Convention on the part of Russia. Had, therefore, Turkey been abandoned and left unprotected, Russia would certainly have been mistress of her capital. I value this Convention for two reasons; first, because it expresses a determination on the part of England that Russian aggression shall cease; secondly—and I value it the more on this account—because it goes farther, and expresses, also, the determination that this country shall again take its place in the Councils of Europe. I know there are hon. Gentlemen who say what is it to us whether Russia gets Constantinople or not? But I think those who speak thus of Russia's getting possession of that city ignore the fact that this is not merely a question bearing on our road to India. Far higher things are involved. Napoleon had no road to India to care for when he and Alexander met at Tilsit and entered into a public Convention, and when a secret Convention was also discussed according to the terms of which they were to divide the world between them. Napoleon has given us his record of this conversation, and of the offer made to him by Alexander, which he described as giving up to him the sovereignty of the world on condition of his allowing Russia to have Constantinople. Napoleon's words were—

> "I was taken by the desire to drive the Turks out of Europe, but I knew what the possession of Constantinople was. I gave up half the Empire of the world rather than give Russia that narrow Strait;"

and, saying this at St. Helena, he expressed no regret for what he had done. Was Napoleon no judge of the effect of allowing Russia to have command of Constantinople? But let the House bear with me, while I read from a high authority a description of Russia's aggression. I read from Lord Brougham's *Political Philosophy*—

> "With Ivan began that course of conquest which Russia has ever since been pursuing in every quarter, extending her vast frontiers on all points at the expense of all her neighbours; and although it must be admitted that what she at first took from Poland and Lithuania was, for the most part, a recovery of possessions which in remote times had been taken by those States, yet she very soon began to carry her arms where no such pretext existed for the aggression on the European side of the Empire, while on the Asiatic frontier the pretext never existed at all. The march of Russian conquest has been uniformly the same. War was made on some frivolous pretext, generally for the protection of some weaker Power against a stronger neighbour; often for the protection of some Province against the Government to which it belonged. Conquests were made; a peace concluded, and part of the conquests were given up as the price of retaining the rest; and if this was prevented either by the defeat of the Russian arms in another quarter, or by the interposition of neighbouring States, little or no territory was gained for the present; but a foundation being laid for future intrigues, a new war was soon waged, and the acquisition of dominion followed."

Does not this exactly apply to the Crimean War and the recent war with Turkey? He continues—

> "Even where successful operations made this delay unnecessary, the whole of the Provinces overrun were not at first retained. A few years of peace only elapsed before hostilities recommenced, and then the extension of Empire was fully effected. Sometimes it happened that, having taken too much at first, the despoiled neighbour began the war in order to recover what he had lost, and the result of the hostilities was generally to confirm the whole conquest formerly made. Thus, it generally cost her in one way or another two if not more wars to establish her power in each of her conquests, and they who regard the interests of humanity and peace, which are one and the same, can derive but little consolation from the reflection that the same events which have so deeply injured the cause of national independence have also been fatal to the tranquillity and improvement of the world."

Now, let us see what was the extension of Russian territory from the end of the 17th century to the time this was written. Lord Brougham, in his description of this, says—

> "The progress made in all directions by Russia since the end of the 17th century—that is, since the accession of Peter the First—may be represented to the mind by considering the space over which she has spread herself, and the number of subjects she has gained. Her conquests from Sweden are more extensive than what remains of that extensive Kingdom; they stretch through 15° of latitude; her conquests from Turkey extend through 20° of longitude; her conquests from Persia extend through 8° of longitude; and her conquests from Tartary through more than 35°; while of Poland she has acquired, by successive partitions, territory of between 10,000 and 11,000 square miles, with a

population of between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000, besides all she had formerly obtained in Courland and the Ukraine. Her frontier has been advanced towards the West—that is, into Europe—700 miles; on the South towards Constantinople, 500 miles; and towards India, 1,000 miles."

That is the Power with which we have to deal. What has happened since this was written? Georgia has become a Province of Russia; the Circassian mountaineers have been trampled down? and Russia is approaching Persia. Is this system, which has been pursued since the days of Ivan, to stop at Mount Ararat? Does Russia intend to stop? Why should she stop more now than at any previous period of conquest? Do you think she does not intend to go on? And was England to retire from the Congress after the abandonment of the Tripartite Treaty, admitting her conquests in Asia Minor, and raise no protest against that system of conquest being extended? I believe that had England done that, she would have parted with all her influence in the East; she would have lost all her influence in Europe, and Russia would have acquired that sanction for her future aggression which was denied by the Treaty of 1856. Have the Ministry done right? I may not approve of all they have done; but this is not a question of small details. The Resolution moved by the noble Marquess is really a congeries of small objections—I had almost said cavils—raising no one distinct issue upon which an opinion can be formed. Therefore, I feel the Anglo-Turkish Convention to be a protest against further aggression on the part of Russia. Is it in the interests of peace that Russia should think that England would retire? I am told that we may have to go to war again; but this very declaration of England will, at all events, give us peace for some years to come. It is asked, Why was this Convention entered into without its being communicated to Parliament? That is a great question. It touches the Prerogative of the Crown. But secret Treaties made by Ministers of the Crown are not unknown in English history. Perhaps the most remarkable of these is the secret Treaty made during the sitting of the Congress at Vienna, where Russia and other Powers met to apportion the territories surrendered by France. On that occasion, Russia thought herself entitled to so much that a secret Treaty was entered into between France, England, and Austria, to resist her excessive demands. It is to the biographer of Mr. Canning that we are indebted for the curious story that this Treaty was signed in the bedroom of Lord Castlereagh. It was kept so secret, that the three Ambassadors were reluctant to meet where their meeting might be the subject of observation. They met at a ball in the mansion of Lord Castlereagh, retired separately and unobserved from the ball-room, signed the Treaty in the bedroom of the British Minister, and returned again to the ball-room. For weeks they met each day in Congress Representatives of Russia with that secret Treaty unrevealed. It was never disclosed to Parliament, for the return of Napoleon put an end to the necessity of communicating it. Is it possible to raise a graver question, or one more affecting the very foundations of our Monarchy and Constitution, than by asking us to express an opinion as to how far the Sovereign ought to take the advice of Parliament in the conclusion of a Treaty? But how is it put in this Resolution? As a matter entirely subordinate to the mere question of Epirus and Thessaly. We have no opportunity of laying down any doctrine that will bind future Parliaments, or be a guide to the Sovereign in his relations with them. We are simply asked to express regret that this Treaty was not communicated to Parliament. If it were necessary to raise the question of the relations between the Queen and Parliament, no question ought to be put more solemnly and precisely; but by the terms of the Resolution, it would appear that the interests of the British Constitution were even smaller than those of Thessaly and Epirus; therefore, I decline to vote for that Resolution. I give my vote upon the great question—Have our Ministers done right in concluding this Anglo-Turkish Convention? and I believe, in my conscience, that they have done right. Is there nothing in vindicating the position of England in the Councils of Europe? Is there nothing in the Ministry having vindicated the rights and independence of the Western Nations? I think England was losing her place in the estimation of foreign Powers; and I believe that was owing to our Ministers being under the influence of the principle of "peace at any price," which, if carried into practice, will generally end in war at any cost. I cannot help remembering what was said in this House in the year 1815 by a great Irishman, Henry Grattan. When Napoleon returned from Elba, engagements were entered into by the Representatives at the Congress as to what should be done. A Message was sent by the Regent to Parliament, to the effect that some Treaties had been concluded at the Congress, which he laid before them, and that some engagements had been entered into which he did not communicate. An Amendment to the Address was moved by Lord George Cavendish, expressing the anxious desire of the House of Commons to support any Treaties into which His Royal Highness had entered; but humbly submitting that they would not be justified in declaring their approval of stipulations of which they were not informed. It would be seen that the complaint was that they were asked to approve of the extent of liability undertaken, not that the Treaties had not been communicated to Parliament. But returning to Henry Grattan. I say he gave to Great Britain a significant warning of the effects of departing from her true place in the Councils of Europe. His speech was upon the subject of the expense of a war with Buonaparte, and ended with these words—

> "Recollect that your Empire cannot be saved by a calculation: besides, your wealth is only part of your situation—the name you have established, the deeds you have achieved, and the part you have sustained, preclude you from a second place among nations; and when you cease to be the first, you are nothing."—[1 *Hansard*, xxxi. 430.]

It is strange that this is almost an expansion of the words used in Parliament by his great rival in the Irish House of Commons, Henry Flood, and who was a Member of the British Parliament when the Revolutionary War began. His words were—

> "You have dared to take the first place, and the nation that once has done so, ceases to exist as a nation when it descends to the second."

I am quoting the words of one great Irishman, uttered before the war began, and repeated by another at its close. It is idle, I say, to talk now of responsibilities. England has responsibilities already, created by her name, by what she has achieved, by the extent of the Empire she has founded, and by the Colonies and commerce which she has established in every part of the globe. She cannot descend from her high position and let it be believed that she has ceased to be a living and moving Power, while Russia works her wicked will upon the nations of the earth. This is no Party question. I will not give my vote in the sense of my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Plunket) who moved his Amendment as a Vote of General Confidence in the Government. I think it better for the Government and the country that this wise act which they have done should be approved by men who, like myself, are unwilling to be classed among their adherents. This is a matter which may affect future generations. I am not going to speculate upon what might happen at the dissolution of the Turkish Empire; but if it be true, as my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) has said, that the day is coming when an attempt will be made to apportion it between Greece, Austria, and Russia, I say it is most important that England should assert her place and be promptly on the spot. I, therefore, express my humble hope that to-night this House of Parliament, representing the United Kingdom, will give a marked and emphatic support to the action of the Government. I might have supposed that the Liberal policy would have been against Russia; that the Liberal policy would have been against the most intolerant, the most bigoted, and the meanest despotism in the world. I do not understand the liberality that supports the despotism of Russia. Who is supporting the despotism of Turkey? No one; although I believe the despotism of Turkey is nothing like so bad as it has been described. Let me ask, when has Turkey flogged nuns in their convents as Russia has done? Or has Turkey a Siberia, to which, like Russia, she sends her best men? I say we are dealing with the most intolerant, the most bigoted, and, at the same time, the meanest despotism that ever trampled on the rights of man. It is against this we raise our voices. I do not believe that Russia will seek the Euphrates Valley. She will make her advances through Central Asia. But England has now stepped forward and said she will resist all further aggression by Russia on the Asiatic territories of

Turkey; and but for that action of Her Majesty's Government, Russia might have seized upon Constantinople, with all the influence and power attaching to its situation, which Napoleon so justly estimated when, rather than it should fall into her hands, he resigned the Sovereignty of half the world.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he would only detain the House for a few moments before the right hon Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose to address it. But he thought someone should endeavour to calm the House after the alarming speech of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), who had spoken as if this country were about to go to war with Russia. He had been astonished that evening to hear the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho), whom he found was even more in favour of peace than himself. The noble Lord said he looked upon nothing with so much horror as a war on behalf of religion and humanity. Well, if a man would not go to war for the sake of religion and humanity, there was nothing in the world that would induce him to go to war. He hoped the House would listen to him for a few minutes. Of course, he could not expect to meet with the sympathy that had been accorded to his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick, or to the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck); for speeches delivered from one side of the House in favour of the other were sure to meet with approbation. For his own part, he must say that he rejoiced at the peace which was said to have been made; but which, in his opinion, had only been maintained by the Treaty of Berlin. He did not so much find fault with the Amendment moved by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, for it only expressed satisfaction at peace being restored, and the hope that all that had been done would ameliorate the condition of other nations, and promote the well-being of this Empire. In all these sentiments he most entirely concurred; but it was strange that on an occasion like the present, when the policy of the opposite Party had been challenged by the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition, the Amendment which had been moved on behalf of the Government did not contain a single word respecting confidence in the Government. The main question which the House had to decide was, whether the peace which had been concluded was a peace with honour, and that was the question upon which the House could substantially divide. He was very glad that there would be a division on that question, because it was one which ought to be voted upon by that House before the Dissolution of Parliament took place. They had been told by the hon. Member for Mid-Kent (Sir William Hart Dyke), who had made a sort of official announcement the other day, that no Dissolution of Parliament had yet been decided on by the Government. He was sure that the hon. Gentleman stated what he believed to be the truth; but the very statement coming from the Government that there was to be no Dissolution made him believe that there very likely would be one. Not that the Government would wilfully lead them astray; but because they had got into the habit lately of making statements which hon. Members on his side of the House had been unable to understand. The Prime Minister, for instance, the other day said there was a harbour at Batoum, which would hardly hold six ships; and when it was explained to him that it would really hold 13, he observed that he had only made a picturesque statement. These picturesque statements of the Government were becoming too common. On the first day of the Session they had a picturesque statement from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to the effect that no money would be asked for until the Russian terms were before the Cabinet; and yet, within a week, the right hon. Gentleman came down to the House and asked for money, while still uninformed as to what those terms were. Then they were told before the Easter Recess that no great steps were in contemplation with regard to the Eastern Question; but 48 hours afterwards, they heard that all the savages and cut-throats of India had been brought to Malta.

COLONEL MAKINS rose to Order. He wished to know whether it was right and fitting to describe any portion of Her Majesty's Army as savages and cut-throats?

MR. SPEAKER: I am bound to say that the expression is not becoming. But, at the same time, I am not in a position to call upon the hon. Baronet to withdraw it as being un-Parliamentary.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON observed, that after that expression of opinion from the Chair, he would certainly withdraw the words he had used; but he thought it right to inform the hon. and gallant Member opposite that they were used only in a Pickwickian sense. The Anglo-Turkish Convention seemed to him to have been concluded from an unworthy fear of Russia; and he thought that that was condemnation of the policy of the Government only two years ago. They all remembered that when the Bill was brought in to make Her Majesty Empress of India, the House was told, in a memorable speech which no one could ever forget, that if they could only make the Queen Empress of India, there would be no fear that the Czar would ever attack the Indian Possessions of the Crown. Another reason why he should vote for the Motion of the noble Marquess was, that he did not think Parliament had been properly treated with reference to the matter. They had been called together three weeks earlier than usual that year, as they were informed, for the purpose of giving advice and assistance to Her Majesty's Government; and, if he were not putting it too strong, he must say that Parliament was called not to be consulted, but to be insulted. Parliament had never been able to get any information on any matter in connection with Eastern events; the Ministry acted without consultation with Parliament, and then Parliament was simply informed that certain things had been done. He must be understood to express his condemnation of the way in which matters were carried on at the Congress, of which they had heard so much. The history of that secret Treaty was one of the most humiliating things that could possibly be conceived. While telegrams were being sent to this country relating what the Plenipotentiaries were doing, the whole matter was concluded by a Treaty which one of the Plenipotentiaries had in his pocket. He could not understand how so many English Gentlemen could stand up and advocate such a proceeding as that. In his opinion, taking the secret Treaty from the Foreign Office—as it was well known a certain gentleman did—was not so very much worse than making that secret Treaty, and using it behind the back of Parliament. He could not help thinking that when the banquet of to-morrow would be given to the Prime Minister at the Mansion House, some other body of men should get up some sort of a dinner to be given to Mr. Charles Marvin. As the case had been brought before a Court of Justice, and dismissed, he might say that, in his opinion, the two transactions stood very much upon the same footing. He knew, of course, that they would be in a minority that night, and that hon. Members opposite would cheer when the numbers were announced; but he also knew that when this matter came before the country, the Opposition would not be in so great a minority as some people thought. Two days ago, he was reading one of the Prime Minister's novels, and he was struck by one expression he found in it. It was said—"Time and thought are great disenchanters." When reading that, he said to himself that time and the tax-gatherer would disenchant the people of this country from many illusions. They had been told by the Marquess of Salisbury that they should take up a share of Imperial interests. He believed that in a short time the nation would take up the line of common sense, and that these transactions would then be regarded in a way very different from that in which they were contemplated at present. He should vote for the Resolution with his heart and soul, because he believed that it was intended to be a censure upon the Ministry, who, in his opinion, by their tortious foreign policy, had damaged the fair fame of English statesmanship, and had laid a heavy burden unnecessarily upon a people already heavily taxed. They had blindly entered into a most serious expense, which, although it might not be severely felt at present, would be a grievous burden in times to come.

MR. O'CLERY said, he should not vote upon this question, because he belonged neither to the Liberal or the Conservative Party, and, as a Member of the Home Rule Party, he did not feel himself bound to act with either. No doubt, hon. Members on both sides of the House would remember—and if they did not he would remind them—that there was a time when the English Liberals had only to put a Resolution on the Paper, and all the Irish Members were bound to follow in their wake. But that time had passed, and there was now a third Party, that followed English Liberals no more than English Conservatives. At the same time, he had one charge to bring against the Government. When the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) spoke of the terrible despotism of Russia, he was cheered to the echo by the Conservatives. He was reminded of the part taken by the Conservatives in reference to Poland at the time of the late war. They said it was necessary that something should be done for Poland. He remembered reading in the chief Jingo journal—*The Daily Telegraph*—that 200,000 Poles were in the Russian Army. The writer suggested that there should be a rising, and that Poland should re-assert itself, and a Committee was formed in London for the purpose of promoting an insurrection. Now, the English Parliament would say that it was very sorry for Poland, but would give it no help to rise against its enemy. No doubt he should be told that the Government had no official knowledge of the insurrection; but could they deny that they had unofficial cognizance of it? At the Berlin Congress no English Plenipotentiary dared say one word for Poland; for it was known that they would be told that England had her own Poland, and should settle her own affairs before calling on Russia to look to hers. The Home Rule Party had been taunted in that House with having no great interest in Imperial affairs. Why should they have any interest in them, until they found the right position of their country within the Empire accorded her? The Irish Members were brought there, but they had no interest in Imperial affairs until the wrong inflicted on Ireland had been undone, and she was placed in the same position as Hungary had obtained in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. He was reminded by the debate and the crisis through which they had passed, that this country had other enemies besides Russia. He very much feared that there were many bitter enemies of this country beyond the Atlantic—men who had been driven away from Ireland. Great as might be the merit due to the Earl of Beaconsfield for his services in establishing peace between England and Russia, greater merit would be due to him if he made peace between England and Ireland. It was the duty of the Government to make peace between England and Ireland, for they would thereby disarm Irish Americans, and make Irishmen at home contented. In the question of Prerogative which had been raised in the debate, he took no great interest—except that he knew that after suffering for want of a Parliament for 78 years, by a stretch of the Prerogative, a Parliament could be held in Dublin. Therefore, no Irish Members had any great interest in checking the Prerogative. He felt sure that Her Majesty's Government could conclude no better or truer peace than one with Ireland.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER and Mr. SULLIVAN rose together, there being loud cries for the latter, who, however, at length gave way.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am sorry to have to stand between the hon. and learned Member for Louth and the House; but I feel that it would be disrespectful to the House, if I were not to say a few words upon the subject which has engaged our attention for several nights. No one can doubt that the matter which has been brought under the notice of this House by the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition is one which well deserves the mature and careful consideration of the British Parliament, and I may say especially of the House of Commons. No one can doubt that this subject has been worthily brought forward by the noble Lord, and that it has been worthily discussed in the course of the four nights we have spent in debate upon it. If the Resolution of the noble Lord be open to observation, it is open to that made just now by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), that it raises so many questions that it is difficult to select those which should be discussed, and that it is difficult to keep the discussion to the points which are raised. That, however, is not the fault of the noble Lord. It was, indeed, his duty to call attention to this subject, and I think he has done well in selecting the form of Motion which he has made in order that he might challenge, as a whole, the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and that he might call upon the Government to make a statement on behalf and in explanation of that policy. No doubt, questions of great importance have been raised. There have been questions not only as to the details of this or that Convention or Treaty; but there have also been questions as to the exercise of the Prerogative, the military condition of the country, and various other matters with which I need not now detain the House. Many of those questions are of such magnitude that they might each have been the subject of a separate debate, though it is right that they should have been considered in the present discussion. I will endeavour, in the few observations with which I shall trouble the House, to follow the lead which the noble Lord gave us in the opening of his speech. He said that it was not, in his opinion, right that we should compare the state of things that has been produced by the Treaty of Berlin with the state of things produced by the Treaty of San Stefano. He said—"You ought to take a wider range, and, instead of comparing the effects of the Treaty of Berlin with the effects of the Treaty of San Stefano, you ought to compare them rather with the effects of the Treaty of Paris in 1856—you ought to see how far that which has now been done modifies the effects of the arrangement which was made in 1856." Well, subject to a qualification, I accept that view of the noble Lord; but the qualification I subject it to is this—that, in comparing the effects of the Treaty of Berlin with the effects of the Treaty of Paris, you must not leave out of sight the intermediate stage—the effect and the meaning of the Treaty of San Stefano. Now, what was the general policy which dictated the arrangements of 1856? What was the key-note of that policy? It was the maintenance of the Turkish Empire as an integral part of the system of Europe. The Treaty was concluded, as we are often told, for the maintenance of the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire. We have heard the observation—"What has now become of the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire?" Undoubtedly, in a certain sense, the arrangements of 1856, which must be regarded as having been more or less experimental, have failed. The history of the period which has elapsed since the Treaty of 1856 proves that the experiment has, to a certain extent, failed, and also throws much light on the causes that have led to its failure. I am not quite sure that we shall all agree as to the meaning of the expression I have quoted; but undoubtedly the general intention of Europe at the time of the Treaty was to maintain a strong Power in South-Eastern Europe, which should be a guardian of the Straits, which should be the possessor of Constantinople, and which should suffice to maintain the balance of the other Powers of Europe, by the rule of the Turkish Emperor. The reasons for that policy were such as commended themselves to all the statesmen of Europe at the time; but the experiment has failed from a combination of three causes. In the first place, there was, undoubtedly, a failure on the part of the Ottoman Porte to govern the whole of that country of which it had the charge in a manner that was satisfactory. Secondly, there was—what we cannot shut our eyes to—so large an amount of intrigue on the part of some other Powers as to render it difficult, if not impossible, for the Porte to carry on its government. Thirdly, there was a certain amount of apathy and negligence on the part of some of the Powers who had been parties to the arrangement of 1856; they failed to do what was in contemplation when the Treaty of 1856 was made—they failed to do what they might have done—to assist the Porte in the better carrying on of its government. When I say that, I make no secret that among the Powers I so accuse, and perhaps at the head of those Powers, was our own nation. I must say that I think all the evidence shows that there was—I do not say it was inexcusable—I do not say that there was no palliation or explanation of our conduct—but there was a most unfortunate apathy on the part of the people of this country, in not keeping a proper watch over what was going on in Turkey, and in not exercising the influence which it was in their power to exercise. I think that things went further—I think we could point out occasions, and many occasions, upon which England may be actually said to have encouraged Turkey to go into large expenditure, to contract debt, and to embarrass herself by adopting Western ideas, and, at the same time, abstained—designedly and avowedly abstained—from interposing in any way to modify the faults of her Government. I will not attempt at this time of night to quote passages on this subject; but I could point to despatches of Lord Clarendon in the earliest days of the Administration of 1869, in which it was laid down in the most distinct manner that England, in consenting to enter into the Conference on the affairs of Greece, must make it a matter of stipulation that the Conference must confine itself to the particular subjects before it, and not go into any of those general questions. That was the case again at a later time, when the Black Sea Treaty was revised.

MR. GLADSTONE wished for the date of the despatch to which reference was made.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The date is December 29th, 1868, and if my right hon. Friend wishes, I will read the despatch. It is from Lord Clarendon to Lord Lyons—

> "Now, it appears to Her Majesty's Government that the Powers should, at the outset, carefully guard themselves against taking any active part, beyond the mere suggestion of bases of reconciliation, in the settlement of the dispute between Turkey and Greece. Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that it should be clearly understood amongst the Members of the Conference that their recommendations are in no case to be supported by any intervention, whether requested by or imposed on either or both, on the part of their Naval Forces. I need scarcely say that Her Majesty's Government cannot contemplate the employment of coercive measures to enforce against either party the recommendations of the Conference. If these recommendations are not accepted by both, the only alternative which Her Majesty's Government can admit is that the Powers will have no other course open to them but to withdraw from further interposition in the dispute."

On the day following, there was another despatch on the same subject—

> "It is sufficient for the present purpose that I should authorize your Excellency to make known to M. de Lavalette that, with the distinct understanding that no other question shall be mooted at the Conference save that of a settlement of the differences between Turkey and Greece, and that no proposal shall be brought forward affecting the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, or involving interference in the internal administration of Turkey, or with the rights of the Sultan over his subjects, Her Majesty's Government agree to be represented in the Conference."

I am not making any special charge upon this occasion; but I am illustrating from such passages as these the spirit in which the British Government then looked at questions affecting the integrity and the internal affairs of Turkey. I say that that was one of the concurrent causes that led to the failure of the experiment of 1856. Well, Sir, but now what happened? The result of all that was the disturbances in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the failure of the attempts made to pacify Turkey, and the various incidents of the Servian War, the Constantinople Conference, and all the rest with which the House is familiar; and, finally, the war with Russia, ending with the Treaty of San Stefano. And when the failure of the arrangements of 1856 had become most manifest—when the very purpose for which those arrangements had been entered into had broken down, and it was shown that no Power would come forward and assist Turkey in her struggle with Russia—at that moment it was that we took up the thread of affairs, as we had taken part in the proceedings before. You must look at affairs as they were at the time of the Treaty of San Stefano, and consider the course taken by the Government in order to re-establish what they thought deserved to be re-established. What was the key to the purpose of the arrangements of 1856? The maintenance of a Power strong enough and independent enough to be able to act as guardian of the most important positions in Europe. What would have been the effect of the propositions of the Treaty of San Stefeno? Entirely to destroy that arrangement. I will not ask now what the effect might be upon the different races that were subject to Turkey. I will look at the matter from a European point of view—from that point of view which those who made the arrangements of 1856 would have taken—and I say these arrangements were completely broken down when the Treaty of San Stefano was concluded. Now, look at the general effect of the Treaty of Berlin. That Treaty has, to a very considerable extent, undone that part of the work of the Treaty of San Stefano which destroyed the arrangements in principle of 1856, and has, to a considerable extent, replaced it by one more durable. It is perfectly true that we are twitted with the question—"What has become of the cardinal point of the Treaty of 1856? What has become of the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire?" And we are told that because the Ottoman Empire has lost a considerable part of her territory and many of her subjects, we cannot talk of her independence and integrity. The hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke just now (Sir William Harcourt) made very merry over this view of the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire; but while he was speaking it occurred to me that he is a Member of the great Liberal Party, which some years ago was stronger and very much more numerous than it is at present; but I suppose that, though it has lost a large number of Members in this House, although they no longer occupy the position they did four years ago, I suppose that we are not to be told that, therefore, the independence and integrity of the Liberal Party are gone? If they are strong enough for the purposes they have to perform, we need not trouble ourselves about them; and so, if we are satisfied that the Turkish Empire as it stands under the Treaty of Berlin is strong enough to fulfil its functions, we may rest very well satisfied without inquiring how much territory and how many subjects it has lost. No doubt, the arrangements which have been made involve considerable sacrifices on the part of Turkey; but they are sacrifices which I firmly believe do not weaken, but rather strengthen her. You do not weaken her by taking from her Provinces the affairs of which she was unable to administer, and which had become foci of intrigue and difficulty; rather you strengthen her by so concentrating her power as to enable her better to manage the territory which she still possesses, and by giving her a frontier which, though contracted, still leaves her strong enough to be the guardian of those important interests to which I have referred. But, in dealing with this question on grounds of general policy, we are met by two objections. In the first place, we are told that we might have done all this long ago, before the war commenced, and without the necessity of all that terrible loss of life and fearful human suffering which we have witnessed. Well, it is really very difficult to argue the question of what might, or what might not have been done. For my own part, I am entirely unable to say what might have happened under certain circumstances. But I still believe that if we had attempted to put pressure on Turkey at the time when it is said we ought to have pursued that course, and if we had attempted to take measures which would practically have involved us in war with her, I believe Turkey would have resisted it, that she would not have given way, and that her high spirit—her obstinacy, if you will—would have led her not to consent to those sacrifices she has had to make until by the hard necessities of stern warfare it was made manifest to her that she must submit to superior force. There may be those who may think differently; but I believed at the time—and I believe now, and everything which has happened since only strengthens my belief—that if we had gone to war with Turkey for the purpose of enforcing these arrangements, the suffering would have been greater and the war more terrible, and more prolonged, and more serious, even than it has been, because the object was to localize the contest as far as possible, and to prevent that great upset which, if it had occurred, would have led to something in the nature of a general scramble, and would, perhaps, have ended in a European war. Then, it is said—"After the terms proposed by Russia in June, you might strongly have recommended the Porte to accept them." But the Porte would not have done anything of the sort. The Porte, but a few weeks before, refused much more moderate propositions pressed upon her by Europe, and she certainly would not have accepted those of Russia, because she believed in her powers of resistance; and had we pressed those terms upon her, we should have done no good; but should, on the contrary, have lost the only chance of being able, at the proper time, to mediate with advantage. Well, then, we are told there are a great many defects in the arrangements we have made; and, certainly, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich has taken a very different view of this Resolution from that which the proposer took. The noble Lord, in proposing his Resolution, welcomed, upon the whole, the arrangements of the Treaty of Berlin; but the right hon. Gentleman, though, to a certain extent, admitting that the Treaty had done great things, yet took occasion to find fault with every Article in it. His language, in fact, amounted to this—everything that was good in the Treaty was in spite of the Government, and everything that was bad in it was in consequence of the action of the Government. I will not attempt at this time to detain the House by going into details; but the right hon. Gentleman considered that on every question which arose, about which there was a difference of opinion, the influence of the British Plenipotentiaries was given not on the side of freedom, and he gave instances to prove what he said. Well, Sir; but let us consider what the whole position of the British Government had been in the matter. You never would have had this Conference, you never would have had this Treaty, had it not been for the action of the British Government. Allow me to ask whether the arrangements of the San Stefano Treaty were more in the direction of freedom than those of the Treaty of Berlin? Though upon each particular question that arose you may find that the Plenipotentiaries took this or that line, and you may be disposed to question their action, yet you must remember that they had to enforce what was practical against what appeared most attractive on the surface. It must always be borne in mind what has been done by the British Government in bringing about that settlement, as a whole, outweighing altogether the minor questions of detail. I am not at all disposed to admit—though I am as ready as any man to recognize the great faults in the Administration of Turkey—I am not by any means disposed to admit that everything that was done to add to the strength of Turkey, and to place certain populations and territories under the Ottoman Government, was necessarily an action in a direction opposed to freedom. I deny that. I think it is a libel upon the Government of Turkey, so to describe their action. [*Laughter.*] I hear a laugh. Let us take one or two points. In the question of commerce and trade, is Turkey not much more liberal than Russia? In the question of the freedom of religion, is not the Government of Turkey honourably distinguished among those Governments which are contrasted with her? Aye, even in questions of political liberty, Turkey will bear comparison. We do not forget the gallant stand that Turkey made when she protected political refugees from a neighbouring country. Therefore, while I admit, most freely, the evils—the cardinal evils—of the Government of Turkey, I deny that you have a right to speak of her as entirely and necessarily antagonistic to freedom. Then we have had this serious charge made against us —and it is an important point—upon the conduct of the Government with regard to Greece; and on this we have been told many things it is hard to bear. We have been told that England neglected the interests of Greece; that we betrayed the interests of Greece; that we misled Greece; that we prevented Greece from taking the line which it would have been for her interest and her desire to have taken at an earlier period—that, in fact, it was England which disappointed the hopes of Greece. I must say the language which has been used on this point has been at times most painful to listen to; but it has been less painful, because we feel there is no justice in it. We feel, however, we may regard the moderate expression in the noble Lord's Resolution of regret, that we have not found it possible to do something more satisfactory for Greece; but all that was practicable was done; and, as far as we are concerned, we can stand up, and, looking Greece in the face, say—"Not only have we not injured you, but we gave you the best advice for you to follow—advice from which you will reap advantage. It was through taking our advice that you were spared the horrors of a war which would have undoubtedly have inflicted on you the greatest possible suffering, which would have extended the area of conflict, and out of which it is exceedingly doubtful whether you would have derived any advantage at all." We are told that others thought differently, that the French Plenipotentiaries came forward with proposals which others at the Congress would have been prepared to accept if England had not put her veto upon them. I entirely deny that there is any justification for such a statement as that. That the English Plenipotentiaries entertained views, with regard to the impossibility and impracticability of giving Thessaly and Epirus to Greece, is perfectly true; that the English Plenipotentiaries, in private conversations with their Colleagues, represented these matters, I believe is equally true. I have no doubt that in private conversations these views were freely expressed; and I am not disposed to doubt, though I am not aware of the precise information upon which the statement rests, that there may have been occasions upon which our Representatives, or, possibly, one of them, may have in conversation expressed strongly his views of the impracticability of proposals which may have suggested themselves to the minds of the French Plenipotentiaries. I do not dispute the fact; but I say, holding the views Her Majesty's Government and Representatives did, it was perfectly right. I say, it would have been deluding Greece to come forward and make proposals which would after have led to nothing, which would certainly have been refused by Turkey, and which would probably have led to the failure, or to a great reduction, of the labours of the Congress. The feelings of Turkey seem to have been set aside in all these matters; and I think one cardinal error we are apt to fall into, when we are dealing with Turkish questions, is to omit to consider Turkey. Sir, it would have been quite impossible to have attempted to have pressed upon Turkey the arrangement for giving Thessaly and Epirus to Greece—against the will of Turkey—it would hardly have been tolerated. If the French Plenipotentiaries, or anyone else, had said—"If this arrangement is not accepted, we are prepared to enforce it," it would have been a different matter; but it was not so; and if the suggestion was ever entertained, it was in a loose and unpractical form; and when it came to be discussed, such strong objections were urged against it that the Plenipotentiaries held this language. M. Waddington said—

> "With regard to Greece, it is not, of course, the object of the Congress to afford satisfaction to the extravagant aspirations of certain organs of Hellenic opinion; but M. Waddington thinks that it would be an equitable and politic act to annex to her populations which would be for her a source of strength, while they are but one of weakness to Turkey. To accomplish these objects, his Excellency considers it necessary to abstain from exaggerated pretensions. But his Excellency considers it necessary, on the one hand, not to demand from the Porte impossible sacrifices; and, on the other, to appeal to the moderation of Greece."

And, therefore, he made the proposal which was accepted by the Congress, and which had its origin in the suggestion of the British Plenipotentiaries; and what was that proposal? Largely to extend the frontier of Greece, to give Greece more territory, I believe, than is given to any one of the other Powers under the settlement—more than to Servia, Montenegro, or Roumania. I understand that was the case. At all events, it was a large and substantial concession; and, looking at the question from first to last, looking at the advice we gave which was good for her, considering the strong influence which Her Majesty's Government brought to bear on the Government of Turkey to prevent them from attacking Greece, which they were very much tempted to do, considering all that was done and all that was prevented, we cannot look on the case as regards Greece with anything like dissatisfaction. I will not go further into the arrangements with regard to the Treaty of Berlin, but I will say a few words with regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. With regard to that Convention, it had precisely the same object we had in view in the regulations agreed to in the Treaty of Berlin. The object was to assist in maintaining the Turkish Empire, as it would be left after these arrangements, so as to give some hope for its stability and security. It was important that the Empire should be maintained in some strength — it was important that it should be as well governed as circumstances would admit, and it was clear she would be exposed to influences with which she had had to cope before, and which would become much more serious by Turkey being weakened; therefore, there was little hope of a long or durable peace in these Provinces, which would have enabled Turkey to introduce the reforms that are necessary. It is all very well to say that the Government of Turkey is an abominable Government, and the sooner it is got rid of the better; but two questions arise—how is it to be got rid of, by what process, and at what cost? and, secondly, what are you to put in its place? Until these questions can be properly answered, it is our duty and interest to maintain Turkey in as strong a position as practicable, consistently with the good government which may be introduced into her Dominions. It was with that double object that the Anglo-Turkish Convention was concluded. I am asked whether there are any other engagements? There are none. It is perfectly true there have been very confidential communications between the different European Powers on matters of considerable importance; but all the engagements that have been entered into which would bind this country have been disclosed and made known to this House—I speak, of course, excluding provisional agreements made before the Congress. The House is aware that there were such agreements, made with a view to our great object, to insure confidence and bring the deliberations of the Congress to a practical issue. But all that we are bound by is the Anglo-Turkish Convention, now upon the Table. When speaking of these arrangements, we are told we are undertaking that which is really absurd; that we are proposing to attempt to reform a bad Government; that it is out of the question we should do so, and that we do not mean to try. Well, it is not altogether unnatural that some of our critics should be incredulous on this subject, because they probably look back on their own experience. I can assure the House that, though we enter upon the task with no feeling of boastfulness or self-confidence, we do intend and hope that we may succeed in bringing about material improvements in this country. If we are asked—"What is the object we have in view?" or, as the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) puts it—"Do you think it your duty to go and improve the populations of Asia Minor?" my answer is, we do not go simply for the sake of improving the condition of these people, though it would be a very great source of pride and satisfaction to us if we were able to do so; but we make these arrangements with a view to our own interests, with a view to protect the communications between one part of our Empire and another—our communications with India, and to maintain the position we hold in India. We are told we are adding to our responsibilities. I say, we are not adding to them; we are recognizing them. I say it is necessary for us to do so if we would guard the Empire we have in charge. There are those, I believe who think it would be desirable that we should, as quietly and as quickly as we can, retire from the position we hold in India, and contract our Empire to the limits of our own country, and possibly some of our Colonies. It is all very well to hold out such a policy as that. It would be an intelligible policy, and might be approved by a small minority; but it is not one that would be approved by the majority of this House. And if we are to maintain our Empire, we must consider where the dangers are that threaten it, and what necessities there are to guard it. I say these dangers change from time to time, as circumstances change, and it is no use to tell me that some years ago there was no danger. Undoubtedly, the march of Russia against India would not be directed through Asia Minor. That is not the sort of danger one is afraid of. What we are afraid of is the influence of Russia amongst the Indian populations, which might shake the influence of England amongst those populations. We are told the route of Russia towards India is not through Asia Minor, but through Persia and Central Asia. It would only be adjourning the difficulties which we should then have to meet, perhaps at a time when we were less able to cope with them. In the course of this debate we have heard several references to historical parallels. Interesting references have been made to the history of Rome; but I think a more apt parallel might be found in another part of ancient history. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) might have remembered a little more in detail the peculiar circumstances under which the growth of the Macedonian Power commenced. I think there are curious points of parallelism in reference to the early growth of the power of Philip of Macedon. What was the state of Greece at that time? Its greatest military power—Sparta—was for a time paralyzed and weakened. The great maritime Power of Athens was divided by the struggles of parties in her own bosom; she had a small war party, and a large peace party. The latter were men whose views were honourable, no doubt, but of such a character that they shrank from plunging their country into war, and interrupting commercial pursuits, in order to check the growing and advancing ambition of their great Northern neighbour. What happens after that? Philip of Macedon takes one point after another, and then he makes himself champion of the Amphictyonic Council—the great Congress, as it were, of Greece—until at last the Athenians find themselves completely out-generalled and defeated, and they and the liberties of Greece with them are at the mercy of the conqueror. The other day I looked at a great historian of that time, and I cannot help extracting a passage, which I hope the House will forgive me if I read. Mr. Grote says that the people of Athens doubtless had many infirmities, and committed many errors; but the worst error of all—during the years 333-336—was their aversion to the pecuniary efforts required for prosecuting the war against Philip. Then the historian goes on to say—

> "Of the peace party, there were, doubtless, some who acted corruptly; but many others of them, without any taint of personal corruption, espoused the same policy more because they found it easier, for the time being, to administer the city under peace than under war, and because war was burdensome and disagreeable to them, as well as to their fellow-citizens, and because they either did not or would not look forward to the consequences of inaction."

I think the history of that time—and there are other parallel points with which I will not now detain the House—ought not to be lost sight of in the present case. But there is one other matter on which I think it necessary to make a few observations. I have endeavoured to explain to the House the general objects of the Treaty of Berlin and the Anglo-Turkish Convention. But we are challenged not only upon the merits of our policy, but upon the mode in which we have proceeded in bringing that policy to a point. We have had some very ugly words applied to us from time to time; but I think it is better we should take as little notice of those hard words as possible, and I console myself sometimes, when I hear language such as has been freely used against us, with the reflection of a clever French writer, who says that his opponent calls him all sorts of names—an assassin, a thief, an infidel, a heretic, Judas, Cain, and all the rest of it, and then quietly adds—"*Je ne me soucia pas de tout cela; c'est sa façon de dire qu'il n'est pas de mon avis.*" When I hear such immoderate language made use of, I am led to make the same reflection. But, Sir, I gladly own that the noble Lord is a man of a different calibre. It is asked by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) how a Convention which was never submitted to the Congress, and had never received the approval of Europe, was, in the view of the Government, consistent with the declarations it made to Europe? He also wanted to know whether it was admissible for us to assume such a right of interference as we denied to Russia under the arrangement of 1856; and he proceeded to ask how we reconciled our conduct in the matter with the declaration that we made to Europe. There is another point upon which we have been challenged. We have been challenged upon the Agreement which it is well known—and it is no use trying to conceal the fact—was an Agreement made with Russia before we entered into the Congress of Berlin. Upon both of these points I think we stand perfectly clear, and in a position which requires no real justification. With regard to the original Agreement with Russia, my noble Friend the Postmaster General has put the matter in its true light before the House. What was the situation in which we were placed? When my noble Friend the Marquess of Salisbury took the Seals of the Foreign Office, he issued a Circular about which much was said at the time, and concerning which much has been said in this House to-night. In that Circular he pointed out the great objections which England felt to the Treaty of San Stefano; and what happened? In the first place, we had a great amount of approval from those who disapproved of the Treaty of San Stefano, and we also had a great many criticisms from those who objected to the course which Her Majesty's Government had taken. The main criticism upon the Circular was, that it was all very well as a negative piece of criticism, but that its chief fault lay in the fact that it did not point out what we were prepared to accept. That language was used not only by critics in this country, but it was addressed to us by, I think I may say, all the different foreign Governments with whom we were in correspondence. I am not going too far in saying that the Circular of my noble Friend commanded the general approval of all the foreign Governments with whom we were in communication, and every one of those Governments more or less directly said to us—"You have done very well so far; but go a little further, and let us know what it is you mean to do?" I will here, with the permission of the House, quote the opinion of my noble Friend the Earl of Derby on this point. I quote my noble Friend's expression of opinion upon this subject with the greater satisfaction, because it is contained in a speech printed and circulated by "The Eastern Question Association," with a view to show what the course of England ought to have been in the matter, and that the course actually taken was wrong. When that Association meets with a passage in a speech which particularly commends itself to them, they put it into extra large type. This opinion of the Earl of Derby is treated in that manner—

> "Now, my observation is that a Conference or Congress is a very convenient agency for putting on record in the most formal manner international decisions which have already been come to in substance; and in these days, when we can ask a question and get an answer from the furthest end of Europe within 24 hours, it is just as easy to ascertain opinion, and almost as easy to conduct negotiations, outside a Congress as within. If I had to deal with the matter, I should endeavour to keep the Congress alive, saying and doing nothing to prevent its ultimate meeting, but letting it stand over until the way was smoothed by private and separate negotiations between the Powers concerned."

And further on he says—

> "I should have placed our views directly before the Russian Government, and discussed them point by point. The opinions of other Governments would not have been difficult to obtain. On many points we have got them already, and I think that many of the results of a Congress might be attained without the rather cumbersome machinery of a Congress itself."

That is exactly what we were doing. We addressed ourselves to the various Powers, and not to Russia alone. There were communications going on between Her Majesty's Government and the various Powers as to matters that would have to be discussed in the Congress. Undoubtedly, if we had gone into the Congress without any understanding with any Power, and without knowing what such Power was going to say, in the first place, a great deal of time would have been wasted, and, in the second place, the Congress would certainly have broken up, and the result would have been—I need not say what. Therefore, the course which we took was a perfectly legitimate and fair one, and one which it was important we—as having a great object in view—should take. No complaint has been made with regard to that course, except in this country. There was no complaint that we were dealing in any way unfairly by the Congress. All these questions were fully and freely discussed in the Congress, although it was perfectly well understood that, on certain points, there was an Agreement between England and Russia, and that we should not break up the Congress, and go to war. We did not by that abandon our liberty of discussion. On the contrary, we expressly reserved it. It was perfectly well understood that we reserved our liberty of discussion; and, on more than one point, we succeeded in obtaining modifications. Then we are told there is something extraordinary, something unprecedented, something very mean and shabby, in going into Congress with arrangements and agreements already made between some of the parties. That observation is applied not only to this arrangement with Russia, but also to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. I say there is nothing extraordinary, nothing unprecedented, nothing not entirely justified by the precedents of former times. I could easily give cases, from the days of the Treaty of Vienna, and other times; but I go to a later period. I take the year 1856, and I go to the arrangement of the Congress of Paris; and I ask whether it was not the case that France, Austria, and England went into that Congress with a private arrangement between them already made? And we have executed and ratified a separate Treaty very similar, though, of course, with some small difference, to that of which we are now speaking. They made the Tripartite Treaty and Guarantee while the Congress was still proceeding, and they never communicated it to the Congress, nor to the British Parliament until after it had been ratified. Our course has been directly in accordance with precedent, and I say that we adopted an understood and perfectly legitimate mode of carrying on diplomatic transactions. But I do not like to stand on mere questions of form. I say that, in point of substance, it was perfectly well known to the other Powers that England stood in a different position from those Powers in respect of Asiatic questions. From repeated communications we had with them, it was understood from the first what the feelings of other nations were, and also that they were well aware of ours. It was perfectly well understood that we were not to look for assistance from other countries in bringing about a settlement as to the Asiatic conquests of Russia, and that in that matter we must stand alone. They were willing to consult with us on the questions of Bulgaria and the Dardanelles; but in respect of the Asiatic question, we had no assistance whatever from them. On the part of Russia, also, we found that she was unwilling to listen to proposals for the relinquishment of her conquests in Asia; and, under these circumstances, it was right and proper, and I venture to say it was not only right, but it was to be expected, we should look after our own interests, and should make arrangements by which we should do for Turkey in Asia what the other Powers were doing for Turkey in Europe. It is all very well to say that our only object was to get possession of Cyprus, and, at the same time, to inform us that Cyprus is a burdensome and not a profitable possession. I do not say that it is going to be anything but a burden, in the sense in which you use the term. But the object we had in view was to maintain Turkey in Asia strong enough to guard the passages that were required to be guarded, and it was necessary that we should come to some arrangement with the Porte which would give us a right and a voice in the matter. It is all very well to say we need not have given a guarantee. But we wanted to show the Porte that it might rely upon us, and in that way we got a lever to enable us to induce the Porte to make such reforms as we may agree upon. No doubt, we asked for Cyprus partly with a military object, partly because we found it was important for us, if we should ever have occasion to place troops in the Levant, to find a station better and more convenient than Malta. But the main point we had in view was the safeguarding of the Asiatic Possessions of Turkey, and in order to do so, it was perfectly obvious and necessary that we should do our best towards the improvement of their Administration. How are we to do that? I admit that it is a difficult task; but we have undertaken it, and we have undertaken it soberly and seriously and in earnest, and we do not believe it is impossible. I do not say that in the course of six months or a year you can produce in that country perfect tranquillity, and establish a Constitution and immaculate Government. No, Sir; there are difficulties, and great difficulties, which have to be met, and which it will take time to eradicate. What is one of the great causes of that difficulty? It is the weakness of the Porte, not its malice or evil-mindedness. It is therefore necessary that you should strengthen the Empire of Turkey materially and morally. You must do honour to the Sultan as a Sovereign, while adopting, at one and the same time, the best and firmest measures to enable further reforms to be carried out. About those reforms there is no great mystery. They relate to the revenue system, to the judicial and the police system; and I think there will be no great difficulty in finding men who will assist in making the improvements which we want to introduce. I maintain it would be absurd, wrong, and obviously futile, for me to enter into details on such a subject at the present time. We have not these details cut and dried, although we have clear ideas as to the kind of reforms which we wish to see carried into effect. The revenue system is, perhaps, the first point upon which a Government and people must come into contact; and, therefore, demands the first attention. But there are other matters as important, to which I need not now particularly refer. This, however, I may say—that if we fail in this great task, it will not be for want of entering upon it with a determination to do our part to fulfil it. We feel that it is a task which, in India, has not overstrained the administrative capacity of Englishmen, and we think we may rely upon such men as those who have created that great Empire to do everything in their power to aid us. I earnestly trust that in the work we are about to undertake we shall have, not only the support of the Sultan and the Government of Turkey, but also the moral support and cordial goodwill of other nations who are equally interested with ourselves in maintaining good government and tranquillity in these possessions. We do not occupy this position in rivalry with, or to the exclusion of, any other Power; but for purposes that are of common value to all, and in which we hope to be regarded only as the pioneers of civilization. I hope, Sir, that in this great task we may be sustained and cheered by that which is, after all, the greatest support of British Ministers—I mean the confidence and support of our own countrymen.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Sir, I ask the House to acquit me of any egotism if, at a time and under circumstances so unusual, I interpose. Hon. Gentlemen opposite may, at all events, take into account for me that they have just had the supreme advantage of a speech in their behalf, delivered from these Benches, with his accustomed eloquence and ability, by the Leader of that Irish Party to which it is my honour and pride to belong. That speech creates for me the necessity which I plead as my excuse, when I ask to be allowed in a few brief sentences to vindicate the vote I am about to give, and to vindicate as far as I may that land whose voice has never been given against liberty. This is the first vote I shall have given on any of the many issues raised in this House on the Eastern Question throughout two years. Like my Irish Colleagues, I have shrunk from whatever appeared like mere Party manœuvres, and to-night I speak as no partizan. I may say now, as I said last year, there are no men in this House who can hold the scales of judgment more impartially and independently on this question than Irish Members. For as none here can feel as we do against Russia as one of the destroyers of Poland, so we who have known what it is to suffer can also feel, as few others may, for subject Christian races groaning under a Moslem yoke. From that independent position I judge this issue to-night; and I, for one, shall not support the Vote of Confidence in Government proposed by my eloquent countryman opposite, the hon. and learned Member for Dublin University (Mr. Plunket). I do not say—I do not believe—that the Government have been as often wrong in this matter as their hostile critics of the Liberal Party have from time to time alleged. On many of those points I thought the Government right, and entitled to praise and support; pre-eminently so in their demand that the Treaty of San Stefano should be laid in its entirety before Europe. And to-night, in so far as they adopt and stand by the Treaty of Berlin, I would give them my vote of approval. In so far as that Treaty has followed the lines of the San Stefano Treaty, as substantially it does, I hail it as a great public good; the effectuation of a blessed work of redemption and liberty. [*Cheers.*] Ah! I missed that word from the speech of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt). I felt a sort of pride when I heard those rapturous cheers with which the Government Benches hailed his every sentence, as far as those cheers could be thought to be homage to his genius and ability. I wished they were given to him when, with still more glorious eloquence, he pleads the cause of Ireland to a silent and hostile array. But to-night, his voice was all of Britain's greatness and Britain's glory; of Russia's acquisitions and lust of territory. Russia's lust of territory, indeed! Had he no word to say of England's? As I listened to his quotations describing Russia's annexations, I almost fancied it was a page from the history of British rule in India, or a passage from the impeachment of Warren Hastings. I call upon my hon. and learned Friend to say, in the face of the country, if England is the Power to appear as Russia's accuser, or anyone's accuser, as an annexationist? But we are not to be deceived by the pretence that this is a mere question of Russia or Turkey. My hon. and learned Friend put it so, but it will not do. We may hate Russian annexation as much as he, and yet give all our sympathy and aid to the work of salvation and liberation in South-Eastern Europe. Why did my hon. and learned Friend, when arguing as if we must needs have Turkish rule or else Russian rule—why did he not deal with the other and true alternative—namely, that of independent or semi-independent States or Principalities? Would this be to favour Russian aggrandizement? Just contemplate actual facts; judge by what has happened before our eyes. Roumania is free. Is Roumania Russian? Why, Sir, so far from that, if she had not been deserted by England, and repulsed by Europe, Roumania would the other day have measured swords with that same Russia. So with Herzegovina, with Bosnia, with Montenegro, so with the new Bulgaria. Ah, Sir! it is but trying to play on our feelings of antipathy to Russia, this endeavour to make it all a choice only between Turkish rule and Russian rule. I tell my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick, he has not faced the real substance and meaning of the question before us. There is in all this business the gigantic issue of liberty or slavery for millions of the Christian race. For my part, I bless the work that has been so far done. Does he rejoice that we hail in this hour the appearance of a new member of the European family? A new State has been born, and terrible has been its baptism of blood and fire. Has he no word of cheer for this child of liberty, young Bulgaria? And if, indeed, he rejoices—if hon. Gentlemen do really rejoice, and do not secretly grieve, at this much of what the Berlin Treaty has confirmed, whom have we to thank for such a glorious work? By the price of whose blood and treasure has this work of liberty been accomplished? Not by yours. Would that it had been. It might have been so; but you would not. Whose sword, then, must my hon. and learned Friend and myself thank for this? Why, the sword of that Russia which he rises here to assail; not the sword of that England of whose glories he is so tender. I can tell him that often ere now even despotic Powers have been the agencies of liberty. It was so when, joining this same Russia, England and France 50 years ago broke the fetters of Greece—yea, Turkish fetters; and I invite my hon. and learned Friend to name, if he can, a European war that England entered on, for 80 years, in which the heart of Ireland went with her save and except those two occasions on which, in Greece and in Syria, at the call of chivalrous Christian France, England struck the Turkish Power. And now, by the secret Convention of June, you have, on the one hand, sold yourselves to be the prop and mainstay of this Power; and, on the other hand, set the evil example of annexation. ["No, no!" "yes, yes!"] You guarantee Turkey in Asia on Turkish promises of reform. We have had all this before, and what came of your Guarantees of Turkish authority on condition of reform? Why, that the reform went to sleep, and your Guarantee merely upheld the old *régime* of corruption, tyranny, and fraud. And this is what must go on from age to age, forsooth, because we dislike Russia. Yes, I, too, abhor some deeds of Russia; but who else has been the friend of the Christian races in the East? My hon. and learned Friend appealed to our religious emotions, as if Catholics must necessarily side with Turkish rule. I would remind him that it was the voice and the influence of a Catholic Pope that gave to European history the victory of Lepanto. Whatever historic associations we, as Irishmen and Catholics, possess in Eastern affairs, are all—thank God!—on the side of the Cross, not the Crescent. The last man of my name, one in whom perished the chieftainship of an Irish clan, fell sword in hand on the ramparts of Belgrade. The memory of the gallant Pole, John Sobieski, has not faded from the world. Yes, Sir, all our associations, as Irishmen and as Catholics alike, are with the cause in which those men fell. The blood they poured on that Eastern soil is avenged to-day. May we not say it bears rich fruit in the resurrection of the Christian flag which waves over free Bulgaria?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I know the House, after four nights' debate, is anxious for a division; and at this hour of the morning I should have felt disposed, under ordinary circumstances, to waive the privilege I possess of making a reply upon the whole debate, had it not been for one omission which I unfortunately made in my speech on Monday, and which has so often been referred to. Therefore, I could not altogether pass it by without giving rise to some misinterpretation. It was observed by my hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke), that I made no reference to the Prerogative, and my hon. Friend immediately attributed that omission to the proper cause; and, although the more ingenious intellect of some hon. and right hon. Gentlemen have discovered other reasons, the explanation of the omission is the one suggested by the hon. Gentleman. The fact is, I intended among the other subjects which, imperfectly, as I am aware, I brought before the House, to mention that question of Prerogative; but, owing to the multiplicity of subjects under my attention, the few sentences I intended to devote to it entirely escaped my recollection. In alluding to it now, I will not detain the House for any length. Sir, I do not for a moment deny—I do not think it possible to deny—the right of the Crown, on the advice of responsible Ministers, to do certain acts, and to conclude Treaties. It is quite unnecessary for hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite to argue at great length to show that that has been on all occasions the practice. That I entirely admit. But what appears to me is this—that the successful working of our Constitution depends to a very great degree—I may say mainly—on no one of the powers of the Constitution being over-strained. In my opinion, the Constitutional right of the Crown has been unduly strained by the exercise of it upon this occasion. Well, Sir, it is said that Treaties have been entered into without the knowledge of Parliament, and among the cases which have been put forward, there is none which has been more frequently alluded to than the Tripartite Treaty of 1856. Sir, I maintain the circumstances of all these Treaties to which reference has been made are entirely different to the circumstances under which this Treaty has been made. I will not go into a number of cases; but take the Treaty of 1856. Parliament and the country were perfectly aware with what objects the war with Russia had been entered upon, and they knew the main points which the Plenipotentiaries had to consider at Paris. Parliament and the country knew that the war had been fought for the maintenance of the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, and they also knew that the Plenipotentiaries in Paris were endeavouring to conclude a Treaty which should give final effect to the object for which the war had been waged. The Tripartite Treaty was a means for obtaining the object for which we went to war—in fact, it was a continuation and execution of a policy perfectly well understood and approved. But what is the case now? We have been told over and over again—we have been told especially by the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon)—that this is the initiation of a new policy. But I doubt whether—and I have good reason to doubt—it is any policy at all, and that it is really nothing more than a temporary expedient. What is the policy which, up to the present time, Her Majesty's Government have been pursuing, and which has had the assent of Parliament? It has been a policy of neutrality in the war with Turkey; it has been a policy of abandonment of the principle of preserving the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire—in fact, it has been a policy of strict neutrality, with certain reservations as to certain specified points—a policy of leaving Turkey to her fate. But in this Convention, we have the beginning of a policy of a totally different character—we have, in a revived condition, the policy abandoned in Europe. We have, in this, every previous proceeding of the Government reversed. If any observations were necessary to show how unexpected and how unnecessary this policy was, I have only to refer to the astonishment and excitement caused, both in this House and in the country, by the announcement of this Treaty. Sir, I say this Treaty has been concluded under circumstances totally different to those under which any other Treaty has been concluded. Although I do not say it would have been necessary that the Government should have laid that Treaty upon the Table, yet I do say, after a declaration of policy made to the House and the people, before they embarked on a totally different policy, the House might have been and ought to have been consulted. I say there has been a straining of the Prerogative of the Crown in this matter, and I venture to say that in time to come it will be far more difficult than it has hitherto been to maintain that practice of the Prerogative of the Crown. Now, Sir, I feel that there have been one or two remarkable omissions in the course of this debate to which I must call the attention of the House. We have been addressed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Treaty of Berlin generally, and more especially with regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. Sir, we have been addressed by the Home Secretary, we have been addressed by the President of the Board of Trade; but we have not been addressed on the subject of the military and naval obligations in which the Anglo-Turkish Convention involves us. It is somewhat remarkable that we have not been addressed either by the Secretary of State for War, or by the First Lord of the Admiralty, nor by the Under Secretary of State for India. Sir, I think it would have been of interest to the House to hear from one of those authorities in what way the acquisition of the Island of Cyprus adds either to our military or naval power? I think it would have been desirable if we had been answered by some of those Gentlemen as to points urged frequently in the course of this debate as to the nature, the extent, and the possibility of our meeting the onerous engagements we have assumed in respect to the protection of Turkey against Russia. But not one word have we heard in explanation of these matters. Then there is another important fact on which no explanation has been made by the Government. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) called very especial attention to the declaration which was made by Lord Salisbury, the present Foreign Secretary, a little more than a year ago, on the subject of our position in regard to Asia Minor and Armenia. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not touch upon that part of the question at all. He did not explain the reasons which had induced Lord Salisbury to make so total and complete a change in his opinions on that subject in the course of 12 months. I cannot help arriving at the conclusion—and I think the House will be disposed to do the same—that this is not a deliberate policy on the part of the Government, that this is not the policy which occurred to the Government this time last year, but it is a policy which has occurred to them simply in order to carry off the failure of all the professions they have made, and to induce the country to accept a result so different from that which they were led to expect from the Berlin Congress. There has been no other explanation of this extraordinary change given by the Government; and in the absence of that explanation, I cannot come to any other conclusion than that this policy is not the result of conviction, but only a makeshift to avoid what would either appear to be a diplomatic defeat or the waste of a great deal of unnecessary preparation that was made.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 195; Noes 338: Majority 143.

AYES.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Allen, W. S.
Anderson, G.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Backhouse, E.
Balfour, Sir G.
Barclay, A. C.
Barclay, J. W.
Barran, J.
Bass, A.
Bass, H.
Baxter, rt. hn. W. E.
Bazley, Sir T.
Beaumont, Colonel F.
Bell, I. L.
Blake, T.
Blennerhassett, R. P.
Brassey, H. A.
Brassey, T.
Briggs, W. E.
Bright, J. (Manchester)
Bristowe, S. B.
Brocklehurst, W. C.
Brogden, A.
Bruce, Lord C.
Burt, T.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, Sir G.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Cave, T.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Chadwick, D.
Chamberlain, J.
Chambers, Sir T.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Cholmeley, Sir H.
Clarke, J. C.
Clifford, C. C.
Cole, H. T.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collins, E.
Colman, J. J.
Corbett, J.
Cotes, C. C.
Courtney, L. H.
Cowan, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Cross, J. K.
Davies, D.
Davies, R.
Delahunty, J.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Duff, M. E. G.
Duff, R. W.
Dundas, J. C.
Earp, T.
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Admiral hn. F.
Fawcett, H.
Ferguson, R.
Fitzwilliam, hon. C. W. W.
Fletcher, I.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, Sir C.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, W. H.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Gordon, Lord D.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gourley, E. T.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grant, A.
Grey, Earl de
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Hankey, T.
Harcourt, Sir W. V.
Harrison, C.
Harrison, J. F.
Hartington, Marq. of
Havelock, Sir H.
Hayter, A. D.
Henry, M.
Herschell, F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hill, T. R.
Holms, J.
Holms, W.
Hopwood, C. H.
Howard, hon. C.
Howard, E. S.
Hughes, W. B.
Hutchinson, J. D.
Ingram, W. J.
Jackson, Sir H. M.
James, Sir H.
James, W. H.
Jenkins, D. J.
Jenkins, E.
Johnstone, Sir H.
Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir U.
Kingscote, Colonel
Knatchbull-Hugessen, rt. hon. E.
Laing, S.
Law, rt. hon. H.
Lawrence, Sir J. C.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leatham, E. A.
Leeman, G.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Leith, J. F.
Lloyd, M.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Lush, Dr.
Lusk, Sir A.
Macdonald, A.
Macduff, Viscount
M'Arthur, A.
M'Arthur, W.
M'Laren, D.
Maitland, J.
Marjoribanks, Sir D. C.
Marling, S. S.
Massey, rt. hon. W. N.
Meldon, C. H.
Middleton, Sir A. E.
Milbank, F. A.
Monk, C. J.
Morgan, G. O.
Morley, S.
Mundella, A. J.
Muntz, P. H.
Murphy, N. D.
Noel, E.
Nolan, Major
Norwood, C. M.
O'Conor, D. M.
Palmer, C. M.
Palmer, G.
Parker, C. S.
Peel, A. W.
Pender, J.
Pennington, F.
Perkins, Sir F.
Philips, R. N.
Playfair, rt. hon. L.
Plimsoll, S.
Portman, hon. W. H. B.
Potter, T. B.
Ralli, P.
Ramsay, J.
Rathbone, W.
Richard, H.
Roberts, J.
Robertson, H.
Russell, Lord A.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H.
Sheil, E.
Sheridan, H. B.
Simon, Mr. Serjeant
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Smyth, P. J.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stanton, A. J.
Stewart, J.
Stuart, Colonel
Sullivan, A. M.
Swanston, A.
Tavistock, Marquess of

Taylor, P. A.
Temple, right hon. W. Cowper-
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, G. O.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Waddy, S. D.
Waterlow, Sir S. H.
Weguelin, T. M.
Whitbread, S.
Whitwell, J.
Whitworth, B.
Williams, B. T.
Williams, W.
Wilson, C.
Wilson, I.
Wilson, Sir M.
Young, A. W.

TELLERS.

Adam, rt. hn. W. P.
Kensington, Lord

## NOES.

Agnew, R. V.
Alexander, Colonel
Allcroft, J. D.
Allen, Major
Allsopp, C.
Allsopp, H.
Anstruther, Sir W.
Arbuthnot, Lt.-Col. G.
Archdale, W. H.
Arkwright, A. P.
Arkwright, F.
Ashbury, J. L.
Assheton, R.
Astley, Sir J. D.
Bagge, Sir W.
Balfour, A. J.
Barne, F. St. J. N.
Barrington, Viscount
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bates, E.
Bateson, Sir T.
Beach, rt. hon. Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bective, Earl of
Benett-Stanford, V. F.
Bentinck, rt. hon. G. C.
Bentinck, G. W. P.
Beresford, Lord C.
Beresford, G. De la P.
Beresford, Colonel M.
Birley, H.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Boord, T. W.
Bourke, hon. R.
Bourne, Colonel
Bowyer, Sir G.
Brise, Colonel R.
Broadley, W. H. H.
Brooks, M.
Brooks, W. C.
Bruce, hon. T.
Bruen, H.
Brymer, W. E.
Burrell, Sir W. W.
Butt, I.
Buxton, Sir R. J.
Cameron, D.
Campbell, C.
Cartwright, F.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, rt. hon. S.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaplin, Colonel E.
Charley, W. T.
Christie, W. L.
Clive, Col. hon. G. W.
Close, M. C.
Clowes, S. W.
Cobbold, T. C.
Cochrane, A. D. W. R. B.
Cole, Col. hon. H. A.
Coope, O. E.
Cordes, T.
Corry, hon. H. W. L.
Corry, J. P.
Cotton, W. J. R.
Cowen, J.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, rt. hon. R. A.
Cubitt, G.
Cuninghame, Sir W.
Cust, H. C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, C.
Dalway, M. R.
Davenport, W. B.
Deedes, W.
Denison, C. B.
Denison, W. B.
Denison, W. E.
Dick, F.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Douglas, Sir G.
Drax, J. S. W. S. E.
Duff, J.
Dunbar, J.
Dyott, Colonel R.
Eaton, H. W.
Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, Sir G.
Elliot, G. W.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H.
Emlyn, Viscount
Errington, G.
Estcourt, G. S.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, A. O.
Fellowes, E.
Finch, G. H.
Floyer, J.
Folkestone, Viscount
Forester, C. T. W.
Foster, W. H.
Fraser, Sir W. A.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Freshfield, C. K.
Galway, Viscount
Gardner, J. T. Agg-
Gardner, R. Richardson-
Garnier, J. C.
Gathorne-Hardy, hn. A.
Gathorne-Hardy, hn. S.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.
Giffard, Sir H. S.
Giles, A.
Gilpin, Sir R. T.
Goddard, A. L.
Goldney, G.
Gooch, Sir D.
Gordon, W.
Gore-Langton, W. S.
Gorst, J. E.
Goulding, W.
Grantham, W.
Greenall, Sir G.
Greene, E.
Gregory, G. B.
Guinness, Sir A.
Hall, A. W.
Halsey, T. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hamilton, hon. R. B.
Hamond, C. F.
Hanbury, R. W.
Harcourt, E. W.
Hardcastle, E.
Harvey, Sir R. B.
Hay, rt. hn. Sir J. C. D.
Heath, R.
Helmsley, Viscount
Herbert, hon. S.
Hermon, E.
Hervey, Lord F.
Heygate, W. U.
Hick, J.
Hildyard, T. B. T.
Hinchingbrook, Visc.
Holford, J. P. G.
Holker, Sir J.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Holt, J. M.
Home, Captain
Hood, Captain hon. A. W. A. N.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hubbard, E.
Hubbard, rt. hon. J.
Isaac, S.
Jervis, Colonel
Johnson, J. G.
Johnstone, Sir F.
Jolliffe, hon. S.
Jones, J.
Kennard, Colonel
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knowles, T.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Lambert, N. G.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Learmonth, A.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lee, Major V.
Legard, Sir C.
Legh, W. J.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Leslie, Sir J.
Lewis, C. E.
Lewis, O.
Lewisham, Viscount
Lindsay, Col. R. L.
Lloyd, S.
Lloyd, T. E.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, rt. hon. J.
Macartney, J. W. E.
Mac Iver, D.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Majendie, L. A.
Makins, Colonel
Malcolm, J. W.
Mandeville, Viscount
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
March, Earl of
Marten, A. G.
Master, T. W. C.
Merewether, C. G.
Miles, Sir P. J. W.
Mills, A.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Monckton, F.
Montgomerie, R.
Montgomery, Sir G. G.
Moore, A.
Moray, Colonel H. D.
Morgan, hon. F.
Morris, G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Mulholland, J.
Muncaster, Lord
Naghten, Lt.-Colonel
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Noel, rt. hon. G. J.
North, Colonel
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
O'Beirne, Major
O'Byrne, W. R.
O'Donnell, F. H.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Gorman, P.
O'Leary, W.
O'Neill, hon. E.
Onslow, D.
O'Shaughnessy, R.
Paget, R. H.
Palk, Sir L.
Parker, Lt.-Col. W.
Peek, Sir H.
Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Pennant, hon. G.
Peploe, Major
Percy, Earl
Phipps, P.
Pim, Captain B.
Plunket, hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. R.
Polhill-Turner, Capt.
Powell, W.
Power, R.
Praed, C. T.
Praed, H. B.
Price, Captain

Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, H. C.
Read, C. S.
Repton, G. W.
Ridley, E.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ripley, H. W.
Ritchie, C. T.
Rodwell, B. B. H.
Roebuck, J. A.
Rothschild, Sir N. M. de
Round, J.
Russell, Sir C.
Ryder, G. R.
Salt, T.
Samuda, J. D'A.
Sanderson, T. K.
Sandon, Viscount
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scott, M. D.
Selwin - Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Shirley, S. E.
Shute, General
Sidebottom, T. H.
Simonds, W. B.
Smith, A.
Smith, F. C.
Smith, rt. hn. W. H.
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Lord H. R. C.
Spinks, Mr. Serjeant
Stanhope, hon. E.
Stanhope, W. T. W. S.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Starkey, L. R.
Starkie, J. P. C.
Steere, L.
Stewart, M. J.
Storer, G.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Taylor, rt. hon. Col.
Tennant, R.
Thornhill, T.
Thwaites, D.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Tollemache, hon. W. F.
Torr, J.
Tremayne, J.
Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-
Turnor, E.
Verner, E. W.
Wait, W. K.
Walker, O. O.
Walker, T. E.
Wallace, Sir R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S.
Walsh, hon. A.
Warburton, P. E.
Ward, M. F.
Watson, rt. hon. W.
Welby-Gregory, Sir W.
Wellesley, Colonel
Wethered, T. O.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.
Whitelaw, A.
Whitworth, W.
Williams, Sir F. M.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Wilmot, Sir J. E.
Wilson, W.
Wolff, Sir H. D.
Woodd, B. T.
Wroughton, P.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, Sir W. W.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Yarmouth, Earl of
Yeaman, J.
Yorke, hon. E.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.
Dyke, Sir W. H.
Winn, R.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that he had an Amendment on the Paper to the effect that no territory in Europe should be restored to Turkey without at least the guarantee of administrative autonomy deemed necessary by the Conference of Constantinople; but as it had been so completely adopted by the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, he hoped the Government would accept it. He would take that opportunity of saying that he had voted for the Motion of the noble Lord, and he wished to explain, as he did not have the opportunity of making a speech before the division, that he did so upon a somewhat different basis than that stated by the noble Lord.

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

*Resolved,* That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learnt with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire.

To be presented by Privy Councillors.

## EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL—[*Lords.*]

(*The Lord Advocate.*)

[BILLS 156-292.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 4, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Regulation as to employment of child under 10, and certificate of knowledge being condition of employment of child over 10).

MR. RAMSAY moved, as an Amendment, in page 1, lines 20 and 21, to leave out "thirteen," and insert "fourteen." It would have the effect of making the limit of age the same as that in the Factory Act.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL observed, that in England, 13 was the rule, and he objected to its being made different in Scotland.

MR. RAMSAY said, that the only object was to assimilate the ages with those of the Factory Act.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Restriction on casual employment of children).

On the Motion of MR. RAMSAY, Amendment made in page 2, line 4, to leave out "thirteen," and insert "fourteen."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Exception to prohibition of employment of children).

MR. RAMSAY moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, line 14, to leave out "two," and insert "three." The object of the Amendment was to make it necessary that schools should be within three, instead of two, miles' distance of children.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that this was another Amendment that he thought should be more fully discussed before it was passed.

THE LORD ADVOCATE stated, that the matter had been considered by the Government, and that after very careful consideration they had adopted the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Definition of employment in case of parent).

MR. C. S. PARKER asked, if he rightly understood that under the clause persons would be liable to imprisonment for any period not exceeding 14 days?

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that the object of imprisonment as directed by the Bill was to punish a person for not sending his children to school.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 9 to 17, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 18 (Teachers may be appointed for fixed periods not exceeding five years. Removal of such teachers).

MR. GRANT DUFF moved, as an Amendment, in page 5, line 22, to leave out the words "Latin, Greek, modern languages," and insert—

"The language, literature, and history of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, of France, Germany, and the other principal European countries, Latin and Greek."

THE LORD ADVOCATE was afraid that he could not assent to the Amendment, and for this reason, that the words used in the section were at present sufficient to define the class of schools to which it was intended to apply.

MR. GRANT DUFF said, that the Amendment had been pressed upon him very much by schoolmasters, who considered it right that the alteration should be made; and that, as under the present Act, the study of English should not be placed at a great disadvantage. They considered that it was very objectionable that people should be led to suppose that the study of Latin and Greek took higher rank for the purpose of school instruction than the study of English. At that late hour it was impossible to go into the arguments on the subject, but he was prepared to argue the matter at considerable length.

THE LORD ADVOCATE remarked that the words of the present clause, which were the same as those used in the Act of 1872, were sufficiently comprehensive to include all the branches of education which the hon. Member desired.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, if the Amendment was to have real practical effect, he would heartily support it; but if it was a mere question of words, he thought it was scarcely worth while to press it.

MR. GRANT DUFF said, after the expressions of opinion he had heard, he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause A (Expenses of higher class school buildings may be paid out of school fund and charged on rates).

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR moved, as an Amendment, in page 5, line 15, after "management," to insert—

"And shall be empowered to pay from the school fund such other expenses for the promotion of efficient education in the said school as are not provided for by the revenues stated in section sixty-two of the principal Act: Provided, That no expenditure under this section shall be incurred without the consent of the Scotch Education Department."

MR. J. W. BARCLAY objected to the Amendment, the object of which would be to have higher education paid for out of the public rates. He was quite prepared, in so far as the Bill went, to allow school boards to maintain schools out of the public rates; but there was strong objection to going beyond that. Great complaints had already been made about the school rates which had been levied. If they were going to endow higher education it should be in the form of exhibitions, and such like; and not by reducing, at the public expense, the cost of education to those who were able to pay for it.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR could not understand the objection to the Amendment, which he thought would have been assented to at once. The principal Act intended to promote very much the education of the higher schools; but on its being worked out, it was found that these schools had been deprived of the support which was intended for them. Almost all the chief schools boards in Scotland desired to have the power which the clause would confer upon them, and he was equally sure the opinion of the country favoured it.

Mr. MARK STEWART supported the Amendment, in favour of which a strong feeling prevailed in Scotland.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL supported the Amendment. It was quite as important to have efficient secondary schools as it was to provide efficient elementary schools.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, if the Amendment were embodied in the Bill, it would provide for the education of the rich as well as the poor coming out of the public rates in Scotland. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had advocated the establishment of secondary schools at the expense of the rates, and if that were agreed to, there would be a secondary as well as primary school in every parish. Already, the expenses on the ratepayers were very great in consequence of the Education Act, and he knew there was considerable feeling on the subject in the country. He agreed in education being extended to certain classes by means of the rates; but he objected to any money being applied for the purpose of educating the children of those who could afford to pay for their instruction.

The LORD ADVOCATE did not in any way object to the Amendment. He thought it was quite out of the question to say that its intention was to establish throughout Scotland secondary schools. The intention of the Amendment seemed to him to be quite plain, and that was to enable school boards to render effective secondary high-class schools.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR approved of the Amendment, because it was surrounded with such safeguards, that abuses in respect to burdensome charges on the ratepayers without restriction, were nearly impracticable. He, therefore, hoped the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) would not divide against it.

Mr. RAMSAY said, there was no one more anxious than himself to see higher education placed within the reach of all classes; but he was not certain that the object of the Amendment would be understood in Scotland as securing that end. He thought it would be much better to withdraw the Amendment until another Session of Parliament; and then when the people of Scotland had had an opportunity of understanding its intention, it could, if necessary, be brought forward again.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Mr. J. STEWART moved the following new Clause:—

(School Boards may unite.)

"It shall be lawful for any one or more School Boards, whether of parishes or of burghs, with the sanction of the Scotch Education Department, to unite with any other School Board or School Boards, whether of parishes or burghs, for the purposes of the principal Act and this Act, and in the event of an agreement to unite being so come to the localities represented by the boards so agreeing to unite shall from and after the general election of a School Board next ensuing after such agreement cease to have separate School Boards, and shall be united into one school district and shall have a School Board accordingly."

He hoped the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate would see his way to accept the proposal, which was that, in certain cases, school boards, if they thought necessary, might unite. The principal Act gave power to a parish school board to absorb a burgh school board; but a burgh school board could not absorb a parish school board. The clause was intended to meet the latter case.

The LORD ADVOCATE did not disagree with the hon. Member when he said that there were cases for which it might be desirable to provide a power for union. But he did not by any means believe that the boards themselves should have the power of deciding whether they would unite. That was a matter for the consideration of the ratepayers.

Mr. J. STEWART said, that as he understood the right hon. and learned Gentleman to accept the proposal, he had no objection to withdraw the clause and to bring it up in an amended form.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. J. STEWART moved to insert the following Clause:—

(Removal of doubt as to right of schoolmaster to the franchise.)

"Whereas doubts have arisen as to the right of a teacher of a public school under a School Board, who holds office at the pleasure of the Board, and who occupies as part of the emoluments of his office any lands or heritages under the School Board, to be registered as a voter and to vote at elections for a Member or Members of Parliament, in respect of the qualification afforded by such lands and heritages: And whereas it is expedient that such doubts should be removed, Be it enacted, That it shall be no objection to the name of any such teacher being placed on the register of voters for the burgh or county within which such lands or heritages are situate, that the lands or heritages occupied by him, and on which his claim to the franchise rests, are held as part of the emoluments of his office, and at the pleasure of the School Board."

He was willing to agree to the alteration of words proposed by the hon. Member for the Wigton Burghs — namely, to substitute the words "lands or heritages" for "dwelling house."

The CHAIRMAN said, the clause was not in Order, and could not be moved.

DR. CAMERON said, that it had been understood that after the introduction of this Bill, all schoolmasters would obtain the franchise.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY hoped the Government would make some provision for granting the franchise to schoolmasters. Possibly, the words of the clause were not the best that could be devised; but some amendment of the Bill might be sufficient for the purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that it appeared to him that a clause dealing with the franchise would not be in Order in an education measure.

MR. RAMSAY said, that the Committee would like to be informed whether it would be possible, at any time during the progress of the Bill, to have such a clause as this inserted? Undoubtedly, it was understood that this clause would be accepted; and he felt that, when the only provision by which teachers would have a claim to the franchise was struck out, it was with the opinion that the franchise would be secured by the subsequent introduction of this clause.

THE CHAIRMAN remarked, that he had already said the clause was not in Order. The Committee could only deal with the Bill; a clause relating to the franchise was not within its purview.

MR. MARK STEWART said, that he withdrew an Amendment, on the understanding that a clause to this effect would be accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN repeated that a clause relating to the franchise was out of Order, but the hon. Member would be in Order in moving his first clause.

MR. MARK STEWART begged to move, after Clause 18, to insert the following Clause:—

(Retiring allowance to teachers of higher class public schools.)

"That Clause sixty-one of the principal Act (one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two) shall extend to retiring allowance to be granted by School Boards to teachers of higher class public schools as well as elementary public schools."

THE LORD ADVOCATE thought that if a clause really were necessary to effect the object in view, one might be introduced; but he did not consider that the clause as it stood was admissible.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, there had been a great deal of discussion with reference to the status of schoolmasters under the former Act; but, anxious as he was to have the situation of a schoolmaster improved, and his remuneration largely increased, he was sure that the present proposal was inopportune, and would have a detrimental effect.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. MARK STEWART moved the following new Clause:—

(Removal from office of teachers.)

"Notwithstanding anything contained in section fifty-five of the principal Act, the principal teacher of a school appointed after the passing of the Act of 1872, may be removed from office at any time, by summary procedure before the sheriff in case of immorality or cruelty, or on a report by one of Her Majesty's inspectors of schools in case of incompetency, inefficiency, or neglect of duty; such report to be approved by the Scotch Education Department."

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he did not see that there was any necessity for this clause.

MR. MARK STEWART said, that the object of it was to fix some limit to the power of a school board to remove a teacher. At present they might get rid of a schoolmaster for the most trivial matters.

Clause *negatived.*

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE moved, in page 6, after Clause 22, to insert the following Clause:—

(Extension of burghs for municipal purposes not to alter School Board areas unless otherwise ordered by Scotch Education Department.)

"Where by any local Act, or under the powers of any public general Act, the area of any burgh shall hereafter be extended for municipal or police purposes, such extension shall not alter for the purposes of the principal Act or this Act the area of such burgh, or the area of any parish from which any district shall be taken for such extension; and the valuation roll of such extended burgh, so far as it relates to such district, shall, for the purposes of the principal Act and this Act, be held to be a part of the valuation roll applicable to such parish, unless and until such district be annexed to the said burgh for those purposes in manner hereinafter mentioned: Provided always, That the Scotch Education Department may at any time, after due inquiry, order such district to be annexed to such burgh for the purposes of the principal Act and this Act, upon such terms and subject to such arrangements as in the educational interests of the district the said department may think desirable."

The LORD ADVOCATE observed, that very inconvenient results might be produced by the extension of school board districts, in regard to the property and arrangement of the different districts. He would suggest to the hon. Baronet the Member for North Lanarkshire that he should amend his clause, by providing that the Scotch Education Department, in directing that a district should be annexed to a burgh for school board purposes, should be limited to cases where it formed part of the same county. Further, he would suggest that the words at the end of the clause, "in the educational interests of the district," should be omitted.

Mr. RAMSAY said, that in certain cases, before the limits of a district could be altered, the sanction, or at least the concurrence, of the Public Works Loans Commissioners was requisite.

Dr. CAMERON saw no reason why there should be any difference between England and Scotland in that matter, and thought there would be no more difficulty in Scotland than was experienced in England.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE proposed only that the alteration should be made after full and proper inquiry by the Education Department.

Clause *amended*, and *agreed to*.

Mr. GRANT DUFF moved the following clause:—

(Manual of elementary natural science.)

"That, immediately after the passing of this Act, it shall be the duty of the Scotch Education Department to cause to be prepared a manual of elementary natural science, and that, on and after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, the use of the said manual shall be obligatory in all public schools throughout Scotland."

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY did not exactly understand what would be the effect of this clause, and thought there would be some difficulty with regard to it.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that the Scotch Education Department and the Government were exceedingly unwilling to force a manual of this kind upon the public schools in Scotland, and thought it would be better to leave its adoption to their own choice.

Mr. GRANT DUFF observed, that if a manual of elementary science were not introduced by the Government, it would be 20 years before it was adopted. He proposed the clause as the only practical mode of securing its adoption.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, that the Scotch Education Department ought to take the matter up, and so soon as possible supply the manual.

Clause *negatived*.

Mr. RAMSAY moved the following Clause:—

(Burgh School Board in certain cases may include parish School Board.)

"In the case of any parish within which there is a burgh having a separate School Board, and containing a population greater in number than the population of the landward part of such parish, it shall be lawful for the Scotch Education Department to order that such landward parish, from and after a date to be specified in such order, shall cease to have a separate School Board, and shall, for the purposes of the principal Act and of this Act, be included in the area of such burgh and be subject to the School Board of the same."

He said, that it simply carried out the 19th clause of the principal Act, under which the Education Department from time to time had authority to order that any town having a school board should cease to have a board, and that its board should be merged in that of the parish. This clause provided for cases where it was desirable to merge the parish school board in that of the burgh.

Mr. DALRYMPLE suggested that the clause should be brought up on Report.

The LORD ADVOCATE was aware that there were one or two places in

Scotland where the parish was so small that there was no school board, and the children attended the neighbouring burgh school. He knew only, however, of two such instances. On the other hand, there were a great many cases where considerable hardship would be effected by this clause. If the clause were adopted at all, it ought to be remodelled.

Mr. RAMSAY said, that the primary object of the clause was to meet the case of places where there was no school board, and the children were educated in the burgh schools, their own districts bearing no share of the expense. The clause was also designed to meet cases—as that of the burgh of Renfrew—where the outlying district was willing to bear its share of the burden. Considerable inconvenience was experienced in such cases from the modes of election in burghs and parishes being different. In no single instance would the ratepayers be prejudiced, because the Education Department had full power to prevent any wrong being done.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY hoped the clause would not be pressed.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. RAMSAY next moved the following Clause :—

(Detached parts of parish to form part of parish by which they are surrounded.)

"For the purposes of the principal Act and of this Act, all detached parts of parishes shall be considered as forming part of that parish by which they are surrounded, or, if partly surrounded by two or more parishes, then as forming part of that parish with which they have the longest common boundary: Provided, That, in case any question or dispute shall arise under this section, the same shall be settled and determined by the Scotch Education Department, whose decision shall be final."

The LORD ADVOCATE intimated that he could not accept the clause.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY thought that exceptional cases, like those under consideration, should be provided for.

The LORD ADVOCATE observed, that it would be a great pity to overturn all existing arrangements for the sake of a few isolated cases.

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. TREVELYAN moved the following Clauses :—

"The word sheriff, or sheriff of the county, in the principal Act and in this Act, shall mean any police magistrate in any burgh where the ordinary sheriff courts are not regularly held.

"Every School Board shall have it in its power to compel all half-time children in attendance at Board Schools to attend one particular school should it deem it desirable to do so.

"That, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in section seventy of the principal Act, proceedings may be taken against a defaulting parent at intervals of not less than three weeks after a previous conviction."

He said, the first two clauses were Amendments of Clause 21; and with regard to the third, it proceeded upon a pretty-well established principle. The proposal to give the School Board power to compel half-time children to attend any particular school did not, he thought, conflict with any previous legislation.

The LORD ADVOCATE remarked that the Factory Acts gave a right of choice as to the particular school to be attended.

Clauses, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY moved the following Clause :—

"When two or more parishes or parts of parishes are united, whether quoad omnia or quoad sacra, such united parishes or parts of parishes shall for the purposes of the Education (Scotland) Acts, 1872 and 1878, be esteemed one parish."

The LORD ADVOCATE was surprised that the hon. Member desired to introduce a clause which would necessarily have the effect of diminishing the area of school boards.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. GRANT DUFF (for Mr. R. W. Duff) moved the following Clause :—

"Notwithstanding the provision in Clause 16 of the principal Act, providing for the election of a School Board in each parish and burgh once and not oftener in every period of three years, it is hereby enacted that, from and after the passing of this Act, the election of a School Board shall take place once only in five years."

Amendment *negatived.*

On the Motion of Mr. J. W. Barclay, the following Clause was read a first and second time, and *added* to the Bill :—

(Compulsory purchase of sites.—Regulations as to the purchase of land compulsorily.—Publication of notices.—Service of notices.—Petition to Education Department.—No order valid until confirmed by Parliament.—Costs how to be defrayed.)

"With respect to the purchase of land by School Boards for the purposes of the Education

(Scotland) Acts, 1872 and 1878, the following provisions shall have effect (that is to say):—

"(1.) 'The Lands Clauses Consolidation (Scotland) Act, 1845,' and the Acts amending the same, shall be incorporated with this Act, except the provisions relating to access to the special Act; and in construing those Acts for the purposes of this section the special Act shall be construed to mean this Act, and the promoters of the undertaking shall be construed to mean the School Board, and land shall be construed to include any right over land;

"(2.) The School Board, before putting in force any of the powers of the said Acts, with respect to the purchase and taking of land otherwise than by agreement, shall—

"(a.) Publish, during three consecutive weeks in the months of October and November, or either of them, a notice describing shortly the object for which the land is proposed to be taken, naming a place where a plan of the land proposed to be taken may be seen at all reasonable hours, and stating the quantity of land that they require, and shall further;

"(b.) After such publication, serve a notice, in manner mentioned in this section on every owner or reputed owner, lessee or reputed lessee, and occupier of such land, defining in each case the particular land intended to be taken, and requiring an answer stating whether the person so served assents, dissents, or is neuter in respect of taking such land;

"(c.) Such notice shall be served—

"(a.) By delivery of the same personally on the person required to be served, or, if such person is absent abroad, to his agent; or

"(b.) By leaving the same at the usual or last known place of abode of such person as aforesaid, or by forwarding the same by post in a registered letter, addressed to the usual or last known place of abode of such person.

"(3.) Upon compliance with the provisions contained in this section with respect to notices the School Board may, if they think fit, present a petition under their seal to the Scotch Education Department (hereinafter called 'the Department'), praying that an order may be made authorising the School Board to put in force the powers of the said Acts with respect to the purchase and taking of land otherwise than by agreement, so far as regards the land therein mentioned; the petition shall state the land intended to be taken and the purposes for which it is required, and the names of the owners, lessees, and occupiers of land who have assented, dissented, or are neuter in respect of the taking of such land, or who have returned no answer to the notice, and shall be supported by such evidence as the Department may from time to time require;

"(4.) If, on consideration of the petition, and proof of the publication and service of the proper notices, the Department think fit to proceed with the case, they may, if they think fit, appoint some person to inquire in the district in which the land is situate respecting the propriety of the proposed order, and also direct such person to hold a public inquiry;

"(5.) After such consideration and proof, and after receiving a report made upon any such inquiry, the Department may make the order prayed for, authorising the School Board to put in force with reference to the land referred to in such order the powers of the said Acts with respect to the purchase and taking of land otherwise than by agreement, or any of them, and either absolutely or with such conditions and modifications as they may think fit, and it shall be the duty of the School Board to serve a copy of any order so made in the manner and upon the persons in which and upon whom notices in respect of the land to which the order relates are required by this Act to be served;

"(6.) No order so made shall be of any validity unless the same has been confirmed by Act of Parliament, and it shall be lawful for the Department, as soon as conveniently may be, to obtain such confirmation, and the Act confirming such order shall be deemed to be a public general Act of Parliament;

"(7.) The Department, in case of their refusing or modifying such order, may make such order as they think fit for the allowance of the costs, charges, and expenses of any person whose land is proposed to be taken of and incident to such application and inquiry respectively;

"(8.) All costs, charges, and expenses incurred by the Department in relation to any order under this section shall, to such amount as the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury think proper to direct, and all costs, charges, and expenses of any person which shall be so allowed by the Department as aforesaid, shall become a charge upon the school fund of the district to which such order relates, and be repaid to the said Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury or to such person respectively, by annual instalments not exceeding five, together with interest after the yearly rate of five pounds in the hundred, to be computed from the date of any such direction of the said Commissioners, or allowance of such costs, charges, and expenses respectively upon so much of the principal sum due in respect of the said costs, charges, and expenses as may from time to time remain unpaid."

MR. J. W. BARCLAY moved the following Clause:—

"Clergymen of the Church of Scotland shall be liable to be assessed for the poor and for the purposes of the Education (Scotland) Acts, 1872 and 1878, in respect of their manses and glebes."

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. GRANT DUFF considered he was in Order in bringing under the notice of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate a suggestion of a school board in the North, that it was desirable for such bodies to have greater powers to establish industrial schools. He believed such powers were granted under the English Education Act of 1871, and he asked the right hon. and learned Lord to consider the question.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, the subject was one to which he had given a good deal of consideration; but, finding that school boards and parochial boards in Scotland, and Scotch Members entertaining such widely different views upon the subject, he gave up, for the present, all idea of legislation on the question, which, however, he must say, was a very important one.

Mr. GRANT DUFF drew the attention of the Lord Advocate to the fact that many persons in Scotland desired to have the examinations of elementary schools carried out simply by Her Majesty's Inspectors, and not by other persons as the Bill provided.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Tuesday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter after
Four o'clock in the morning
till Monday next.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Monday, 5th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Consolidated Fund (No. 4)*; Arranmore Polling District (Ireland)* (189); Locomotives on Highways (Scotland)* (190).
*Second Reading*—Tenant Right (Ireland) (156), *negatived.*
*Committee*—Highways* (177-192).
*Committee—Report*—Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment)* (180); Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) (168); Elders Widows' Fund* (182).
*Report*—Idiots, &c. (Ireland)* (187).

## INDIA—TAXATION AND EXPENDITURE.—PETITION.

### MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

The Earl of NORTHBROOK rose to present a Petition from the Inhabitants of Calcutta and its vicinity, on the subject of the recent increase of Taxation and of the Military and Public Works Expenditure in India. The Petition was signed by 2,000 persons, and from his personal knowledge he could state that among the Petitioners were some Native gentlemen who occupied the highest positions in the Province of Bengal. Among them were Maharajah Joteendro Mohun Tagore, one of the Members of the Legislative Council of India; Maharajah Narendra Krishna, lately a Member of the Legislative Council of India; Members of the Legislative Council of Bengal, both Mussulman and Hindoo, one of the latter being Kristodas Pal, the editor of *The Hindoo Patriot,* a journal written entirely in English by Natives of Bengal, which, though freely criticizing the acts of the authorities in India, was in its whole tone and spirit thoroughly loyal to the British Government. The Petition commenced by stating that—

> "The Petitioners had observed with a deep feeling of gratitude the awakened interest of the people of the United Kingdom in the welfare of the subjects of the British Crown in India, as evidenced by their contributions for the relief of the sufferers by Famine."

They went on to say that—

> "When the intelligence of the heavy strain upon the Indian Revenue, in consequence of the recent Famine, reached the United Kingdom, proposals were made at several influential public meetings held at great centres of national life, for giving a substantial grant of millions of pounds sterling from the Imperial Exchequer to supplement the means of the Government of India for the alleviation of sufferings from the Famine; that the Petitioners could not in adequate terms express their gratitude for the benevolent feeling which prompted these proposals, but happily the Government of India had been able to fulfil its mission of mercy without the suggested contribution from the Imperial Government. The Famine Expenditure had, however, necessitated heavy taxation, amounting to £1,500,000 per annum, and while the Petitioners, as indeed the people of India generally, considered it their loyal duty to submit to all such additional taxation as might be necessary for the well-being of their country, they could not conceal their earnest conviction that the new burdens imposed would press severely upon the poorer classes, who constitute the mass of the population, and that if they were made permanent, as they had been made by the recent fiscal measures, the taxpayers had a good reason for complaint when no attempt had been made to afford them relief by reduction of expenditure, for which the Petitioners considered there was legitimate and ample room."

The Petitioners then proceeded to refer at some length to several heads of expenditure, in which they submitted that reductions could be made.

As the Petition was dated from Calcutta as far back as March in the present year, he thought it right to explain why it had not been presented before. The fact was that in forwarding the Petition, the Secretary to the Petition Committee wrote to him a letter, in which there was this statement—

> "I have the honour to forward by this mail the Petition to the House of Lords regarding Indian Expenditure and Taxation, signed by 2,000 persons. The Committee regret that, since the adoption of the Petition at the public meeting held in this city on the 2nd of March last, events in Europe have taken a gloomy turn, which may compel England to have recourse to arms for the protection of British interests. At a time like this, it may be inopportune to urge upon Parliament the question of the adjustment of the military charges of England in relation to India on a fair and equitable basis, which will necessarily lead to further burdens upon the Imperial Exchequer."

He thought the sentiments expressed in that letter were such as to do credit to the Petitioners. The fact that they did not wish the Petition to be presented at a time when the state of affairs on the Continent of Europe was in so uncertain a condition showed a very loyal feeling on their part, which would doubtless be appreciated by their Lordships.

As regards his (the Earl of Northbrook's) position with respect to the Petition—knowing the worth and character of the Petitioners—seeing that the Petition was written in the most loyal and proper spirit—and that, while he could not entirely agree with its contents, there was very much with which he concurred; he thought that there was no reason, notwithstanding the high position he had recently filled in India, to prevent him from presenting the Petition.

Turning to the contents of the Petition, the first head of Expenditure to which the Petitioners drew attention was the military. They wished for a re-adjustment of the principle on which the English and the Indian shares of the Home Expenditure for Her Majesty's Forces serving in India were now apportioned.

The Petitioners went into considerable detail on this subject, showing that there had been an increase of something like £1,000,000 sterling in the Home Charges of the British Army in India. In asking that these charges should be revised, the Petitioners had only done the same thing that had been done by successive Secretaries of State for India. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) had urged the claims of India in terms nearly as strong as those which were used by the Duke of Argyll. Successive Governments of India had expressed similar opinions. When he (the Earl of Northbrook) was in India, he had addressed several despatches to the Secretary of State, urging that those charges should be revised, to the relief of the Indian finances. The same views were entertained by his successor (Lord Lytton). Sir John Strachey, the Financial Member of the Council of the Viceroy, in a speech delivered by him in the Legislative Council on the 27th December last, said—

> "Turning to the Military Expenditure, I examined in some detail in my Minute laid before the Council on the 15th of March, the accounts of the Army. I showed that it now costs upwards of £17,000,000 a-year; that its cost has increased by upwards of £1,000,000 since 1875-6; and that a large share of this increase is in the Expenditure recorded in the Home accounts. I need not recapitulate the details thus reviewed, but I will repeat the conclusion, which I then stated as follows:—
>
> "'The Government of India must certainly endeavour to find the means of meeting the increased Military Charges, some of which are apparently inevitable, by economies in other Departments of the Military Service; this endeavour must be largely dependent for success upon the support of Her Majesty's Government. I do not assert that the whole of the additional Expenditure on the Army has not been incurred for excellent objects, or that it could have been avoided; but that the Indian Revenues are liable to have great charges thrown upon them without the Government of India being consulted, and almost without any power of remonstrance, is a fact the gravity of which can hardly be exaggerated.'
>
> "We have not neglected this matter during the year; it has been the subject of elaborate inquiry, the results of which have still to be considered. Whether we shall not be able to carry out reductions which some high authorities have advocated depends upon considerations, the effect of which on the ultimate conclusions of the Government I cannot now foresee. Judging from the past, we may esteem ourselves fortunate if further additions to the Home Military Charges are not thrown upon us; but what is possible on our part to prevent such a result shall certainly be done. We know that we may rely upon the support of the Secretary of State in securing this object, and we may hope that some re-consideration of the burden thrown upon us, on account of this branch of charge, may be found possible, which shall lead to an arrangement more consistent with our own views of what is equitable to India."

The Petitioners showed that many Committees had considered this question, the last being a Committee presided over by his right hon. Friend (Mr. Bouverie), in June, 1875; but that, hitherto, there had been no satisfactory result. Neither the Petitioners nor he (the Earl of Northbrook) supposed that there was any desire on the part of the Secretaries of State for War to act unjustly to India. He was certain that it was the desire of his noble Friend behind him (Viscount Cardwell) to act in this, as in all other matters, with perfect fairness and justice, and he had full confidence that Her Majesty's present Government wished to do what was right in the matter. He would not dwell further on this part of the subject, more especially as he understood that the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cranbrook) had some information to convey to their Lordships, which he trusted might prove satisfactory.

Besides the increase in the Home Charges of the British troops serving in India, the Petitioners alluded to many occasions in which the Army of India had been engaged out of India upon Imperial service, when, in their opinion, an undue portion of the expense was charged upon India. He (the Earl of Northbrook) was of opinion that India was charged with more than was equitable in the case of the Abyssinian War; and in the case of a small Force sent to Perak, in the neighbourhood of Singapore, a few years ago, he entertained, and had expressed, the same opinion. Moreover, he considered that Indian Revenues had been charged in that case contrary to law, and he had last year asked the Secretary of State (the Marquess of Salisbury) to explain why an Address was not moved to the Crown, which, under the Government of India Act, ought to have been done before such a charge was imposed upon India. The noble Marquess was unable to afford their Lordships any explanation of that omission. It was a small affair; but still it was important that the law should be observed. He would not allude further to it, more especially as he was glad to perceive that in the case of the Native Indian troops recently brought for service to Malta, a right principle had been adopted for the first time. The whole of the expense of the transport and the pay of those troops was to be charged on the Imperial Revenue.

He would add that the recent despatch of Native troops to Malta had placed the question of the Home Charges of the Army employed in India on a different footing from that which it occupied before. When any portion of Her Majesty's Forces were sent out from this country to India, India paid for the whole cost of recruiting and training every man sent out—so much for an infantry soldier, so much for a gunner, and so on, besides their pay and maintenance from the moment they left England; while, on the other hand, if Indian forces were sent out of India on Imperial service, this country did not pay anything for the cost of recruiting or training them, and very seldom for the whole of their pay. A considerable portion of the charge for them fell upon India herself. As it was now recognized that Native Indian troops might be made available for service with the other troops of Her Majesty in portions of Her Majesty's Dominions other than India—he thought that constituted a good reason for placing the Home Charges for troops serving in India on a basis more equitable to India.

The Petitioners considered that some reduction might be made in the strength of the Native Army of India. He (the Earl of Northbrook) had considered this subject most carefully while in India, and could not agree with the Petitioners that it would be desirable to reduce the Native Army; but of the two alternatives, he would prefer a smaller Army to an increased taxation. He remembered the opinion given by Lord Canning, that it was a question between imposing new and irritating taxes in India, and reducing the British Forces in India. "Danger for danger"—he believed those were Lord Canning's words—"I should prefer to reduce the Army;" and he (the Earl of Northbrook) very much sympathized with Lord Canning's views.

The feelings expressed by the Petitioners on the subject of Military Expenditure was undoubtedly genuine and sincere; this was shown by the speech of Sir Ashley Eden, the present Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, in the Legislative Council of India, in December last, when the new taxes were proposed. Sir Ashley Eden said, that while the Natives of Bengal were prepared to bear loyally the additional taxation necessary to provide for the Famine Expenditure, it was his duty to inform the Government that a strong feeling was entertained by them that the Military Expenditure was susceptible of reduction, and that it should be reduced.

The next head of Expenditure to which the Petitioners referred was "Public Works." They said—"The Public Works Department constitutes another fruitful source of expenditure." They considered that however valuable railways or irrigation works might be, the expenditure upon them was not always judicious, and ought to be carefully checked. It was remarkable that whenever the opinions of intelligent, educated, and thoughtful Natives of India were expressed, they were altogether at variance with the views advocated by Mr. Bright at certain public meetings last year—that the best thing for India would be that some £30,000,000 should be laid out at once upon irrigation. The Petitioners thought—and he (the Earl of Northbrook) entirely agreed with them—that public works were too dearly purchased, if they involved the imposition of increased burdens on the people.

He (the Earl of Northbrook) was somewhat apprehensive, from the recent accounts published in India, that the Expenditure upon Public Works constructed with borrowed money was increasing more rapidly than was consistent with the condition of the finances. In 1876-7, the Expenditure upon such works was £3,809,284, and Sir William Muir, the Financial Member of the Council of the Viceroy, said, in his Budget Statement, that the Government intended, in consequence of the increased charge on the finances which resulted from the depreciation in the value of silver, still further to contract that Expenditure. But in 1877-8, the Expenditure was £4,877,000, and for 1878-9, it was estimated at £4,555,000. It was probable that this increase had been occasioned by the necessity of providing employment for the people during the Famine in the South of India; but he (the Earl of Northbrook) felt somewhat apprehensive of the intentions of the Government of India in that respect, more especially as he had read some speeches made in India, which indicated that some scheme for the construction of local works from borrowed money, the interest of which must come in one way or another out of taxes, had been under consideration.

The Petitioners also quoted the opinion, which it seemed had been published in India, of Sir Andrew Clarke, an Engineer officer of distinction, who was selected by the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) to superintend the Public Works in India, that there was a great redundancy in the Staff of Engineers in India. Sir Andrew Clarke was reported to have written—"Some special means should be adopted to induce or to force the retirement of at least 100 Engineers," and to have expressed an opinion against the Cooper's Hill College, which apparently had the effect of sending to India an excessive supply of young Civil Engineers, at an unnecessary cost to Indian Revenues. He (the Earl of Northbrook) had no recollection of having received any representations of that nature when he was in India; but he trusted that, considering the high authority of Sir Andrew Clarke, the Secretary of State would lay upon the Table any communications that might have been received from India upon the subject.

While on the subject of Public Works, he wished to ask if there was any intention on the part of the Government to guarantee a railway across Asia Minor, either wholly or in part, from the Revenues of India? That was a matter which had been very fully considered by the Government of India when the late Lord Mayo was Viceroy, and on the 2nd of June, 1871, the following opinion was expressed:—

> "Upon the whole, we desire to offer such encouragement as may be possible to the project for the construction of a railway from either the Bosphorus or the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf; but we are decidedly averse to any promise of pecuniary assistance being made. We cannot consider the project of such vital or paramount importance to the interests of India as would justify us in placing a charge upon the resources of the Empire for its construction or maintenance."

That opinion was given by very high authorities; besides Lord Mayo, there was his (the Earl of Northbrook's) noble and gallant Friend on the cross Benches (Lord Napier of Magdala); Sir John Strachey, the present Finance Minister of India; Sir Richard Temple, the present Governor of Bombay; Sir James FitzJames Stephen; Sir Barrow Ellis, one of the Members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India; and Major General Sir Henry Norman, also a Member of that Council. He (the Earl of Northbrook) trusted that no step would be taken to saddle the Revenues of India with a guarantee of this description, with so strong an expression of opinion against it, without an opportunity being given for a discussion in Parliament.

The Petitioners proceeded to express their opinion that some reductions might be made in the cost of the general Administration of India, and particularly by the increased employment of Natives of India. He (the Earl of Northbrook) could answer for it, that the desire of the Government of India for many years had been to employ Natives of India wherever their services could be made available to the advantage of the Public Service; and he was aware, from communications which he had received from Lord Lytton, that this was an object which he had much at heart, and that he hoped to be able to make arrangements for the employment of an additional number of Natives of India, which might also have the effect of producing some saving of Expenditure.

The Petitioners made, in connection with this subject, some observations which were well deserving of consideration. They said—

> The Government of India has taken an important step by the new system of Provincial finance. It has, it is true, given considerable latitude to the local Governments in the administration of their own affairs; but its direct result to the people has been an immense increase of local burdens. Within the last seven years, in Bengal alone, there has been an increase of about £1,000,000, and for the whole of India more than £3,000,000 per annum by Provincial taxation. Whether the tax is imposed by the local Government or by the Supreme Government, the effect upon the taxpayers is the same; they are burdened with so much additional taxation. If the responsibilities of the local Governments are to be increased, it is but fair that the people subject to those Governments should be allowed some voice in the administration of the Provincial revenues, either in the shape of a Consultative Council or by the extension of the powers of the local Legislative Councils in financial matters, and by a larger admission of non-official Members, so as not to leave them in a standing minority."

He (the Earl of Northbrook) knew that it was the opinion of many high authorities, and among them of his friend Sir William Muir, who was for many years Lieutenant Governor of the North-Western Provinces, that now that the responsibilities of the Lieutenant Governors of Provinces had been much increased, especially in regard to the disposal of the Provincial Revenues, it was very desirable to establish some kind of Council to assist them in their duties, and moreover to supply an element of stability to the policy of those Provinces, which was, under the present system, almost entirely under the control of the Lieutenant Governor for the time being. He (the Earl of Northbrook) was inclined to think that it might be well to strengthen the Provincial Governments by the establishment of some description of Councils; and he thought that if that were done, it would be desirable to appoint to such Councils Natives of India of high character—such, for example, as had filled the office of Members of the different Legislative Councils. Another suggestion had been made of a similar kind, that Native gentlemen who had filled high office under the Government should be formed into a kind of Privy Council, and should have the function, which they would consider as a high honour, of advising the Government, in some recognized capacity, upon matters of importance. He (the Earl of Northbrook) entertained a strong opinion of the advantage which was derived by the Government of India from taking into their counsels such Natives of India—and more especially in regard to taxation—when it was of the greatest importance to know the real feelings of the people.

The Petition concluded in terms to which he asked the attention of their Lordships—

> "Your Lordships' Petitioners have been led to make this appeal to your Lordships, because heavy burdens have been lately imposed upon the people of India. The object which has led to the imposition of these burdens is, undoubtedly, humane, for it is intended to apply the additional funds to the relief and prevention of famine; but practically the object is to increase the general revenues of the country, particularly in view of extension of public works. Your Lordships' Petitioners and the rest of their countrymen gratefully acknowledge the solicitude of the Government of India to save the lives of poor sufferers from the Famine, and are willing to bear what additional burdens they can for that benevolent purpose. But at the same time they cannot disguise the feeling, which is widely prevalent throughout India, that by making necessary, judicious, and vigorous retrenchments, without diminishing the strength or efficiency of the Administration, and by a fair and equitable adjustment of military charges payable by England and India respectively, a considerable saving may be effected—indeed, much more than the sums

calculated from the new measures of taxation. And when this is made patent, your Lordships' Petitioners feel confident that your Lordships will not sanction the permanent imposition of the recent heavy taxation in India without first trying the much-needed and just alternative of retrenchment. This, your Lordships' Petitioners respectfully submit, is an essential point in providing for Famine Expenditure; for if £3,000,000 sterling a-year additional taxation beyond the amount in 1870-71 be taken from the people, not to mention the periodic increase of the land assessment and of other taxation, such as the proposed enhancement of the stamp duties, and municipal taxation, which also presses upon them severely, they must thereby be so impoverished that, in the event of future famines, there being less margin for private savings, there will necessarily be more strain upon public expenditure to meet the pressure of famine, though the general capacity of the people to cope with that strain will be reduced *pro tanto.* Your Lordships' Petitioners, therefore, pray that your Lordships' House, which has always been distinguished for its generous solicitude for the welfare of the people of India, will be pleased to inquire and consider as to how far the new requirements of India for famine relief may be met by the enforcement of economy, without recourse to additional taxation."

The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury), when Secretary of State for India, pointed out in one of his speeches that the distress and mortality caused by the recent famine arose, not from the want of a sufficient supply of food in India, nor from the want of means of communication—for food enough seems always to have been conveyed by means of the railways to the most distressed districts—but because the people were not well enough off to bear the strain of two successive bad years, and had nothing to depend on but the public works provided for them by the Government, and the charitable assistance which was contributed for their relief. The noble Marquess looked forward to the improvement of the condition of the people as the best security against the recurrence of such calamities. The Petitioners said that of the various suggestions made for the mitigation of famine sufferings, that made by the noble Marquess—namely, the observance of frugality by the people, was both sound and practical.

"But (they added with truth) the people of India are noted for thrifty and frugal habits, and for patience under suffering, and that if the poorer classes fall an easy prey to a widespread disaster like the famine, it is not because they are extravagant in times of prosperity, but because their means are very limited, and that the multiplication of burdens upon them must diminish the little room they have for the practice of that frugality upon which the Secretary of State justly lays stress."

With regard to the anticipation of the Petitioners, that by a re-adjustment of the Military Charges, or by some other such economies as they had indicated, enough would be saved to equal the £1,500,000 which it was proposed to raise by additional taxation, he could not himself think it right to hold out any such expectation. Although he thought something might be done in the way of reduction of Expenditure—and he was satisfied that the Government of India were not neglectful of any opportunity that might occur for effecting reductions—he did not think it likely that the cost of the Government of India could be very considerably diminished. Whatever savings might be made in one direction would be met by the increasing demands for improvements of different kinds throughout India.

But there was an aspect of the question which appeared to him to afford a more favourable prospect of the remission of taxation than the reductions of Expenditure recommended by the Petitioners. It appeared to him that some, at least, of the new taxes were not necessary, and ought not to be imposed.

From the accounts of the Revenue and Expenditure of India for the last four or five years, they found that, exclusive of the money spent on Public Works Extraordinary, and that spent on account of Famine relief, there were surpluses of between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 sterling in each of the years from 1873-4 up to 1876-7, when the surplus fell to about £1,000,000 sterling; and, according to the statement published by the Government of India, if there had been no Famine, there would have been a surplus of £2,750,000 for the year 1877-8. Accordingly, it would appear at first sight that there was no necessity for putting on additional taxation in order to obtain the surplus of £1,500,000 which the Government of India considered should be provided as an insurance against Expenditure on account of Famines, and £500,000 as an ordinary balance, or £2,000,000 in all. With the exception of 1876-7 more than the surplus required had been obtained in each of the last five years. The insurance against famine had been kept up. The whole cost, £6,500,000, of the

Bengal Famine had been paid out of surplus income in a few years. Unfortunately, however, that impression would not be correct. The depreciation in the value of silver made the cost of the remittances to England from India £1,500,000 more than it was a few years ago. Although, on the other hand, the guaranteed railways were paying so well that the sum which the Government had to pay on account of these undertakings had been very inconsiderable of late, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, he admitted that a certain amount of increased taxation was necessary; and about a year ago new taxes were imposed, and certain other arrangements made, which improved the financial position by about £700,000.

But in February of this year a licence tax was imposed, and a cess imposed upon land. There was additional taxation to the amount of £1,100,000 imposed in that month. The speeches made by the Viceroy, and by Members of the Government of India, in December last, had led him (the Earl of Northbrook) to believe at first that it was necessary to impose this additional taxation. But the discussion in December last took place before full information could have been in the possession of the Government of the financial results of the year 1877-8, or of the prospects of the coming year. The new taxes were voted before the Budget for the year was, or could have been, prepared; and when in March the usual Budget was produced, and the Estimates and Accounts were published, he was unable to find in them a justification for the imposition of £1,100,000 of additional taxation. The Budget of March provided for an estimated surplus for 1878-9 of £2,156,000. He was happy to say that the Indian Estimates had been framed with such care of late years, that any Government was perfectly safe in concluding that the Receipts would be in excess of the amounts at which they were estimated. This was shown by comparing the Estimates and Accounts of each year, from 1873-4 to 1877-8, inclusive. In 1873-4, the estimated surplus was £220,000, the actual surplus was more than £2,000,000. In 1874-5, the estimated surplus was £1,192,000, the actual surplus more than £2,500,000; in 1875-6, the estimated surplus was £500,000, the actual surplus £1,250,000; in 1876-7, the estimated surplus was £144,000, the actual surplus £1,000,000. In 1877-8, the estimated surplus was £1,803,300, and the most recent accounts showed that the actual surplus would probably be £2,750,000. These figures were, of course, exclusive of the Expenditure on Public Works Extraordinary and on Famine relief. He did not condemn the practice of under-estimating Receipts. The Government of India were perfectly right to be on the safe side; but with Estimates so carefully framed, it would, in his opinion, have been amply sufficient to have estimated for a surplus of £1,500,000 instead of for a surplus of £2,156,000. Unless some unforeseen disturbance of the finances occurred, there would have been every probability of realizing an actual surplus of £2,000,000 at the end of the year.

His (the Earl of Northbrook's) opinion, that taxes had been unnecessarily imposed, was confirmed by the figures of the Budget itself. Besides the estimated surplus having been, in his opinion, in excess of the real requirements of the case, he found that Customs' duties had been taken off to the amount of £232,000; so that, upon the face of the Budget, it appeared to him that if no taxes had been taken off, some, at least, of the new taxes would have been unnecessary.

But the news received that morning from Calcutta was that the salt tax had just been very considerably reduced in Bengal and the North-West. He could not, of course, state precisely what the financial effect of that measure would be; but he could state the calculation of his responsible Advisers of the financial effect which would have followed from a somewhat similar measure which was under his consideration in the year 1873. In that year, he was informed that to reduce the salt duty in Northern India to 2 rupees 4 annas, and in Bengal to 2 rupees 12 annas, being somewhat less than the reduction which, if the report was correct, had been made now, would involve a loss to the Revenue of £758,000.

What was the meaning of the course adopted by the Indian Government? It was this—that the Government found that they had a greater surplus than they expected to have; and they had, therefore, in the middle of the financial year, made a considerable reduction in the duty on salt. The calculations they had made in

December last were, in fact, too gloomy. They had supposed themselves to be in a worse financial position than that in which they really were, and, anticipating now a larger surplus than they had expected either in December or March, they resolved to remit other taxation, instead of to abstain from levying the new taxes they had put on. Now, those taxes were put on for an express purpose, and they were justified as having been put on for that purpose only. Sir John Strachey, speaking on the 9th of February, 1878, said—

> "These new taxes are required for the sole purpose of giving us, year by year, a sufficient surplus of Income over Expenditure to meet Famine Charges."

Again, the Preamble of the Bills which imposed the new taxation made that clear. It ran thus—

> "Whereas, in order to provide means for defraying the Public Expenditure from time to time incurred and to be incurred for the relief and prevention of Famine in British India, it is necessary to effect a permanent increase of the Revenue."

And the proceeds of the taxes were to be applied to that purpose only.

It appeared to him that. in the face of that statement, the Government of India were bound, the moment they saw they had imposed new taxes which were not required, to have abstained from levying them, instead of using the surplus for the purpose of taking off old taxes.

But it might be said that the taxes which were imposed it was advisable to impose, and that the taxes which were reduced it was advisable to remit. He did not think that anyone who was well acquainted with India would concur in that view. The new taxes were a licence tax, and an increase of the cesses on land. The licence tax was an unpopular impost, bearing as it did on the poorer portion of the commercial classes throughout India, while the increase of the cesses on land disturbed the settlement under which an occupier of land held his land for a certain term of years. Necessity could alone justify the imposition of such taxes, and they ought to be removed as soon as possible. He knew it was thought by many that it was very advisable to reduce the salt duty, and to get rid of the Customs' line. He did not wish to undervalue the importance of that measure, and he would gladly have gone further in that direction than he did when he was in India, had he been able to do so without imposing fresh taxes; but of all taxes, the salt duty weighed with least oppression upon the people of India, and created the least discontent, and such was the opinion expressed by Sir John Strachey on the 27th of December last. He said that—

> "Payment of the tax is distributed over the year by almost daily instalments, each of them infinitesimally small;"

and that—

> "In the years 1859, 1860, and 1861, the salt duty was raised in Bengal by 12 annas a-maund, and in the Upper Provinces by one rupee a-maund, not only without occasioning discontent or reducing consumption, but the measures hardly even attracted attention."

On the same occasion, Sir Ashley Eden, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, whose attention to the welfare of the people is well known, gave it as his deliberate opinion that a reduction of the salt tax in Bengal was not required. He called it—

> "A sacrifice of Revenue in concession to theory which would afford no real relief to the people."

The changes made in the Customs' tariff might be desirable in themselves, especially the remission of the export duty upon sugar. But, in his opinion, however right it might be to make those reforms, they ought to have been postponed until they could have been effected without the imposition of new taxes.

In India, it was unwise and unsafe to take off taxes to which the people were accustomed and to impose others. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) used wise words on this point, when examined a few years ago before a Committee of the other House of Parliament. He said—

> "The difference between England and India in matters of finance is this—that in England you can raise a large increase of taxation without in the least degree risking the security of your institutions; but you cannot do so in India."

When he (the Earl of Northbrook) was in India, a Correspondence took place between the Government of India and the noble Marquess on the subject of certain reductions of Customs' duties. The Government of India expressed their opinion that it would be highly inexpedient to impose fresh taxes for the purpose of making those reductions, and the noble

Marquess, both in writing to the Government of India, and in his place in that House, expressed his entire concurrence with that opinion, and said that the Customs' reform he wished to make "was not by any means intended to involve any increase of taxation." He (the Earl of Northbrook) had then expressed the satisfaction with which he had received that assurance from the noble Marquess. It was renewed last year in explicit terms by the Under Secretary of State in the other House of Parliament. But what had been done now? New taxes had been put on, and immediately afterwards Customs and other duties had been taken off, which, if they had been left alone, would have made some, at least, of the new taxes unnecessary.

Their Lordships should bear in mind what was the opinion of men who had governed India in reference to the effect of imposing fresh taxation. He had had to consider the question in India with the advice and assistance of the best and ablest Indian Civil servants, and he had made himself acquainted with the opinions of his Predecessors. He found that, in a Paper which had been laid before Parliament and was in their Lordships' Library, Lord Mayo said, not long before his lamented death, that—

> "A feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction existed among every class, both European and Native, on account of the constant increase of taxation which had for years been going on."

And Lord Mayo added that—

> "The continuance of that feeling was a political danger, the magnitude of which could hardly be over-estimated."

Such was the opinion of Lord Mayo; and he (the Earl of Northbrook), after taking every pains he could to inquire for himself, and with the responsibility of the Government of India upon him, deliberately arrived at the same conclusion.

In giving their Lordships his views on the subject of the taxes which had been imposed in India, he had acted with reluctance. Since he had returned from India, he had avoided troubling their Lordships often on matters connected with India. It had been his desire to give what little support he could to Her Majesty's Government upon Indian affairs, and it was especially his desire to interpose no difficulties in the way of the Government of India. At the same time, in a matter of such importance to

the welfare of India, it was his duty to express his opinions and to point out the danger of imposing fresh taxes. He might have hesitated if he had thought there was no remedy; but as the remedy was clear, there was an additional reason why he should take that opportunity of expressing his views on the subject. He trusted that the reduction of the salt tax might be postponed, and that the Government of India might be able to remit some part, at least, of the new taxes which had been imposed. He would only add that the danger to the stability of British rule in India, from the imposition of unnecessary taxation and anything like extravagant administration of the finances, was far greater, in his opinion, than any likely to arise from the recent alteration of the position of Russia in Asia Minor. The noble Earl concluded by moving for Copy of any Correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India in Council on the subject of the excess of supply of Civil Engineers for service in India.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: I rise to speak on the subject at considerable disadvantage after the noble Earl who has had such long experience of India and Indian finance; yet I will endeavour, as well as I can, to go through the various topics to which he has called attention, and I think I shall, in the end, be able to show your Lordships that the indictment which he has framed against the taxation of India is not of the serious character he supposes, and that the changes which have been made are of such a nature that they will lay the foundation of a better fiscal system in India, and lead to the redress of those grievances to which he has called your Lordships' attention. This conversation, as your Lordships know, commenced with the remarks of the noble Earl upon the Petition presented from the British Indian Association. Now, I am far from undervaluing that Petition, or those by whom it is signed; yet I am not prepared to admit that it is anything like an accurate statement of the facts of the case. If my noble Friend will read the Petition carefully, he will observe some of the most extraordinary mistakes it is possible to conceive, especially in regard to the Home Charges as affecting the Army of India. For instance, a comparison is made of one item with another, taking no note of the fact that in the one case the figures included stores which, in themselves, represented £1,200,000. With regard to the question of Military Expenditure, to which my attention was drawn on going into the War Office, I found that my noble Friend who preceded me had got into a hot correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, and that things had practically come to a dead-lock. There being no possibility of a solution of the difficulty under existing conditions, I obtained the services of a gentleman whom your Lordships know to be well fitted for the work—Mr. Edward Bouverie — who became Chairman of the Committee that had been appointed by the two Departments, which, under his presidency, and after a complete investigation, came to a decision as to what the War Office ought to receive, and what the India Office ought to deduct. I can say, with the utmost confidence, that I have never taken any partizan view of this matter. I offered to refer all questions when I was in the War Office just as I do now that I am in the India Office. There was no desire on the part either of the War Office or the Treasury to treat India unfairly, or to lay any undue burdens upon her; but when the Petitioners complain of having now to pay differently than for the East Indian Army under the old system, it is my duty to point out that they entirely forget that instead of sending them out recruits, we now send them out the manufactured article. The Home Charges are charges which almost entirely affect India. It is quite true that we have the troops in England, and can make use of them in any great pressure or emergency; but they are being prepared for the Indian Army; and, therefore, India ought not to complain if this is charged in the expense. But I do not desire to waste time upon that point, which has practically been given up by the noble Earl; for he said he did not see how any great reduction could be made. When, however, I come to tell what has been arranged, your Lordships will see there is every prospect of things being put upon a sound footing. A dispute has been going on between the two Offices—the War Office and the India Office—for many years, in respect to the claims of one or the other; but that has been settled by the Imperial Government surrendering a claim to some £150,000, and in March next that whole matter will be ended. An arrangement is under consideration as to the sums to be paid in future; and it is proposed that that arrangement shall remain in force for a certain number of years, and will then be subject to revision. With regard to Abyssinia, I need not go into that matter, inasmuch as a different system as to the employment of troops out of India has recently been adopted, by which the whole of the charges are placed on the Imperial Government. There may, of course, be cases in which a different state of affairs may arise; and, therefore, we cannot lay down any hard-and-fast line on this subject. Now, my noble Friend (the Earl of Northbrook) has expressed his opinion that a further reduction of the Army in India is not desirable. Certainly, after the pains taken some years ago on this question, it is impossible to approach it with a view to anything like a great reduction. We might make reductions here and there; but I think my noble Friend was right in not holding out any hopes to the Petitioners of making any such reduction as would meet the views they have expressed. Now, with regard to public works, I do not think that too great caution can be exercised. There is a notion afloat that you cannot spend too much upon public works, or make too many of them to benefit India; but there was never a greater delusion. Works may fail to be of any utility to a locality, and therefore it is of the utmost importance that the greatest care should be taken in the selection of localities. It is possible that works may exceed in cost the advantage to be derived from them; and then they became a burden instead of a benefit. Such works, I am sorry to say, exist already. On the other hand, irrigation works and railways should be introduced wherever it is reasonably probable that the benefit they will confer will be proportionate to the outlay involved. Indeed, it is essential that they should be undertaken. Railways are especially valuable if they are well laid out, and with a due regard to the needs of the people. In the late Famine, the railways did more than anything else to save life; for it enabled the authorities to transport enormous masses of food, estimated at millions of tons, which otherwise could not have been carried to the starving people. We do not know how much more awful the calamity would have been without the railways. Now, as to what the noble Earl has said in reference to Sir Andrew Clarke, the head of the Public Works, I think that what he desires is that we should not send out in great numbers from Cooper's Hill engineers who are not perfectly educated in their profession, that we should keep them back until they are more completely educated, for fear that there should not be employment for those of only moderate attainments. That recommendation was attended to by my noble Predecessor in Office, who, while unable to prevent students from going out in accordance with the terms of their engagements, had persuaded one-half of those who might have done so to remain in this country, and to study engineering works practically in order that they might be better fitted for their duties in India when they did go out. As to the railways in Asia Minor, about which the noble Earl has asked me, no application has yet been made to the English Government for guarantees; and if there had been, I should certainly consult the Government of India before taking any responsibility upon myself. In a great question of this sort, I will not commit myself further than to say that both the Government and the country will have full time to consider the matter before anything could be done to impose a tax on the Revenues of India. In regard to the general administration of India, it is very desirable on many grounds—but, above all, because pledges have been given both by Acts of Parliament, and Proclamation—that Natives should be employed in Government work; it is essential that we should redeem our obligations; but, at the same time, we must take care that they are placed in positions in which they cannot come into collision with the legitimate claims of the Indian Civil Service. Means ought to be taken to provide for the employment of Natives, not in the lower places which they might enter by competition, but also in the higher places which they might obtain by selection on the score of special fitness. If Natives were to be admitted to the Councils of a Lieutenant Governor—on which I do not express an opinion—that official, no doubt, would have the selection of Native members; and, of course, would choose men qualified to assist him. I now come to what is the pith of my noble Friend's speech—the question of taxation. There is one thing absolutely clear, from the speeches of Sir John Strachey and others in the Legislative Council, and that is that throughout all these proceedings the chief object has been to equalize the salt duties, to abolish the barbarous system of Customs' lines, to reduce the transit dues, and further to enter into engagements with the Governments of States producing salt, in order that we may practically obtain control of the salt made in India. The noble Earl expressed himself anxious for the equalization and the lowering of the salt duties, and says that if he had had a surplus he would have used it to accomplish those objects. But, as a matter of fact, he had, according to his statement, a surplus for four years, and it is curious he did not do it. Why, even with that surplus, he looked forward to the necessity for additional taxation, in order to meet these constantly recurring Famines, which were becoming ordinary instead of extraordinary. In five years, the extraordinary expenditure on Famines has amounted to £16,000,000, and the surplus of which he speaks was swallowed up. He did not advert to the fact that the income tax has been abolished; and therefore it has become necessary to have recourse to the new taxes, which are now objected to. It is impossible, or, at least, unwise at present, to revive the income tax; had it been kept partially alive, it might have sufficed or have been raised, and these new taxes would not have had to be imposed. But as it is, is it unreasonable to impose a new tax for the purpose of effecting fiscal reforms, when those fiscal reforms will furnish the means of meeting the expenses of constantly recurring Famines? The noble Earl did not rely upon the surplus to meet the Famine Expenditure; he thought it necessary to provide another fund for the purpose; and this, let me point out, is exactly what is being done by Sir John Strachey. He has been endeavouring to accomplish that which four successive Governments have been attempting to do — namely, to enter into arrangements with the States that produce salt, so as to get the entire trade into our hands, and thus, for one thing, to put an end to smuggling. In the other House, an ex-Minister and eminent authority as a chemist declared that in India vitality cannot be kept up without a certain quantity of salt; a Native without his salt was not, if I may use the expression, worth his salt. Well, what has been the effect already of getting rid of the transit dues? The price, exclusive of duty, has in a part of India been reduced from three rupees to less than 1 rupee per maund. It is very desirable that there should be an uniform salt tax throughout India; it would now be throughout a very large portion 2 rupees 8 annas, or about ¾*d.* a-pound, which cannot press hardly upon the Natives. I might, in explaining the needs of India, call attention to the depreciation of silver, which exercises so injurious an effect on the finance of India at the present moment. This, I fear, is not to be cured by legislation, but depends upon ordinary rules of political economy. I now come to the question of the licence and cess taxes; and Sir John Strachey defended them upon a principle which has recently been maintained with great urgency in your Lordships' House—namely, that when dealing with the poorer classes we should endeavour to make them thrifty and look after themselves as far as possible. He said that it was upon the agriculturists and small traders that the great weight of the Famines fell; and that, therefore, it is not an unreasonable thing that they should pay towards this fund which is to provide against future Famines. The licence tax falls upon the trader, but it is small, and it is perfectly absurd to compare the small trader in India with a similar man in England; while the cess tax is a tax on rentals, and on proprietors, and if you look at the burdens laid upon these Provinces in former times, you will find that a less amount is now demanded than was taken then, because, instead of taking one-half, you take only one-third now; and it is a tax not on the rentpayer, but upon the man who receives the rent, and it is so small that it will not press upon the occupant. You may find that sometimes it will reach the occupant; but, as a rule, I think it is of so small an amount that it will not affect the proprietor to such an extent as to make him look for someone to bear the amount on his behalf. I agree with my noble Friend that new taxes, whether at home or in India, are very undesirable, and nobody can be more strongly of opinion than Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey that Taxation and Expenditure must be reduced as far as possible, but that you must make both ends meet; but when they have to deal with exceptional circumstances, such as Famines, which seem to prey like wild beasts on different parts of India, it then becomes necessary to look for some resource which shall be permanently available. With that view, Sir John Strachey has endeavoured to obtain £2,000,000 above his Expenditure—that is, £500,000 over as surplus, and £1,500,000 to be invested in reproductive works, so as to enable him, when Famine comes, to borrow money on the interest arising from the investment so made. I hope to Heaven these Famines may pass away; but we have had them constantly since 1874, and nothing can be more distressing than to read the accounts of them, while, on the other hand, nothing can be more heroic than the way in which the Civil servants in India, for the most part, have acted in dealing with them. If by so small a taxation as this you can provide remunerative Public Works, which may tend to bring to an end these disastrous Famines, you will have achieved a work which will be an honour to Sir John Strachey, who introduced it and to this country, for having sanctioned it.

LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA considered the Armies of India reduced to the lowest standard consistent with safety. A few thousand men, such as the Force sent to Abyssinia, or that recently sent to Malta, might be temporarily employed out of the country for Imperial purposes, or employed to maintain order on the North-West Frontier; but the country could not safely bear any permanent reduction of the Army. With regard to the Public Works, he observed, that nothing was so expensive and wasteful as a fluctuating condition of those Works. At times there had been most urgent and pressing demands for the extension of the Public Works. Then, when a fit of economy seized the Government, there had been sudden reductions; but the Establishments could not be suddenly reduced without great sacrifices, and remained a burthen on the Public Works, increasing their cost enormously. With regard to the railways, he considered that no new works of magnitude should be commenced until the great military arteries—the lines of railway from the sea at Bombay by the Indus Valley to Lahore, and the continuation of the military line, from Calcutta to Peshawur through Lahore, had been completed. The progress of the Lahore and Peshawur portion had been most dilatory. Regarding the Councils for the Lieutenant Governors of Provinces, he considered that it would be a very beneficial measure to give them, and to appoint to them Natives of approved ability and loyalty; but as Councils were very expensive bodies, involving large salaries, he trusted that their cost would be met by reductions in the Civil Establishments.

Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Then—

## INDIA (CIVIL ENGINEERS).

### ADDRESS FOR PAPERS.

*Moved*, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of any correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India in Council on the subject of the excess of supply of civil engineers for service in India.—(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

## TENANT RIGHT (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Earl of Longford.*)

### (NO. 156.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said: My Lords, this Bill has come up from the House of Commons. It was not the subject of much public discussion there, but was very closely scrutinised in private conference by the Representatives of both the interests concerned, who arrived at a common agreement. It was not opposed by the Government, and I hope that here it may find favour with your Lordships. The Bill does not open a general review of the Irish Land Act, it refers to a special class of cases only, it has but one operative clause, and its purpose is to set at rest doubts leading to litigation and dispute in certain cases not definitely provided for by that Act. It seems to have been assumed, during the discussions upon the Irish Land Act, that the Ulster tenant-right custom would attach only to yearly tenancies; but it has been found in practice that tenants, at the expiration of leases, or who hold under lease, have considered themselves in the same position, and entitled to make the same claim to the benefit of the custom, as yearly tenants; in short, the present doubt is, whether the lease overrides the custom, or whether, as the tenants now claim, the custom overrides the lease, in cases where a yearly tenant would have been entitled thereto. The promoters of this Bill, who are landlords, or representatives of landlords, of considerable estates in different counties in Ulster, are of opinion that the claim of the tenants is right, in an equitable view of the 1st clause of the Land Act; and by this Bill they propose to complete what the Land Act has left in doubt, and to declare that where the custom is legalized at the expiration of a yearly tenancy, and in those cases only, it shall be legalized at the expiration of a lease. It is, no doubt, open to tenants to go into Court and establish their claims if they can; but the promoters of this Bill wish to avoid a period of possibly vexatious litigation, and they are ready to bind themselves and others to admit such claims in the cases specified in the Bill. The Bill has been placed in my hands as being unconnected with the district; but I have the general interest shared by all your Lordships in the welfare of the agricultural community in Ireland, and as this Bill has been accepted by what I may call a joint committee of landlords and tenants before it reached your Lordships' House, I think that it may pass here, as it passed there. I am aware that some noble Lords have viewed this measure with suspicion, either under the apprehension that further and objectionable legislation may be founded upon it, or because the landlord's rights may not be sufficiently protected. To the first I would point out that the Bill is of so special and limited an application that it can scarcely be extended to cover other ground, and to meet the views of those who think that the power should be reserved to owners to disprove a claim that may not be well founded. I am quite willing, on the part of the promoters, to introduce an Amendment to secure their position—the Amendment did form part of a former Bill promoted by the same parties for the same purpose. ["Read!"] A noble Lord who was inclined to object to this Bill has been good enough to communicate with me, and to express himself satisfied; and with this modification, I hope that opposition will not be pressed against a measure that is regarded with some anxiety by those interested.

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Longford.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said, that he had given Notice to move the rejection of the Bill; but, after consultation with his noble Friend, he had come to the conclusion that, as far as he was concerned, the Amendment would remove any necessity there previously existed for his moving the rejection of the Bill.

VISCOUNT LIFFORD described the Bill as an extraordinary one, and said, that no one had asked for it, and when it was supposed that it had been dropped in that House there was a regular pæan of exultation by the tenant-right party in the North of Ireland. The question involved in the Bill was a vital one for their Lordships' consideration; it was nothing more or less than this—whether what was laid down by Lord Mansfield as a fundamental principle of Common Law—namely, that no custom was to override a covenant should be reversed by Act of Parliament? It had been stated that it was doubtful whether the Land Act settled the question, and the late Lord Chief Justice Monahan actually decided that Parliament had made a great breach in the law, and that custom was to override covenant. The majority of the Judges—and certainly the late Lord Chief Justice Whiteside—said such an evasion of Common Law had never been made before, and now it was proposed to set the matter at rest by another Act of Parliament. What was the present condition of Ulster tenant-right? Within the last few days there had been a sale of tenant-right in the county from which this Bill had arisen. The tenant-right of 21 acres and 28 perches, held at the annual rent of £23 6*s.* 6*d.*, was bought for £750, or at the rate of £36 per acre. Forty years' purchase had been charged against the late Lord Leitrim; and, although it had been proved there had been false swearing in the matter, yet Lord Leitrim's property was saddled to that amount. He would just read to the House a judgment by one of the County Court Judges, which had been reported in the newspapers within the last month. The Judge said—

> "He would value very differently the land of small proprietors, like the person in that case, to what he would do the land of a person who had 1,000 acres. The large proprietor could afford to let his land at a moderate rent, while a man who had only 14 acres was anxious to make as much as possible out of it. Therefore, it would not be fair to give the same amount against the small owner which was given against the owner of thousands of acres; if he did, it would amount to a confiscation of his property."

Now, according to that judgment, there was one law for the rich, and another for the poor. He was glad to say the tendency was in favour of the poor; but still he might fairly ask their Lordships whether they would give this power to the Judges, to deal with, and determine, leases in that manner—leases which, perhaps, like most Irish leases, were let at very low rates, on condition that certain works were executed? Or, in other words, the question was—whether they would allow one Irishman to rob another; or whether they would vindicate Lord Mansfield's principle that no custom was to override a covenant? He moved that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now,") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day three months.")—(*The Viscount Lifford.*)

THE EARL OF LIMERICK would like to give some of his reasons for voting for the Amendment just moved by his noble Friend. In the first place, the Bill was very deceptive in its drawing. It had been described as a very small matter; but a careful examination of its provisions would show that it went a great deal farther than might be inferred from the speech of his noble Friend who had moved the second reading (the Earl of Longford). The Preamble said the Bill was to remove doubts as to the legal effect of certain leases in the Province of Ulster; but as it was drawn, the Bill not only affected Ulster, but the whole of Ireland; and, in his opinion, the Bill was unnecessary, for the question had not been overlooked when the Land Act was passed. The Bill, as it stood, simply provided that wherever there was any usage included in the Ulster, or analogous customs, such usage might be brought forward at the termination of the lease, unless this was prevented by the lease itself. In fact, the Bill created a custom, but in no way explained the original Act, or removed the doubts relating to it. Where, on any estate the custom held good, even at the termination of a lease, that special usage might, and ought, to be proved under the original Act, like any other usage comprised in the Ulster tenant-right custom, and without such proof by the tenant, the landlord should not be compelled by a new Act to give the benefit of the custom to a tenant who might, perhaps, merely have purchased the remainder of a lease. Under the Bill, a partial custom would be made a general custom, affecting all holdings in Ireland on which there were any usages analogous to the Ulster tenant-right custom, and anyone acquiring the remainder of a lease would, at the same time, acquire the right. That would certainly increase the hardship with which the Land Act pressed upon the landlord. The Amendment which his noble Friend was ready to accept provided that a landlord might go into Court and prove that a property was not subject to this custom; but why should the onus of proof be thrown on the landlord? The Bill, to his mind, was not a measure of justice. So far as he knew, there had not been any strong agitation in Ireland in favour of the Bill; and he did not think the proposed change would ratisfy the tenant-righters, or place the landlords on a safe footing for the future. He felt constrained, therefore, to vote against the second reading.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Although this is a Bill which the Government, as a Government, neither promote nor oppose, I should like to say a few words upon it, seeing that considerable interest is always felt in legislation on this subject. I cannot help feeling that it would not be right to judge of the merits or demerits of the measure with reference to the considerations put forward by the noble Viscount who sits on the cross Benches (Viscount Lifford). The noble Viscount found fault with a decision which had been come to by the tribunals in Ulster, but that can have no bearing upon the merits of the present Bill. No doubt these sales of tenant-rights in Ulster surprise us all; but this Bill will not make the sums larger or smaller. I agree that there are some words in the 2nd clause which might have been carried further. The clauses in the original Act which spoke of customs other than the Ulster, always appeared to me to be of the vaguest description, and I think this Bill, should it meet with the approbation of the House, ought to be limited to the Ulster tenant-right, and ought not to extend to any indefinite custom which may be included in the words "usages analogous thereto." Now, as regards Ulster, this Bill is certainly one which is recommended by those who have the largest possible stake in the property in the province, and, as I understand, it is supported by all the Members from Ulster in the other House. It appears doubtful to me whether the 2nd clause carries the enactment further than does the present law; whatever may be thought of the Act of 1870, there it stands. That Act did not exclude leases. It is as general as it can be, and declares that wherever the Ulster custom exists, there it shall be legal. According to the present law, a tenant might come forward and say—"I have got this holding; the lease has expired; but it has been the custom on this property to allow tenant-right at the expiration of a lease." In fact, this is very common in Ulster, and your Lordships will find, from the Report of Lord Devon's Committee, that even at that time it was well-known that tenant-right in Ulster was allowed at the expiration of a lease. That being so, the Act of 1870 says it shall be legal. Doubts, however, have arisen, and I believe the matter has not been finally decided. Your Lordships should observe that this Bill does not propose to throw upon the landlord a burden of proof which is not thrown upon him in any other case. In the first place, the tenant would have to prove that the custom prevailed on the property; but if the Amendment before us were agreed to, the landlord would be able to show, as a defence against the claim of the tenant, that although on the estate generally the Ulster tenant custom prevails, yet there was an exception to the rule in that part of the estate where this particular holding was situated. Now, when that is the fact, the landlord can easily prove it, because it must appear on the records of the property. The question is, whether this measure, which is promoted by those interested in the matter in Ulster, is fair in its provisions, or whether it unduly stretches the legislation of 1870? In my opinion, it would be a matter of regret if the Bill does not pass, especially considering the qualifications which have been inserted.

Lord CARLINGFORD remarked, that originally there seemed to have been a pretty quarrel in regard to the Bill between noble Lords on the other side of the House; but afterwards it seemed as if a "compromise had broken out" on the subject. It now appeared, however, that this was not the case, and that the House would have to go to a division on the Bill. He was not frightened at the speech in which the rejection of the Bill had been moved; because his noble Friend's statements, even if they were well founded, had nothing to do with the merits of the measure. Much misconception prevailed as to the alarming sums sometimes given for tenant-right in the province of Ulster, especially that part of it with which the noble Viscount himself was connected. No doubt, owing to great competition, the tenant-right did run up to extravagant sums; but the figures were generally very misleading, because one important fact was not taken into account. To estimate the real value of the holding they must take, not only the rent, but the value of the holding, and the buildings upon it at the time. The only way to judge of the extravagance, or otherwise, of a price paid for tenant-right was first to inquire what was the condition of the holding, whether it had been reclaimed and made valuable from the mountain-side or the bog, and what buildings had been put upon it by the industry of the tenant? One of the principles of the Land Act was that the value put into and upon a holding by the tenant should be his property, and not that of the landlord. He was prepared to vote for the second reading for the reasons given by the noble and learned Lord on the subject. He had no fear that injustice would be done to the landlord by it; his only doubt was whether the Bill was at all necessary. Their Lordships must bear in mind that the words of the Land Act did not exclude a holding upon which a lease existed, and it would be strange if they did. The framers of the Bill satisfied themselves that under the general and ordinary rule prevailing in the province of Ulster, the existence or non-existence of a lease made no difference. That was made clear by the famous Devon Commission, and was conformed by inquiries that were made before the Land Bill was drawn. The present Bill simply laid it down that the presumption should be in favour of the tenant, if he could show that the custom applied to his holding, and that in the expiring lease there was no express stipulation against it. That presumption, however, might, of course, be set aside by evidence on the part of the landlord that a variety of the custom that existed on his estate was different to that which obtained in Ulster generally. He could not take upon himself to oppose the second reading of a Bill which might bring increased peace and security to Ulster tenants without inflicting injustice on Ulster landlords.

Lord O'HAGAN intended to vote for the Bill, though without any admiration of it. He quite agreed with the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack that the Bill simply affirmed what was the clear law of the land. His only objection to the Bill was that it was unnecessary. He did not think that a great and important Statute, which worked almost a revolution in society, should be decided upon without full and careful consideration; but, on the other hand, if the Bill were to be rejected, it might tend to create a doubt as to what the law really was. So far as the landed proprietors were concerned, there was evidence of the strongest character that they desired it; in fact, as he understood it, there was no opposition whatever. The Bill was the outcome of a conference of landlords and tenants in which they mutually agreed as to what was for the benefit of their respective interests, and for that reason, then, he felt that he ought to vote for the Bill.

The Earl of ANNESLEY remarked that a great injustice would have been inflicted under the Bill had his noble Friend not consented to introduce the Amendment to which he had referred.

On question that ("now") stand part of the Motion? Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 8; Not-Contents 25: Majority 17.

*Resolved* in the *Negative;* and Bill to be read $2^a$ *this day three months.*

### CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Richmond, D.
Belper, L.
Carlingford, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
O'Hagan, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*) [*Teller.*]
Waveney, L.

### NOT-CONTENTS.

Manchester, D.
Bantry, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Fortescue, E.
Lucan, E.
Redesdale, E.
Clancarty, V. (*E. Clancarty.*)
Hawarden, V.
Lifford, V. [*Teller.*]
Melville, V.
Crofton, L.
de Ros, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*) [*Teller.*]
Gormanston, L. (*V. Gormanston.*)
Hampton, L.
Harlech, L.
Leconfield, L.
Monson, L.
Northwick, L.
Norton, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Seaton, L.
Templemore, L.
Ventry, L.

## DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 168.)

(*The Lord Carlingford*)

### COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE said, the Bill made considerable alteration in an Act which had been in operation for 15 years, and different authorities were, in some cases, substituted for those who had hitherto been found to work well.

LORD CARLINGFORD replied that the Bill had been introduced with the universal consent of all those who had had any experience in regard to the drainage of land in Ireland.

House in Committee (according to Order); Bill *reported,* without Amendment, to be read $3^a$ on *Friday* next.

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Monday, 5th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Boston, *v.* John Wingfield Malcolm, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

NEW MEMBER SWORN—Lord William Montagu Hay, *for* Haddington Burghs.

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, Class IV. — EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND ART; Class III. — LAW AND JUSTICE.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Foreign Jurisdiction * [267].

*Considered as amended* — Contagious Diseases (Animals) [286]; Marriages (Fiji) * [285].

*Withdrawn*—Local Courts of Bankruptcy (Ireland) * [145]; Bankruptcy Law Amendment * [119]; Medical Act (1858) Amendment * [216]; Medical Officers' Qualifications * [62].

## *QUESTIONS.*

## TRADE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

### QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the President of the Board of Trade, To explain why the Annual Statement of Trade of the United Kingdom is not ready for reference within the first quarter of the year, seeing that the Trade Accounts, from which the Annual Statement is compiled, are all collected immediately the year closes?

VISCOUNT SANDON, in reply, said, the Board of Customs was responsible for the delay. He had written to the Chairman of the Board with the view of expediting the publication of the Statement, and it would be laid before the House as soon as possible.

## CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF MR. R. W. HARMAN.—QUESTION.

MR. GORST asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case of Mr. R. W. Harman, of Old Brompton, Kent, who was arrested by the Metropolitan Police at the Eton and Harrow Cricket Match, on a charge of stealing an opera-glass which proved to be his own; whether it is not the fact that Mr. Harman was able on arrest to give the most complete and satisfactory evidence as to his name, address, and position, but was nevertheless detained in prison from Friday to Monday, without having the opportunity of telegraphing or writing to his wife and friends; whether a gentleman was not arrested at the same match last year, under similar circumstances, on a charge of stealing an opera-glass which proved to be his own; whether he was not afterwards confined to his bed for three or four months from illness brought on by the treatment he then received; and, whether he will cause inquiries to be made and proper compensation awarded to Mr. Harman, and take such steps as may for the future protect persons attending the Eton and Harrow Cricket Match from being arrested and sent to prison without reasonable grounds for suspicion?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I suppose the case turns upon the manner in which the police have acted. I cannot promise compensation or anything of the kind in this case. The magistrate informs me that when this prisoner was charged before him, the constables gave their evidence with great deliberation, and a full note was taken of it by the clerk. The prisoner did not at that time impugn their statements, and did not attempt to cross-examine them, and no application was made for bail, which certainly would have been granted. The magistrate was very much struck by the silence of the prisoner, and was inclined to believe that it was because he had nothing to say. I do not think that under such circumstances the magistrate can be blamed for sending him to prison on remand. Unfortunately, the same gentleman was arrested last year. [MR. GORST: Not the same gentleman.] Oh, another gentleman. I beg pardon. He was brought before the same magistrate; the police gave their evidence, and in consequence of that evidence the magistrate at first refused to admit him to bail. It afterwards appeared that he was not a likely person to commit larceny, and he was accordingly discharged. In this case the magistrate thought that the evidence of the police was not carefully given. I do not think that there is any ground for compensation in this case. With regard to the information as to his treatment at the hands of the police there must be some mistake, because he was undoubtedly allowed to write to his wife. The gentleman who was arrested in 1877 was seen by the surgeon, was under no treatment while in prison, and made no complaints. He was visited by his father every day during the five days he was under remand, and also by his solicitor, and was supplied by his friends with a liberal allowance of food. He made no complaint whatever.

## JUDICIAL STATISTICS — CONVICT PRISONS.—QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will be good enough to lay upon the Table of the House, a Return showing the number of prisoners in each of the Government Convict Prisons in Great Britain and Ireland during each of the ten years ending on the last day of December 1877; and showing also the number of suicides and attempts at suicide in those prisons, and also the cases in which prisoners have mutilated or attempted to mutilate themselves, and giving in a condensed form the particulars of each such case of suicide or mutilation; and, further, a Return of the number of prisoners flogged in each prison during each of those years, with the number of lashes inflicted?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I am quite willing to give every kind of information connected with prisons so far as facts are concerned. All the facts I believe, not matters of opinion, are stated in the official statistics and annual Reports which are presented to Parliament, and I am told the Royal Commissioners have requested that some such statements as these may be prepared for them. They are in course of preparation. If the hon. Member desires that I should lay them on the Table of the House, I will do so; but I think they had better appear in the Reports of the Commissioners.

## PRISONS ACTS—PLANK BEDS.

### QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the names of prisons in Great Britain and Ireland in which bare planks were in use as beds for ordinary offenders previous to the Government taking over the management of the prisons into their own hands; and, whether he will be good enough to obtain, through the Foreign and Colonial Offices, Returns showing in what Foreign Countries or Colonies such planks for ordinary offenders are in use in the prisons?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I had hoped to be able to reply at once as to the number of prisons in which planks are used; but, unfortunately, the Return has not yet come down to me. Plank beds were in most liberal use in the prisons long before they were passed over to the Government. I would refer the hon. Gentleman to the origin of the plank bed system. It was started in general use after the Report of the Committee of the House of Lords in 1863. That Committee found they had been introduced generally in military prisons, and recommended that they should be introduced into the civil prisons; and it was in consequence of that Report that the prisons throughout the country adopted the plank beds. With regard to foreign countries, I cannot answer the Question; but I believe that after the holding of the Prison Congress, which will take place in Stockholm in the course of the present year, I shall be able to give the information. When the Return I have already spoken of reaches me, I will be happy to lay it on the Table if the hon. Gentleman wishes.

## ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES.—ARTILLERY SERGEANTS.

### QUESTION.

Mr. MARK STEWART asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that a Sergeant of Militia Artillery is entitled to extra pay, at the rate of 6*d.* per diem, when employed in drilling a Brigade Depôt or Infantry, or at heavy gun practice, whilst the Sergeant of Artillery Volunteers is not so entitled when similarly employed; and, if so, whether he is prepared to alter the Regulations so as to grant, under like circumstances, the same rate of extra pay to both Militia and Volunteer Artillery Sergeants?

Colonel STANLEY: Sir, a pensioner sergeant of Militia—Artillery or Infantry—employed in drilling troops of the Regular Army, is considered to be performing a special military duty; and, under an Auxiliary Reserve Force Circular of 1877, receives, while so employed, an allowance of 3*d.* a-day. This allowance is in reality in lieu of rations in kind, which, to prevent confusion, are not given to the Militia sergeants at periods other than training. The pensioner Volunteer sergeant, if performing similar duties, does not, it is true, receive the allowance of 3*d.* a-day; but he can receive a ration in kind, worth about 7*d.* a-day, for 4*d.*, which places him in about the same position as the Militia sergeant.

## INDIA—MADRAS WILLS FOR 1788 AND 1789.

### QUESTION.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If it is true that the Registry or volume containing copies of the Madras Wills is missing or has been stolen from the India Office?

Mr. E. STANHOPE: Yes, Sir, it is true that the volume containing copies of the Madras wills from 1788 to 1789 is missing. Its loss has only recently been discovered, and if the volume cannot be recovered, other copies of the wills will be obtained from Madras.

## NAVY—COMMANDERS ON THE ACTIVE LIST.—QUESTION.

Mr. VANS AGNEW asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is the case that of the Commanders whose names now stand on the Active List of the Royal Navy only 11 per cent of those who attained that rank in the five years 1870-74 inclusive had served for more than twelve years as Lieutenants; that of those who attained that rank in the three following years, 1875-7 inclusive, 52 per cent had served more than twelve years as Lieutenants; and that in last year twelve out of seventeen, or 70 per cent of the Commanders of 1877, had served more than twelve years as Lieutenants; and, whether he is of opinion that this progressive retardation of promotion is injurious to the service, and if he proposes to take any steps to give a more rapid flow of promotion to Officers in the lower ranks of the Royal Navy than is possible under the rules now in force?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I am free to admit that the hon. Gentleman's figures are nearly, although not quite, correct; and that while only 11 per cent of Lieutenants promoted to be Commanders between 1870 and 1874 had more than 12 years' seniority, 52 per cent of those promoted between 1875-7 had served more than 12 years, and 65 per cent of those promoted in 1877. I must also acknowledge that delay in promotion is injurious to the Service, as it is most desirable that young and vigorous men should be found in the ranks of commanders and captains. The difficulty arises from the fact that a larger number of officers is required in the junior ranks of the Service than can be provided for in the higher ranks; but I am afraid I am not prepared to swell the number of the higher ranks beyond the real requirements of the Service. All I can promise is that, recognizing the evil, I will give the subject my best consideration, with the view of seeing whether a remedy can be devised.

## SUPPLY — SUPPLEMENTARY ARMY ESTIMATES.—QUESTION.

Mr. HAYTER asked the Secretary of State for War, What is the total amount included in the Supplementary Army Estimate in respect of the occupation of Cyprus by Her Majesty's Forces; and, whether he can state how such total amount is distributed for stores, works, and fortifications?

Colonel STANLEY: Sir, the last part of my hon. Friend's Question has not reached me, and I am not, therefore, in a position to answer it. What we have taken is £10,000 for staff, £25,000 for works, and £45,000 for stores; but it is quite obvious that these amounts can only be approximate. These are the stores and works within the General Vote, and what the repayments may be I cannot say.

## RE-ORGANIZATION OF THE ADMIRALTY—REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

### QUESTION.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE (for Captain Pim) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If there is any objection to lay upon the Table of the House, the Report on the Reorganization of the Admiralty made by the Committee appointed for that purpose, consisting of the honourable Baronet the Junior Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Lingen, and Mr. R. G. C. Hamilton, who has just received the appointment of Accountant General of the Navy?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that there was no objection to give the information referred to as to the recommendations of the Committee for the reorganization of the Admiralty; but the Committee itself was a Departmental Committee, and it was unusual to produce Reports of that character to the House, and it would be inconvenient to set a precedent of that kind. If the hon. and learned Member called at the Admiralty, he would be happy to show him the Report.

## NAVY—THE CENSUS.

### QUESTION.

Mr. E. HUBBARD asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he would inform the House how and when he intends to take the Census of the Navy in the form ordered on Monday last, July 29th; and, how soon he expects to lay upon the Table of the House the completed Census, the basis of any correct actuarial calculation of the cost of the Seamen Widows' Pension Fund?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that instructions had been issued for the preparation of forms for taking the Census of the Navy, and he hoped they would soon be completed. When they were, it was intended to issue them to the Commanders-in-Chief at the different ports throughout the globe, to have them filled up on the 1st of January and returned to the Admiralty. But he was afraid it would be the middle of the next year before the Returns could be collected so as to form the basis of any correct actuarial calculation of the cost of a Seamen Widows' Pension Fund.

## THE WINDWARD ISLANDS — BARBADOES.—QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any steps are being taken by the Governor of the Windward Islands to carry out the long contemplated reforms in the Government of Barbadoes; and, whether he can lay upon the Table any Papers or Despatches relating to the present condition of the Colony?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, at the instance of the Governor of Barbadoes, a measure for securing the better representation of the Government in the House of Assembly was introduced into that body; but was, I regret to say, rejected. The Governor has since been obliged to return home for a time on account of ill-health, and I hope during his stay in this country to confer with him as to the course which should now be pursued. I do not think there are any Papers which I could with advantage lay upon the Table at present.

## CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN MILITARY EXPEDITION.—QUESTION.

MR. C. BECKETT DENISON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If any inquiries have been made by Her Majesty's Ambassador at Saint Petersburg as to the aim, object, and purpose of a reported military expedition under General Kaufmann to the South of the Oxus, threatening the town of Balkh, which is in Afghan territory?

MR. BOURKE: Yes, Sir; inquiries have been made at St. Petersburgh on the subject referred to in the Question of my hon. Friend, and the matter is receiving the attention of Her Majesty's Government.

## SUPPLY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, &c.—QUESTIONS.

MR. CHILDERS asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When the Supplementary Budget, if he might use the expression, would be brought on in Committee of Ways and Means? He would also be glad if the right hon. Gentleman could state the course of Business for the week.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I should be only too glad if I could indicate the general course of Business more clearly than I am able to do. To-morrow we shall take as the First Order the Committee of Ways and Means, and I shall then make what my right hon. Friend calls the Supplementary Budget, or Financial Statement. I do not know whether that will lead to discussion in Committee, but I presume there will not be much discussion before going into Committee. Then would follow the Vote for the Supplementary Army Estimates in Supply. I see that the hon. and gallant Member for Bath (Mr. Hayter) has a Notice on the Paper, and I do not know whether he will bring that on to-morrow or not. Therefore, there is great difficulty in judging how much progress we may make to-morrow. Probably, we shall go on with Supply on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. If we get through the Army Estimates, we shall propose then to take the Navy Estimates on Thursday; and if we are fortunate enough to get through them, we shall take the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates on Friday. To-night, if we are able to do it, we hope to get through all the remaining Votes of Classes III., II., and I.; and, if there is time, we might finish the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill. It may be convenient to some hon. Members to say that we propose, in any case, to take the Report on the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill on Monday next.

MR. CHILDERS said, there were Estimates and Supplementary Estimates. In what order was it proposed to take these?

MR. ANDERSON had hoped for some information as to what Bills it was intended to take. Were the Government going on with the Medical Act Amendment Bill? He wished to know, because it was getting so near the end of the Session.

MR. J. COWEN asked, if it was intended to persevere with the Telegraphs Bill; and, if so, he desired some intimation when it was likely to be taken?

MR. JENKINS asked, if it was proposed to go on with the Bishoprics Bill?

MR. M'LAREN asked, what course was to be taken with the Education (Scotland) Bill, which was brought on at three o'clock on Saturday morning, when many of the Scotch Members were not present?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, we propose to take the ordinary Army Estimates first, and then the Supplementary Army Estimates, and to exhaust these before we go to the Navy and Civil Service Estimates. I cannot say at what particular hour the Cattle Plague Bill, which stands just after Supply, is likely to be taken. I will not go on with it at an unreasonable hour, though, at this time of the year, it is difficult to say what is an unreasonable hour. The Bishoprics Bill will be proceeded with. I announced some time ago that the Indictable Offences Bill would not be proceeded with; but although I promised that due Notice would be given of when the Order was to be discharged, I am unable to give that Notice at present. We are unable, at this moment, to say whether we shall proceed with the Telegraphs Bill. As to the Medical Act Amendment Bill, I have communicated with the Lord President of the Council, and he is of opinion, as we also are, that it would be useless to attempt to pass it at this period of the Session; and the Order will, therefore, be discharged. With regard to the Scotch Education Bill, he would leave his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary to say what course he was going to follow.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he would not have brought the Scotch Education Bill forward the other night, except at the request of Scotch Members. When he was asked to bring the Bill on, he said he thought it was rather late, but if they wished to go on, he, for one, would not object to it. One hon. Member objected; but he was met by a perfect chorus of Scotch Members insisting upon it. He (Mr. Assheton Cross) was bound to say a quieter and calmer two hours' discussion he did not believe had ever taken place in that House. He would bring on the Report at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. M'LAREN gave Notice, that he would move that the Report be taken into consideration this day three months, and that would prevent the Bill coming on after half-past 12 o'clock.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON thought the arrangement just announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the Supplementary Budget Statement and the Supplementary Estimates was the most convenient that could be adopted. The Motion, of which his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Bath (Mr. Hayter) had given Notice, called in question, to a certain extent, the whole recent policy of the Government, and also partly the policy of the Expenditure which would have to be discussed in Committee. Now, it seemed to him that the general question of policy had been tolerably well discussed last week. He presumed that there would be a full opportunity in Committee of discussing the Expenditure incurred in removing the Asiatic troops to Malta and in the occupation of Cyprus. He would, therefore, suggest to his hon. and gallant Friend that it would not be necessary to interpose his Motion before the Speaker left the Chair, but that his object would be sufficiently met by a discussion on that Expenditure in Committee. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), who was not in his place, also had a Notice of Motion on going into Committee on the Supplementary Estimates. It would, perhaps, be convenient that the discussion on the Supplementary Estimates should, if possible, be taken to-morrow; and the Motion of the hon. Member for Hackney, which was one of a somewhat abstract nature, might be discussed equally well on going into Supply on any other occasion. He hoped to be able to persuade his hon. Friend not to interpose his Motion to-morrow.

MR. HAYTER, after what had been said by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the noble Lord, acceded to the suggestion just made by his noble Friend. He might however add, that having received a great amount of support on the Liberal side of the House, especially below the Gangway, he surrendered not the substance but only the form of his Motion. It would be competent for him to raise the subject of the Military Expenditure and the occupation of Cyprus in the discussion that would take place in Committee on the Supplementary Estimates.

MR. MUNDELLA said, that as there were some 20 odd Notices on the Paper before going into Committee, he wished to know when the Education Votes would be taken if they were not reached to-night?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, they could hardly expect to reach the Education Votes to-night.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

## H.M.S. "BEAGLE"—EXECUTION OF A NATIVE OF TANNA — POWERS OF NAVAL COMMANDERS.

### RESOLUTION.

Mr. GORST, in rising to call attention to the circumstances under which a Native of Tanna was, on the 25th of September, 1877, put to death on board H.M.S. "Beagle," and to move—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that instructions may be issued to the Officers commanding Her Majesty's ships to define and regulate their authority to put persons to death not subjects of Her Majesty;"

said, he disclaimed any intention of reflecting on the officers engaged in the affair, as they had only carried out the orders thrust upon them by their superiors; but he objected to the system by which naval officers were turned into Judges of Assize, and Her Majesty's ships into a sort of itinerant gallows. He wished a Parliamentary check to be put on such proceedings. It was a matter of complaint, too, that they had neither the whole of the evidence which was taken as to the man's guilt before them, nor had they the whole of the correspondence which took place between the authorities on the subject. It had been said that the hanging of a single man, even for an unjust act, was, after all, more humane than the destruction of a whole village; but why did Lieutenant Caffin not destroy the village? The fact was that he wanted to do so, but found that the village was out of his reach; and there was no reason, therefore, for attributing to him any humane motive for the course which he followed. As he could not destroy the village, the course he took was to seize a number of innocent individuals, who fancied themselves to be under the protection of the British flag and British justice, and who had no more to do with the murder than the First Lord of the Admiralty himself. Most of these men were detained for a time, but were afterwards allowed to go. Three, however, were still secured. Then, for the first time, the lad who was finally hanged was mentioned by one of the three prisoners. In many of those Islands the Chiefs exercised so much power that they could easily get someone to come forward and suffer even death for them; and in this case it appeared to him that the person executed was certainly not the culprit. The lad was cross-examined, but not his accuser. In the course of cross-examination, he contradicted everything that he had said before, and he was condemned solely on the evidence given by him in cross-examination. He was made to say—"I would have fired if my brother's shot had not taken effect," in answer to a question which no English Judge would have allowed to be put. The proceedings were very irregular, and even his judges did not seem to be satisfied that he was the murderer; for sentence was delayed, and the search renewed for the actual murderer. It was only when this search failed that the poor lad was put to death. Hitherto it had been the general opinion that the law of this country prevailed on board Her Majesty's ships of war, and that even an enemy's spy must be tried by a regularly constituted tribunal. The tribunal which had tried this youth had not been regularly constituted; and it was singular that the sentence, which was, of course, an important document, and which had been translated into Tannese for the benefit of the Natives, should not be forthcoming. He could not find it in the Papers presented to Parliament. He had always understood that the deck of a British man-of-war was a place within the peace of our Sovereign Lady. It might be said that the man who was hanged was in the position of a constructive boarder, whom it was lawful to kill as an act of war. He did not adopt that view, however, and his error on the point was shared by Sir Matthew Hale, who, 200 years ago, laid it down that if a man killed an alien enemy within this Kingdom it was felony, unless it were done in the heat of war and in the actual exercise thereof. The question naturally arose, who was really responsible for what had been done? There was evidently a time when the Admiralty thought they could throw the responsibility upon Commodore Hoskins, for they had telegraphed to him asking him to communicate at once the legal authority on which he had acted. Commodore Hoskins drew his neck out of the noose very satisfactorily by referring the Admiralty to two documents which he claimed would amply justify the proceedings. Those documents were a despatch of February, 1876, by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and an opinion given by the Attorney General for New South Wales. The first was not produced, and he thought the House had a right to complain of the course taken by the Government in withholding it. The letter of the Colonial Secretary appeared to authorize the act in question, and the opinion of the Attorney General for New South Wales was to the effect that no tribunal in Her Majesty's Dominions having any jurisdiction to try a foreigner for offences committed outside of those Dominions, the commander of the ship was right in taking the law into his own hands. He had, however, yet to learn that the jurisdiction of a commander of a British man-of-war began when the jurisdiction of every other legal tribunal in Her Majesty's Dominions ceased. The proper course to have adopted would have been to have sent a ship of war to compel the foreign authorities to execute justice upon their offending subject, and not to have taken the law into their own hands. He should like to ask the hon. and learned Attorney General whether, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, the captain of a man-of-war, without the authority of an Act of Parliament, had jurisdiction to try persons not subjects of the Queen for offences committed outside of Her Dominions? If the Government did not mean to assert that, then the proceedings in this Tanna case were wrong. If, on the other hand, the Government did mean to assert it, all he asked was that the authority of the officers commanding British ships should be defined and regulated, if not by the authority of Parliament, at all events, by some instructions from Her Majesty.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that instructions may be issued to the Officers commanding Her Majesty's ships to define and regulate their authority to put persons to death not subjects of Her Majesty,"—(*Mr. Gorst,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER) observed, that the subject before the House was a very serious one, and that it deserved far more grave treatment than had been given to it by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), in making his strictures upon Her Majesty's Government. The two questions raised were—first, whether instructions given by the Colonial Secretary to captains of Her Majesty's ships were proper; and, secondly, whether those instructions had been legally carried out? The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that he did not intend to make any attack on Lieutenant Caffin, but it seemed to him that the whole object of his hon. and learned Friend had been to show that this young officer had not done his duty; and that, in fact, he had hanged the wrong man. He (the Attorney General), however, thought he should be able to demonstrate, without the slightest difficulty, that the hon. and learned Gentleman's adverse criticisms were not in the least degree justified by the facts, that that officer had instituted a proper investigation into the facts of the case, that he had carried out his instructions properly, and that the opinion which he arrived at was right. The important question was not whether he had made a mistake, but whether, under such circumstances as existed in this case, the commander of a British man-of-war was entitled to read a lesson to the Natives of Tanna—that was to say, to endeavour by the action he pursued to put a stop to what was going on; and whether he was entitled to treat this man, who had murdered—for he would assume that for the sake of argument—a British subject in Tanna, as an enemy of Her Majesty? This was a question which must be dealt with, with some regard to the principles of common sense. He did not say there was any jurisdiction in point of law to try this man. No Court had, to his knowledge, yet been established in which to try savages; but when a savage attacked British subjects, and when it was necessary, to secure the rights of British subjects, to levy war upon them, we were perfectly justified in doing so. Take the case of a British ship of war anchoring off the coast. A party of men going on shore were attacked by the Natives, and one of them, from no fault of his own, was slain. Was it to be contended that, because there was no Court to try the Native who slew the man, the commander of Her Majesty's vessel might not take action immediately, and attack them? Had we arrived at such a pitch of humanitarian absurdity as to declare that in such a case the commander of Her Majesty's vessel had no right to take action for the protection of British subjects? It was a strong thing to say that the commander of one of Her Majesty's vessels had no right to levy war. Where his hon. and learned Friend got his views upon the subject he really did not know. His (the Attorney General's) view of this matter was a very simple one. He did not assert that the man was tried by any Court having jurisdiction to try him; but he and his fellows, Natives of Tanna, had murdered British subjects; and several British subjects having been previously murdered in that place, the commander of Her Majesty's vessel had a right to levy war on them. He might have shot them all down; he might have destroyed a whole village had he chosen; but because he had proceeded in a more merciful and considerate way, they had had a virulent attack upon the Government. The Secretary of State for the Colonies having telegraphed to Commodore Hoskins on the subject, the Commodore, in reply, sent a letter which gave a most reasonable and intelligible account of these proceedings. The Commodore said—

> "2. I beg now to report more fully that in giving Lieutenant Caffin orders respecting the punishment of the murderer of Easterbrook at Tanna, I was in the first place guided by the conviction, that it is the duty of naval officers generally to protect British subjects in lawless and savage places, and when they are maltreated or murdered, to punish the perpetrators, if it is clearly established that no sufficient provocation has been given, and that they had not forced themselves into the country in opposition to the wishes of the inhabitants.
>
> "3. In holding that conviction, however, I have not lost sight of the fact, that the first pioneers of trade in such places as the Western Pacific Islands must go about to a great extent with their lives in their hands, and that it would be as impolitic as it would be unjust to visit with extreme rigour the offences against their persons or property which are committed by natives who, in what they do are only following their natural instincts and traditions, and are doubtless in many cases provoked and stimulated to revenge, by acts of which we hear nothing.
>
> "4. From the time of my arrival on this station I have been constantly urged by island traders to avenge such offences with wholesale punishment and slaughter of their aggressors, but I have invariably resisted all applications which would involve indiscriminate firing on villages and probable loss of innocent lives, pointing out that where proper precautions are taken, such occurrences are rare, and are no more than must be expected as the consequence of careless exposure in dealing with savages with whom cannibalism and skull-hunting have been immemorial customs. In reply, it has more than once been intimated to me, that if I would not take action in the matter, the traders would take the law into their own hands; to which I have answered, that it did not alter my view of the matter, and that I should repress any improper conduct of British subjects to the utmost of my power.
>
> "5. It is evident, however, that in our growing intercourse with the islanders, there is a point and class of offences, when it becomes necessary to hold them more strictly amenable to our usages and ideas, and estimate of the value of human life; and such is the case, I consider, when, in places where white men have established a footing, and the natives, from constant intercourse with them, and from labouring in our colonies, are emerging from the lower depths of barbarism, wanton outrages are committed by them on our people, with little or no provocation given, but stimulated by cupidity or revenge."

He submitted that the view of Commodore Hoskins was a correct view. If British subjects had forced themselves upon these savages, the case would have been different; but when British subjects had been for some time living in the place, when the savages had become aware, to a certain extent, of our laws and of our mode of dealing with them, and then wantonly attacked British subjects for the purpose of revenge, or for the purpose of gratifying their cupidity, then it was time, in the opinion of Commodore Hoskins, to interfere. His hon. and learned Friend had said that Parliament was entitled to judge for itself of all the details, and that the instructions which were issued to Commodore Hoskins ought to have been placed before the House. Quite sufficient information had been placed before the House to enable it to judge of the matter, and if his hon. and learned Friend had had any real desire to see the Papers which he named, it was quite competent for him to have moved for them, and they would then have been produced. From the beginning to the end of this accusation against the Government, his hon. and learned Friend had acted like an attorney in a County Court, who, by way of accusation against his adversary, asked why he did not produce this, that, and the other, when all the time his hon. and learned Friend knew that the instructions would have been produced if he had asked for them. If they had had been put on the Table, they would have thrown more light on the subject, and thus his hon. and learned Friend would have been deprived of the only lance he could fairly or unfairly have used against the Government. But it had been said, instead of demanding this murderer to be given up to him, Lieutenant Caffin should have gone to the King or the Chief of the country, and have demanded that he should have taken the man's life away. But where was the difference? If we had the right to levy war, we had the right to take the man's life away? His hon. and learned Friend was more astute in these matters than he was; but he confessed that he could see no substantial difference. We had done all we could, by passing the Pacific Islanders Act, to prevent British subjects from attacking those people, and many outrages having occurred on British subjects, it became necessary that they should be checked. Let the House then consider for a moment whether Commodore Hoskins was fairly open to the attack which had been made upon him? Some time in April of last year, apparently, Easterbrook, the man in question, who was an inhabitant of the Island of Tanna, found his way, accompanied by some four men and his wife, on board a British man-of-war. He was at the time seriously wounded, and at the point of death. He was removed ashore and taken to the house of a missionary, Mr. Neilson, where he died shortly afterwards. Before he died, he stated that he had a quarrel with a man named Nakapok about cocoanuts. The same account had been given by his wife and by the four men. What was remarkable was that in those accounts nothing was said about there having been a quarrel in consequence of an intrigue with the wife of the murderer, and the matter having been brought under the notice of Commodore Hoskins, he issued the following sailing orders to Lieutenant Caffin on the 24th of July, 1877:—

> "Being in every respect ready, you are to put to sea on Wednesday, the 25th instant, and proceed to Noumea, New Caledonia, where you are to communicate with Her Majesty's Consul, and hand him the enclosed letter.
>
> "2. A British subject, named Easterbrook, having been murdered at Sulphur Bay, near Port Resolution, Tanna, Mr. Layard communicated on the subject with Lieutenant Musters, commanding the 'Conflict,' who visited Port Resolution and inquired into the matter. Lieutenant Muster's report of his investigation, and the conclusion he came to, is enclosed for your information.
>
> "3. You are then to proceed to find the 'Renard' in the New Hebrides, and having taken her under your orders, make the best of your way to Port Resolution, Tanna, where you are to further inquire into the murder of Easterbrook; and should you be fully convinced that it was not his own misconduct which led to the commission of the deed, you are, should you deem your force sufficient, to endeavour to obtain possession of the murderer; and, if successful, you are to cause him to be executed in the most public and judicial manner possible.
>
> "4. Should you, however, deem the force at your disposal insufficient for the purpose, and to overawe any resistance, you are to report so to me by the 'Renard,' which vessel, under any circumstances, is to leave for Sydney as soon as possible."

Having received those instructions, Lieutenant Caffin set out for Tanna, and took into his counsel Lieutenant Pugh, who happened to be there at the time. He also consulted Mr. Neilson, the missionary, who seemed to know more about the Natives than anybody else. Lieutenant Caffin then said that on the day following his arrival he sent a letter to the chief men of the village of Numukur. to which the murderer belonged. He added—

> "5. On Tuesday, the 18th"—of September—"a messenger arrived from the village with the reply that the chief men had received my letter, and that they refused to give the murderer up for trial."

Now, his hon. and learned Friend contended that the course which had been taken by Lieutenant Caffin was altogether wrong; although, if the Chiefs had consented to execute the murderer, no complaint, he seemed to think, could be made. But the murderer not being forthcoming, what, he would ask, was Lieutenant Caffin to have done? There being a number of Natives on board the ships, he ordered them to be taken as hostages, in order to see whether he could not make them surrender the murderer. Many of these were afterwards allowed to go, but three were detained. Mr. Neilson then informed him that he had fortunately secured the principal man in the neighbourhood, and it was discovered on interrogation that the pre-supposed murderer Nakapok was not the actual one, but that a person named Yuhmaga, was. Mr. Neilson, the missionary, said—

> "Yuhmaga acknowledged to me that he had shot Easterbrook, and I took out of his hands the musket with which he did it. He alleged in justification that the white man had committed adultery with a woman belonging to him, called Yasua. The woman, who was standing near, confirmed his statement, but on being questioned said that the adultery was committed with her *consent*."

Exhortations were made to the murderer to go on board Her Majesty's ship, where he might rely on a fair trial, and to take the woman with him; but this he refused to do. A boat was landed from the *Beagle* to try and make him, but he rushed into the covers, and it would have been dangerous to follow him, seeing that the Natives, who were friendly to him, were armed, and thus prepared to prevent his capture. Now, what became of his hon. and learned Friend's statement, that Nakapok was the real murderer and that Yuhmaga was only a scapegoat?

Mr. GORST: What I said was, that although Yuhmaga had openly stated on the beach that he was the murderer, yet it was quite conceivable that he was a mere scapegoat put forward by Nakapok.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker) observed, that in reply to that, he could only say it was not conceivable and not possible, and that no rational man dealing with the matter would come to such a conclusion. After Yuhmaga had escaped, a man named Nawanabus, who held a good position among the Tanna people, was examined, and in his examination stated that Yuhmaga had murdered Easterbrook by Nakapok's orders. Yuhmaga, he added, was not accompanied by Nakapok on the evening of the murder, but by Nokwai, a younger brother of his own. Here it was, perhaps, well to remind the House that the investigation of the affair was not pursued under the same advantages as it would have been in a Court of Justice. Lieutenant Caffin had orders to get the murderer, and was bound to go upon the best evidence he could get, without troubling himself particularly about the propriety or otherwise of examining accused parties themselves. Accordingly, he did what most men would have done in the same circumstances. He examined Nokwai, who stated—

> "I saw Yuhmaga shoot Easterbrook. I was standing very close to Yuhmaga at the time. I had no gun, but my club was in my hand at the time. Yuhmaga said to me—'Let us two go and kill the white man.' I said—'I won't, but will go with you and carry my club.' Yuhmaga shot Easterbrook because he had committed adultery with Yasua . . . . the wife of Nakapok. I saw Easterbrook fall to the ground on his back, and I immediately ran. I think Yuhmaga was acting rightly in killing Easterbrook. There had been a quarrel between Nakapok and Easterbrook about cocoanuts. Nakapok did steal Easterbrook's cocoanuts, and brought them to him again for sale. Nakapok induced Yuhmaga to shoot Easterbrook. Nakapok and Easterbrook quarrelled for four days about the cocoanuts, and on the fifth day Easterbrook was shot. He was shot on account of his liberties with the woman, as well as on account of the cocoanut dispute."

Having made that statement, Nokwai was confronted with Yuhmaga, who stated that his gun was loaded with powder and ball, and that his brother told him to fire, and he said he would have fired if his brother's shot had not taken effect. There could, therefore, be no doubt that Nokwai was there to help Yuhmaga in case of need. Now, was a man who committed murder because he was asked to do it to be held guiltless, and was another man who went there to assist him not to be held equally guilty with him? When it was said there was no evidence to convict the murderer, it seemed to be forgotten that they had the man's own confession; and it was also clear, from the evidence which appeared in those Papers, that all the three men concerned were guilty of murder according to our notions of law. In those circumstances, acting under his instructions, Lieutenant Caffin condemned the man to death. Giving a fair and reasonable interpretation to the evidence, anyone who was anxious to do what was just and right, and who, while he sympathized with the Natives, desired to protect British subjects, as was his duty, would come to the same conclusion as that at which Lieutenant Caffin arrived. It might be said that although the conclusion was right, nevertheless the orders were wrong; but he thought the officer was right in the decision to which he came. The hon. and learned Member for Chatham had accused that officer of he knew not what, and said that if he had been a Native Chief he would have refused to give up that Native. No doubt, in that case, the hon. and learned Member would have thrown every obstacle in his power in the way of a course that was reasonable and fair. But the commander of the *Beagle* thought it was his duty to get hold of the murderer; he did his best to get the man who actually fired the fatal shot. He failed to do so; but he did get the man who aided and abetted the crime, and who, according to our law, was guilty of murder, and caused him to be executed under the instructions he had received for the purpose of protecting British life. The question was whether, when British subjects had been wantonly slaughtered without cause or justification, the commander of a British ship of war was not warranted in saying that he would stop such proceedings in future, and throw his protection over British subjects in future in that place, and would do so by levying war on those who had proved themselves to be enemies of Her Majesty?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that as the first Member who brought this subject before the attention of the House, he must express his surprise that, although the Attorney General had addressed the House at much length, he had shed so little light on the subject. It almost seemed as if, feeling the badness of his case, the Attorney General had spoken at such length to confuse the real issue before them. The hon. and learned Attorney General had divided the question under the two heads of the law and the facts. He considered that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) was a good authority to follow in regard to this subject, first as being a lawyer, and next as being an undoubted authority on the subject of the Polynesian Islands. The Attorney General had made merry at the expense of his hon. and learned Friend, because he had not called for Papers; but if he recollected rightly, those Papers had been made the subject of many a Question by his hon. and learned Friend. Let the Government produce the despatch on that matter of Sir Arthur Gordon, the High Commissioner for Polynesia, appointed under an Act of 1875, by which he was invested with exceptional and remarkable privileges for dealing with offences committed in that quarter. The Attorney General said that offences committed by Natives against Europeans did not come within that Act. They did not; neither did they come within any other provisions of law. But Sir Arthur Gordon—the highest authority on such a point—was of opinion that such offences would be better dealt with by him, with all the knowledge at his disposal, than in the manner adopted in this instance. The Attorney General had gone at some length into the question of who was to blame. Now, he thought that what the House had to do was to look at the facts, and see whether something had been done that was blameworthy; and, if that were so, it was for the Government to find the persons who were to bear the blame. The facts showed that there was censurable matter in that case. It was contended that the commander of a British ship had power to enforce by acts of war redress for acts committed against British subjects. But in the Pacific Islands Act there was a clause which, in spite of the power conferred on British officers, declared that nothing contained therein or in any Order in Council should be construed to invest Her Majesty with any title whatever to dominion or sovereignty over such places, in derogation of the rights of the Native Chiefs or Rulers to such sovereignty and dominion. Great care was taken at the passing of that Act to prevent anything like colour being given to the notion that we had a right to deal with the people of those Islands in a totally different way from that in which we dealt with other parts of the world. The Attorney General spoke of an act of war having been done in that case; but he must have used that expression in quite a technical sense, and not in the sense in which a plain man would use it. That, however, had nothing to do with the matter before the House. He would confine himself to the facts as they appeared on the Paper, and was surprised that the hon. and learned Gentleman had relied on picked and selected portions of the evidence of certain parties when their evidence was contradictory, and on the confession of the man himself who had been executed. The only evidence on which Nokwai was hanged was his own, to the effect that he saw the shot fired by his brother, and that if his brother's gun had failed he would have used his own, he having already stated that he had no gun. In the absence of Papers, he would also point out that there was no evidence to show that the murders of British subjects spoken of had occurred to anything like the extent which was supposed. The testimony of the missionaries, on the contrary, he ventured to think, would be found to be that the murders which were committed were connected with attempts to kidnap the Islanders for the purpose of sending them into slavery. As to the taking of hostages in the indiscriminate way in which Lieutenant

Caffin had done, it was worthy of remark that there was no perceptible connection between those hostages and the crime which it was sought to punish; nor was it shown that they had the murderer in any sense within their control. The man, he might add, who was actually hanged, stated in his examination that he had no gun with him, although, having been very severely cross-examined, he said he had one, and upon such evidence as that he was put to death. Those facts, he thought, showed clearly that we had hanged a man who, under similar circumstances, would never have been put to death here or in any civilized country with which he was acquainted. He would, then, ask the House with confidence, whether they regarded the reply of the Attorney General as satisfactory, and whether they did not think that the Government, without being urged by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chatham, ought to have placed before them the evidence which was necessary to a complete review of the case? In the absence of such information, he could not believe that any man could read this account without a feeling of horror at what had occurred. The strongest opinion upon it had been expressed by those persons who had the greatest acquaintance with Polynesia. Admiral Erskine entertained a very strong opinion upon it, and with regard to an even higher authority—Sir Arthur Gordon—he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) challenged the Government to lay his despatch upon the Table.

Sir HENRY JAMES declined to follow the Attorney General through his very long analysis of the facts or to discuss the question of whether Lieutenant Caffin was right or wrong; but he contended that that officer ought never to have been placed in the position in which he found himself of being driven to execute the man in question, whether upon sufficient or insufficient evidence. Our representatives abroad ought not to be called upon to execute summary justice in the protection of the lives or property of British subjects. As for the Attorney General, he appeared, from an answer which he had given to the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) on the 28th of January last, to have once entertained a very different opinion on the question from that which he had maintained that evening, and he would ask the Government whether they took the view that when a court was held under the British flag, a trial took place, and a man was executed, it was a modified mode of levying war, which was the ground upon which the act was justified by the Attorney General? But he would appeal to a despatch of the Board of Admiralty on the subject, in which it was stated that it would be desirable that the Chiefs themselves should inflict punishment on the perpetrators of those outrages; that such a course would be likely to have a more deterrent influence and be less objectionable than the punishment of Natives on board Her Majesty's ships. It had sometimes been said that the Government threw over the Attorney General; but the hon. and learned Gentleman had his revenge, for he had now thrown over the Government. The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) received scant courtesy at the hands of the Attorney General, who to his opponents was usually extremely courteous, on the ground, probably, that being a supporter of the Government he had no right to express his opinion if it were contrary to that entertained by the Government. The Attorney General said that everything had been done which ought to have been done; but it had occurred to some people that it would have been much better that the person by whom the murder was committed should have been executed rather than the half-proved accomplice, and, as the Admiralty said—"It would have been better if the execution had taken place on shore instead of on board the Queen's ship." That was what the Admiralty said, and the independent supporters of the Government were therefore placed in the somewhat disagreeable dilemma of either agreeing with the Attorney General and differing from the First Lord of the Admiralty, or agreeing with the latter and differing from the former. That was not a pleasant alternative for the hon. and gallant Admiral the Member for Stirlingshire (Sir William Edmonstone) to have put before him. He denied that this really was an attack on the Government—it merely called on the House to express an opinion that more distinct and definite as well as just regulations should be issued to the commanders of vessels on the coasts of semi-barbarous States, and they should not be required to act in these cases entirely on their own discretion.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir HARDINGE GIFFARD) maintained that there was no contradiction whatever between the speech of the Attorney General and the despatch of the Admiralty. The hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) had omitted to refer to the words "when practicable" contained in that despatch; and it was clear that, in the present case, it would have been impracticable to carry out the instructions given in that despatch. Objection had been taken to the execution of the man on the ground that he was not the actual murderer; but the facts of the case clearly showed that the person hanged had been guilty of murder either by his own personal act or by "aiding, assisting, or comforting" the actual murderer. In every civilized community, persons who aided others to commit murder were regarded in the same light and punished as the actual murderers. With regard to the question of the evidence on the subject, he observed that hon. Members sought to very much undervalue the intelligence of the Native who was hanged, and it had been alleged that he was half-witted. He (the Solicitor General) arrived at a totally different conclusion from the mode in which those statements of his were given, and from the manner in which he afterwards explained what were the full facts; and those statements being true on the face of them, the Native decidedly and strongly implicated himself in the murder. It had been alleged that the murdered man had been engaged in some intrigue; but even if that were so, it would not justify the injured husband in employing two assassins to murder the adulterer. The statement of the man who was hanged proved that he had been present and had taken part in the murder. If Lieutenant Caffin had not taken the punishment of this man into his own hands, he would have been compelled to let him go free, because there was no local tribunal before which to send him for trial, and it would have been useless to expect the Natives to take any part in bringing the man to justice. There was no tribunal in this country that would have had jurisdiction to try him had the offender been brought over here. According to the statement of the missionary, this was the tenth case of the murder of a British subject under somewhat similar circumstances; and what was done was a military act under military authority in self-preservation. It was just because there was no tribunal to try cases of this sort that the law allowed military officers to interfere and say these crimes should not be committed with impunity. Even in warfare amongst civilized nations it was necessary occasionally to have recourse to reprisals which, under some circumstances, were justifiable; and he could not see therefore why, in dealing with savage tribes, greater accuracy should be observed in such matters as murder. In this case the lieutenant in command appeared to have properly performed his difficult and responsible duty—namely, that of protecting the lives of the Englishmen in the vicinity.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT reminded the House that the Motion was that an Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that instructions might be issued defining the course to be adopted in cases of this kind. How did the Attorney General meet the Motion? By saying that there was no need of instructions, because everything that had been done was perfectly right, and he justified this affair *in omnibus*. They had a discussion last year about the *Huascar* at the end of the Session, and the Attorney General got up and treated the case in the same way and with the same arguments. He said—"This is a case of making war." He seemed to have a notion that Her Majesty's vessels went about all over the globe making war every day whether Her Majesty had declared war or not, and therefore we were not to be surprised at what had happened. It was not the custom of one member of the Bar to say of a brother barrister, as the Attorney General had done of the hon. and learned Member opposite, that he had acted like a County Court attorney; but the Attorney General did that in order to secure a Party cheer from those behind him. In a few weeks after the Attorney General had used last year, in the case of the *Huascar*, the same argument as he had used in this, about levying war, the Lords of the Admiralty wrote a despatch giving by no means the same kind of approval as the Attorney General had given of the transaction. And in this case, also, the Lords of the Admiralty had written a despatch in which they said they trusted this example would produce the intended effect; but they desired that, in future cases, the punishment should if possible be inflicted by the Native Chiefs, as the effect would be more deterrent, and that course would be less objectionable. They also urged the necessity of the greatest caution in dealing with the Natives, which meant that they did not think the greatest caution was exercised in this case. The despatch of the Admiralty plainly indicated a preference for other courses than those which had been adopted in the present case; and he thought, therefore, instructions ought to be issued for the guidance of officers in future.

Sir JOHN HAY thought that the despatch of the Admiralty, which, for the first time in the course of the debate, had been referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), ran on all fours with the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), and therefore no advantage could be gained by pressing his Motion to a division. He believed that the despatch was greatly wanted, and he hoped it would be widely circulated throughout Her Majesty's Navy. He expressed his great regret that one of Her Majesty's ships should have been turned into a perambulating gallows, and that so objectionable a duty as that of carrying out an execution for an offence not committed on board a ship should have been imposed on a commissioned officer of the Queen; but, at the same time, he fully acquitted Lieutenant Caffin of any blame. He was glad that by the publication of the Admiralty despatch the recurrence of such a scene as that which had been witnessed on board the *Beagle* would be prevented. With all respect to the hon. and learned Attorney General, he could not admit that the rope and the gallows were engines of war. Sinking, burning, and destroying were legitimate operations against an enemy of the country; but to take a man on board one of Her Majesty's ships and to hang him at the yard-arm seemed to him far from creditable to Her Majesty's Navy. He would rather have seen a crowd of Natives fired upon and Nokwai and others, including even innocent people, killed by the legitimate methods of warfare than that such a deed as that which was done on board the *Beagle* should have been committed. [*Murmurs.*] Yes, he repeated, he would rather have seen that man and others defending him executed by the proper engines of war than that the rope and the gallows should have been put into the hands of a commanding officer of Her Majesty's Navy.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR thought it was simply horrible, that military and naval officers should be called upon to perform such duties as those of hanging Natives of the Islands for crimes of the ordinary kind, so frequently occurring when Europeans, without the control of their own Government, settled in those Islands; and when they had performed the odious orders issued by their superior naval officer, that their names should be mentioned in the House of Commons and held up before the people of England as those of men who had in themselves done that which was wrong. Lieutenant Caffin should not be censured, for he had simply carried out a disgusting duty, which, in the position he occupied, he was bound to perform by the orders of his commander. He thought there was great reason to complain of the uncertainty in which both military and naval officers were left as to the manner in which they should administer justice on foreign service. The hon. and learned Attorney General had, on a former occasion, referred to the rights and powers possessed by a General in the field, of acting under Martial Law. But it was an entire misapprehension as to this power being legally exercised without the law being declared. No doubt, as the Duke of Wellington stated in the debate on the Martial Law question, which Lord Torrington had declared in Ceylon, the Law Martial was only the will of the General; but that will must be declared, in order that all who offended the Law may know the consequences. Then, as regarded the mode of putting that Law in force, or rather of carrying out the inquiry and punishments—these also must be declared by the General. But then the officer must be in military possession of the territory within which the Law Martial is to operate. He must have all the rights of temporary sovereignty over the people and territory, and thereby be entitled to declare and enforce the new laws which might be necessary to be established. He remembered well the difficulty experienced in China, in regard to punishing Chinese who offended against the rights which General Sir Hugh Gough possessed by being in military occupation of Ningho and territory adjacent. But the late Earl of Derby, at that time Secretary of State for the Colonies, and holding also the Seals of Office as Secretary for War, sent out instructions to Sir Hugh Gough to declare Martial Law, to give warning thereof to the people, and to announce to the Chinese Commander in the neighbourhood of the determination to enforce that Law. This was a methodical and regular course to follow. It was simply substituting for the Civil and Criminal Law of China another law by the new possessor of the district. That law, though promptly applied, did yet possess some degree of formality and legality. It was owing to ignorance of what officials in military possession of, and in command of, territory were to do when in the field, that caused so many serious difficulties; and, seeing how frequently military officers were so situated, he urged that full instructions should be issued to them on that head, not by any Department, but by the Government. He might also mention that in the evidence given before the Select Committee on the affairs of Ceylon, there was excellent evidence given by Sir Charles Dundas—then either Solicitor General or Judge Advocate General—on the subject of Martial Law. It would be a great and good service to the Military Service, if the Government adopted the clear and useful evidence there recorded, and worked the whole into an instruction for the guidance of both naval and military officers. Until this was done we must expect to have many such horrid irregularities as had been brought to light in this debate.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, that, so far as his experience went, when Papers were moved for it was understood that they should be furnished as fully and completely as the circumstances of the case admitted. He was not aware that in the present case there were any Papers whatever which could have been produced, but which had not been. He was informed by his right hon. Friend the Colonial Secretary that no hon. Member had moved for the despatches of Sir Arthur Gordon, to which reference had been made, and that he was perfectly ready to present them if it was the desire of the House. The House would see that Commodore Hoskins was set in motion in the matter by the Consul, that the Consul, in turn, was set in motion by the missionaries, and that the instructions were given, not in consequence of the death of Easterbrook alone, but in consequence of 10 White men having been killed within the nine years during which the missionaries resided in the Island, without any step being taken to bring the perpetrators to justice. His hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke) asked whether those 10 men had not been more or less concerned in kidnapping? He had no knowledge as to that; but from the fact that Mr. Neilson gave that information to Lieutenant Caffin, and brought it so strongly before the Commodore and the Consul, it was thought, at all events, to be necessary that some steps should be taken to punish unjustifiable murders. The murder of Easterbrook was said to have been committed with less compunction from the idea existing in the minds of the Natives that such crimes could be perpetrated with impunity, seeing that there had been 10 murders committed during Mr. Neilson's residence of nine years in the Island, without anything being done to punish the murderers. The Papers stated that the steps which had been taken in the present case, including the execution, had created a profound impression among the Natives, and, according to Mr. Neilson's idea, a lasting one. He would not follow hon. and learned Gentlemen on both sides of the House into the question whether or not that was a legal act. He preferred to ask the House what ought to be done under the circumstances of the case? The Admiralty had already expressed their opinion as to the course which ought to be pursued. They had done so in plain language, not desiring to censure an officer placed in a position of extreme difficulty, who had felt it to be his duty to execute his orders, nor even to censure those who had given him his orders. The Admiralty had no additional information of the circumstances of the case, which had rendered it necessary that those orders should be given, nor of the circumstances under which the 10 murders to which reference had been made had been committed. But they had stated frankly, not only to the officers whose conduct was now in question, but to the whole Service—because that document was in possession of every officer in the Service, and especially on the Australian Station—the course which it was their duty to pursue under similar circumstances. No doubt, it would be very much to the honour and advantage of the Service if the instructions now given by the Admiralty could be strictly and carefully observed. He had no reason to suppose that they would not be so observed, and he was satisfied that they would be found to be sufficient for the purpose. The hon. and learned Member opposite (Sir Henry James) suggested that the Government should undertake to issue Orders defining the circumstances and conditions under which officers of the Army and Navy should exercise the great powers intrusted to them; and he had pointed to the fact that those powers had not been defined in the time of the late Duke of Wellington, who was of opinion that they should be defined. Now, if those questions had been more or less in debate for some 60 or 70 years, it would, he thought, be a rash act if he were to undertake, on behalf of the Government, at a moment's notice, to define the circumstances under which officers of the Army or Navy should exercise the powers intrusted to them. Those officers discharge their duties under great responsibility, and must exercise a great discretion; but they were as much under the law of the land as other persons. They were quite conscious of that; and he believed that, on the whole, they performed their duty not only with a view to the interests of their country, but with a view to the interests of humanity at large. They were generally, he believed, as careful of the lives of those who were called savages as they were of the honour, property, and the lives of Englishmen. Those officers protected, and were at this moment protecting, the lives and property of savages who had no power to protect themselves against persons who really were outlaws, although they loved the name of Englishmen. To tie their hands more than they were at present tied would tend to produce consequences far more serious than had occurred in that case. While, then, he regretted what had happened, he was not prepared to censure the two officers concerned, or to say that under all the circumstances they were absolutely wrong in what they had done. They had been placed in a position of great difficulty; and when, acting on their responsibility, they had done what they believed to be best and right, he could not agree to a Motion which really amounted to a Vote of Censure, and which asked the Government to adopt a proceeding which was, he thought, surrounded with difficulty and danger. Referring to a remark of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), he must observe that he could not admit that the Admiralty had cast any censure upon Admiral de Horsey, commanding on the Pacific Station. In conclusion, he hoped that the hon. and learned Member for Chatham would not persevere with his Motion. If it was pressed to a division, he should be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he would refrain from troubling the House with a speech, because the First Lord of the Admiralty, who was the true authority on that subject, and was at variance upon it with the Attorney General, had conceded in the main what was desired. He therefore joined in requesting the hon. and learned Member for Chatham to withdraw his proposal.

Mr. GORST said, he would not press his Motion to a division. He hoped the First Lord of the Admiralty would take care that his despatch was communicated to all the officers of the Fleet.

Sir EARDLEY WILMOT (who spoke amid much interruption from Members on his own side of the House) said, he was quite aware that, after so long a discussion, the House was impatient for its termination; but having waited for some hours for an opportunity of saying a few words, and wishing to advert to a point in the case which had not been alluded to by preceding speakers, he hoped the House would allow him to make a remark or two very briefly, and he assured hon. Members who were impatient to go away at that hour (8 p.m.) that he would detain them but a very short time. What he wished to observe was that, in the present case, the officers on the station in the South Seas had followed the instructions of the judicial and legal authorities at Sydney. Not long before, two Natives of the Soloman Islands, having committed an atrocious murder, were taken in custody on board one of Her Majesty's ships to Sydney, and there tried in the High Court. They were acquitted on the ground that the offence had been committed out of the British Possessions, and by persons who were not British subjects. Sir George Innes, the Attorney General, being subsequently applied to by the Commander of the South Seas Station, as to how he should act in another case, replied in a letter, which was to be found in the Blue Book now before the House, that as it was useless to attempt to try such offenders according to law, the Commander must exercise his own discretion in punishing outrages of this nature. Had there been time, he (Sir Eardley Wilmot) should have been glad to refer to the cases which seemed to form a precedent for the conduct of Lieutenant Caffin. But, as it was, he would only add that, looking to those cases, and also to the facts surrounding the present case, acting under orders, as he was, from his superior officer, must be acquitted of any blame whatever. The hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had made strictures upon the execution of the brother of the man who had actually fired the shot, and seemed to imply that his offence was of a less grave character; but he (Sir Eardley Wilmot) fully corroborated his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General, that one who stood by with an offensive weapon—for he admitted he carried his club—and gave countenance to murder, was equally guilty with the principal, as a participator in his crime. He would not detain the House longer, but he considered that Lieutenant Caffin had entirely done his duty under the circumstances.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

## INDIA (FINANCES) — INDIAN EXCHANGES.—OBSERVATIONS.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL rose to call attention to the excessive loss in the Indian Exchanges, and to ask if, now that the United States have definitely made silver a legal tender, Her Majesty's Government will consider whether it may be possible to establish equivalent silver coinages in the great silver-using countries; and will also consider whether, by putting more silver in the rupee, the commercial and monetary disturbance caused by the depreciation of silver might at the same time be remedied; and, in the interests of India if not of England also, will send a delegate to the Conference proposed by the United States? The hon. Member said that he could not approach the question as an expert, and, indeed, there were very few experts on the subject of the currency not agreed about anything whatever; but the question was one on which common sense might be exercised. The question involved matters of enormous interest to this country, if not directly, at any rate, with reference to India, and he trusted that he should not be thought out of place in directing the attention of the House to it even at this late period of the Session. It was altogether beyond dispute that silver had of late been very greatly depreciated, and that the Indian silver rupee had deteriorated to the extent of 15 per cent at least. With the exception of ourselves, all the great silver-using countries of the world had taken special precautions against the enormous change in the value of that metal; while England, as mistress of India, holding what he might call excessive Free Trade doctrines, had simply allowed things to take their course. Germany had adopted the radical plan of changing her currency from silver to gold; the countries of the Latin union had strictly limited the coinage of silver. In America silver had been made a legal tender, but the quantity of silver to be coined was restricted and regulated so as to prevent a glut. We alone had taken no action in the matter, and the disturbance had, therefore, fallen with accumulated force on us. The present loss was certainly not less than 15 per cent, and that on Government remittances alone was fully £3,000,000 per annum; while the Manchester trade with India suffered in the same way with all other private interests. The evil being evident, he came to the question of the remedy to be applied. In his opinion, the Secretary of State was quite right in not yielding to panic and suddenly changing the Indian coinage from silver to gold, which, he believed, would very much aggravate the evil; but he regretted that the Secretary of State had not taken the same precautions as had been taken in all other civilized countries, in regard to restricting the silver issue under special and peculiar circumstances, and that in India some measure had not been taken whereby a certain appreciation or increase of value might have been given to the rupee. The restrictions of the coinage could only be regarded as a temporary measure; but as a temporary measure, he believed it was one which would be found serviceable, and which might reasonably be recommended in view of the more permanent settlement to which he hoped the Government would contribute by accepting the invitation to the Conference proposed by the United States, and about to assemble at Paris. The measures adopted in France would be very suitable to the state of things existing in India. The adoption of a bi-metallic currency by the great silver-using countries, if it could be brought about at the forthcoming Silver Congress, would be of immense advantage in steadying monetary operations. As a layman, he was bound to say that there appeared to him to be a good deal of force in the arguments of those who supported the bimetallic theory of currency; and though he fully admitted that we could not adopt it in this country, yet he thought a bimetallic standard would work great good for India. What he wished the Government of India to do was to stop coining rupees till the value of the existing rupee was raised, and then, as soon as the market admitted of it, to coin rupees containing more silver than at present, so as to be of the value of the American half-dollar. The French might then be induced to assimilate the five-franc piece to the dollar. A uniform currency would thus be established over a large part of the world. As regarded gold, he thought America might meet us by putting a little less gold into the five-dollar piece, so as to make it equal to our sovereign. If these changes could be effected, the disturbance of values in India would be remedied by a simple and self-acting process, to which there would be no just objection.

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, no one could doubt the importance of the subject introduced by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy. That importance was, as he truly said, recognized by the House when it appointed, two years ago, a Committee to consider the depreciation in the value of silver—a Committee which was presided over, with more than ordinary ability, by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen). That Committee, of which he (Mr. Cave) was a Member, was appointed in consequence of the unfavourable effect produced on Indian exchanges by the serious fall in the price of silver. They went carefully into the causes of this depreciation, and, after long inquiry, came to the conclusion that it was due chiefly to the enormous production of silver by the mines of Virginia County, in the State of California, and from the demonetization of silver, or, rather, the substitution of gold for silver as the standard of value, in Germany, in the Scandinavian Kingdoms, and in the four countries of the Latin Convention. That depreciation was checked by the absorption of large quantities of silver by various countries, and especially by France. If, however, as appeared probable, that absorption should be temporary, or become greatly diminished, and the yield of the American mines continued at anything like the same rate, it seemed imminent that the depreciation would be still more serious. So far, he was quite in accord with the hon. Member. He agreed, also, that this depreciation had affected, and must affect, the Indian exchanges. At the same time, these exchanges were affected still more by the large remittances made in bills from India, either sent home by the greatly enlarged European Army, or in payment of Home Charges, which had so seriously increased on account of the augmented quantity of stores sent to India from England. The hon. Member proposed to rectify that state of things, which was, doubtless, extremely embarrassing, by, as far as he could understand, coining a new rupee, which should contain a larger amount of silver than the present rupee. But surely that was a very curious prescription—to remedy a fall in the price of silver by lowering its value! Certainly that was so. He would put it in another way, which the hon. Member would acknowledge, at once, to be accurate. Here was the Indian Coinage Act of 1870. He found this enactment in Sections 4 and 7—"The gold mohur is to be worth 15 rupees, of 180 grains each." Supposing the hon. Member added 20 grains to each rupee, and left the gold mohur still worth 15 rupees, did he not debase the silver? He did not debase the coin, of course; but he debased the metal of which the coin was composed. By his plan, the same quantity of gold would purchase a larger quantity of silver. If he altered the gold coin in proportion, of course, he simply did nothing. He (Mr. Cave) made these remarks on the supposition that we had a double standard in India. Practically, we knew that there gold was merely bullion, and that, at the present moment, very much more than 15 rupees must be given for the gold mohur. In fact, it was impossible for legislation to alter the real value of bullion except to a very limited extent, and for a short time, and under very despotic Governments. No one knew better than the hon. Member that there were various rupees of the same nominal value in India at the present moment, and that sicca rupees, and especially the old sicca rupees, sold at a premium; that, in fact, they had practically ceased to be coin, they had become bullion; otherwise the least valuable must always drive out the more valuable which disappeared. When Sir Ralph Woodford was Governor of Trinidad, silver dollars were exported to an inconvenient extent. To remedy this evil he stamped a small bit out of each dollar, and made a decree that it should be of the same value as before. What happened? The price of all commodities rose in proportion, and then the dollar was exported as before. If they could call in all the present rupees, and recoin them, at an enormous expense, with a larger proportion of silver, they would make a present to the creditor and rob the taxpayer; and if they tried to remedy this untoward result by fractional compensation, they would cause immense trouble, and still greater knavery, discontent, and suspicion, of which there was an example in Bengal in 1835. They had something of the same kind in England, and, indeed, had it still in money of account, as it was still, in many instances, uncertain whether a guinea meant 20*s.* or 21*s.* The hon. Member proposed to limit the coinage, and instanced France. Doubtless France had managed well. The Bank of France had been admirably conducted. There was no limit to the issue of paper before the late war; but it was convertible, and always at par. It was at par still, because the people had faith in the Bank and in the enormous stock of bullion contained in it. But when the hon. Member talked of limiting the coinage of silver, it was rather inconsistent to propose at the same time to increase it, because there was no difference between adding 20 grains to the existing rupee and coining a rupee and one-ninth, where they now coined one rupee. Well, then, the hon. Member proposed to issue an international silver coin which should circulate all over the world, fly out like the dove from the Ark and never come back; which, when not wanted in one country as a medium of exchange, should not be melted down, but escape to another country where it was wanted. There had been many International Conferences on this subject. In London, in 1860, there was one under the late lamented Prince Consort, at which he (Mr. Cave) was present. There were also Conferences in Berlin and in Paris. In 1868, a Royal Commission was appointed under the Presidency of Lord Halifax, of which he had the honour of being a Member. It was a very strong Commission, and it had gone very carefully into all the points in question, many of which were those which the hon. Member had touched upon. After a protracted inquiry, they reported in favour of other nations adopting our system, an invitation to which none, not even Germany and the United States, with every advantage of a new point of departure, had responded. Two points, however, came out very clearly in the course of the investigations—namely, that it would be extremely difficult to secure the equal purity of all international coins. He understood, indeed, that a difficulty of this kind had occurred in consequence of the late Pope issuing francs of the same nominal value and appearance, but of less intrinsic value than the franc of the Latin Union. This was one difficulty. Another was that similar coins would be of little use without uniformity in monies of account and in weights and measures. There was an enormous difference between the countries in which silver was only a token and in which it was itself a standard of value. The Americans had lately coined two dollars of different values; but one was for a foreign trade for the special purpose of competing with foreign coins, and did not touch the question. Moreover, he believed the experiment had not succeeded. In the Silver Committee they learnt that many parts of India were without silver, and hopes were held out that those districts might in time exchange their barbarous trade of barter for a more civilized system, which would extend the use of silver. It had also been mentioned that the depreciation of silver would naturally cause an increased export trade from India and other countries with a silver currency, and, at the same time, a diminished import to them, which would tend to cause a demand for silver to pay the balance, and so would check depreciation. It might, however, come to this—that the question of an altered standard might become urgent. It would be extremely inconvenient to alter a system long in existence, and deeply rooted in the feelings and habits of the people. Still, no doubt, the time might come when the question of an altered standard must be faced. But, whatever might happen, he trusted that a double standard might not be adopted as a compromise. The hon. Member hoped that we might accept the invitation of America to a bi-metallic Conference. He was happy to say that invitation had been accepted. There could be no harm in discussion, and he had every confidence in our own delegates; but he hoped that the Conference would not fail to remember that a double standard must be a variable standard, and that it was almost impossible to have the coins of two standards in circulation at once. In the reign of James I., there was a double standard in this country, and at one time gold rose in value and almost disappeared. Proclamations were made from time to time, with the hope of fixing the value of gold so as to avoid this extremely awkward result. Later in the same Reign, gold was over valued and silver disappeared in its turn, to the much greater inconvenience of the country. In spite of what had been said by the hon. Member, his humble opinion was that the Government of the country should, for obvious reasons, retain control over the currency of the country; that there could not be absolute free trade in currency; but that Government should confine itself, speaking generally, to the prevention of fraud and forgery; and that any attempt by ingenious contrivances to interfere with the ordinary operations of trade and with the laws of supply and demand, or to deal artificially and arbitrarily with matters of finance was sure, sooner or later, to end in error and disaster.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR observed, that as his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had raised the silver question, and had suggested that he (General Sir George Balfour) might usefully say a few words on this subject, he readily assented, but with this warning—that it was such a difficult question to discuss, that even the ablest Members of the House had reluctantly taken up the subject. But he would try and mention some points which had hitherto failed to be set forth. The right hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) had even overlooked the remarkable way in which coinage of silver currency in India had been diminished, and the necessity for importing silver into India lessened. He therefore remarked that only a few years ago the silver coin in circulation in India had been averaged at between £180,000,000 and £200,000,000 sterling. This was based on the experience of Sir Thomas Seccombe, the able Financial Secretary. Since then, the Under Secretary of State had announced in that House that the silver circulation had been reduced to £100,000,000 sterling, showing a falling off of £70,000,000 or £80,000,000 sterling. He had tried to get the data upon which that falling-off had been based, but was not able. There was some difficulty in the matter. It was to be regretted that such hindrances were raised. He would now explain one cause for such a diminution in the silver coin; and as he was in Calcutta when paper money was introduced by the late Mr. Wilson, and had since watched the experiment with great interest, he might be excused for stating that the note circulation was greatly limited by the restrictions then placed on the right to cash the notes. It was a failure for several years; but the change which his hon. Friend the Member for Orkney (Mr. Laing) introduced had a great effect, and the paper circulation sprang from £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 to £12,000,000, and sometimes £14,000,000 of a permanent issue—that was, the amount of notes usually in actual circulation on any given date. But that was not a true mode of looking at the effect which paper notes had caused. All acquainted with India well knew the former vast store of silver coin in existence, owing to the great difficulty of sending it from one place to another. From time immemorial the Military Forces were employed in a most harassing way to escort silver coin. Indeed, the Mutiny of the 3rd Regiment of Bengal Cavalry, which began the Mutiny at Meerut, was mainly caused by the exorbitant pressure for treasure escorts. The great tendency was for silver coin to get into out-of-the-way places—Dacca, for instance, was a place for accumulating coin—and those it was not easy to get it away from. But the note circulation had changed the conditions; debts were now easily adjusted by notes. More than that, Government had largely extended the facilities for cashing notes. Indeed, the Government had specially created notes of 10,000 rupees to facilitate those adjustments; and Government had also created a five-rupee note. Under these facilities, coin was no longer needed; so that, besides the paper money in circulation, an amount of between £40,000,000 and £50,000,000 sterling annually passed through the Government Offices. The noble Lord's calculation that the circulation of silver was about £100,000,000 was probably true; and, therefore, we had been economizing the use of silver coin. The money required for actual use having greatly diminished, the surplus of £70,000,000 or £100,000,000 of silver coin had been used up for silver ornaments. There were, probably, 180,000,000 of people — women and children—in the whole of India expected to have ornaments; and, as his hon. Friend the Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) could testify, not one of them ever went out without silver ornaments and bangles, and the lowest value of each would be £1, and lately more probably £2, as the wealth of the country had increased. The Paymaster General would allow that the wear and tear of that silver, worn as ornaments to the extent of only £300,000,000, would justify him in saying that £30,000,000 every year might be a fair estimate to make of the silver required to make up those values, and no doubt the silver needed had been mainly taken from the coin. It was, however, to be feared that the decrease of coin had been carried too far; because, in many parts of India, the people experienced a positive want of coin to exchange for produce, and they were obliged to carry on their business transactions by means of shells. This was a state of things most discreditable to the Government. The abolition of the Madras Mint, by stopping the production of small coins, such as two-anna and four-anna pieces, had led to a great deal of inconvenience among the people. With regard to the raising of the value of the rupee, which his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy proposed, that was a matter beyond him. The currency doctors who had meddled with these things had always been pronounced mad, and he did not wish to interfere with them. He recommended the Government to tax the Bengal landholders, who were now so greatly favoured, in contrast with the heavy pressure of the land tax in other parts of India, and they would fall upon a new mine of wealth. The proposition of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), he frankly confessed, was beyond his ken, but he was satisfied that it demanded consideration at the hands of Government.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, that the subject was an extremely interesting one, and he was not surprised that the hon. Member (Sir George Campbell), who was so familiar with Indian affairs, should be much exercised by any evil which would detract from the prosperity of that great portion of the Empire, and anxious to suggest a practical remedy. The evil was easily explained. In India there was a silver standard and a silver coinage. The Revenue was payable in silver; but there were public obligations to be met—in connection with railways and other things—in gold; and, therefore, the country had to sacrifice a larger proportion of its silver revenue in order to discharge these golden obligations. The same difficulty had arisen in other countries; but there was no real remedy, because the moment they interfered with the standard of value they gave an advantage to either the debtor or the creditor. The hon. Member was not wrong in stating the difference at 15 per cent—it was fully that. There was a time within the last quarter of a century, when this country might have introduced in India a gold coinage in substitution for that of silver without the slightest injury to existing obligations, public or private, because the value of silver was then fully apreciated; but the opportunity was then lost, and has never recurred. The Committee which sat upon this subject after a most careful and exhaustive inquiry was unable to suggest a remedy; because, in fact, there was no remedy. With regard to the Paris Congress, to be held at the instance of the United States, he understood the right hon. Gentleman to say the Government proposed to send a Representative to that Congress. If so, he hoped that Representative would be instructed to listen and not to speak; for it would be deplorable if any representative of England were to countenance the idea that she could entertain the adoption of a double standard. An international system of currency was not necessary for the freedom of commerce. For perfect freedom of commerce we wanted nothing more than we had got—free exports, free imports, and the power of paying for whatever we had in gold and silver; and he could not admit as either practical or useful the proposition of the hon. Member to increase the size of the rupee, and call it a rupee still.

## TURKEY — SLAVERY.— WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY asked leave to withdraw a Notice which he had placed on the Paper, and which now, owing to the close of the Congress, had become an anachronism. It was a Motion for an Address to Her Majesty praying Her to instruct Her Plenipotentiaries at Berlin to move the Congress in completion of the action taken by the Congresses of Vienna and Verona with respect to the Slave Trade, to adopt a declaration—

> "That the existence of slavery as a recognized institution being repugnant to modern civilization, any State that permits it is thereby disqualified from taking equal rank with other Members of the European family of nations."

It had been no fault of his that he had not been afforded an opportunity of bringing this matter forward. A deputation went to Berlin for the purpose of pressing this matter on the different Plenipotentiaries, and all the Plenipotentiaries whom they saw agreed very much with their views, but thought that England ought to take the initiative. The question was then brought before the British Plenipotentiaries; but they did not take the initiative. He did not, on this occasion, wish to introduce any matter of controversy, so he would content himself with saying that this inaction on the part of the British Plenipotentiaries, whatever might have been their motive, was a matter of great regret to very many people in England. He trusted, however, that in the *quasi*-Protectorate which we had assumed in Asia Minor the Government would bear in mind that it was not only the traditional policy of England to get rid of slavery and the slave trade all over the world; but that there could be no doubt many of the greatest evils in the present system of Government in Turkey would be cut at the root by the abolition of domestic slavery. By putting an end to that they would put an end to the means whereby the seclusion of women was enforced, and the seclusion of women was the prolific source of intrigues and corruption in the administration of the Turkish Government. The hon. Member concluded by withdrawing his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

## LAW AND JUSTICE — APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES. — WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION.

Mr. HUTCHINSON said, he did not intend to persevere with the Motion which he had placed upon the Paper, which was to the following effect:—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her commands may be signified to those responsible for the recommendation of persons to be appointed justices of the peace, that considerations of party politics or religious creed should be wholly disregarded in their selection."

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he sympathized with the views of the hon. Member, and could assure him that the subject should receive the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. In the county he (Mr. Assheton Cross) represented, Lord Derby and Lord Winmarleigh and himself had endeavoured to have these appointments kept free from political influence; and although in that county the Chancellor of the Duchy had previously made the appointments, they were now made by the Lord Lieutenant. They thought the Lord Lieutenant much less likely to be influenced by political motives, and he hoped the result they anticipated would be realized, not only in that county, but in other counties of England.

## THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS—PERAK.

### QUESTIONS.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the organization of the police forces maintained in Perak, Salangore, and Sungei Ujong, the number of their men, the terms of their engagement, the scales of pay, and the official costume are not all matters under the immediate regulation of the Governor of the Straits Settlements? Whether those forces are not under the orders of the local British Resident, and whether the officers who hold commands in them are not appointed by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies? With whom does it rest to dismiss a member of those forces for misconduct? Are the public revenues in each of the above States collected by the British Resident and his subordinates; and is not the taxation regulated by him, subject to the control of the Straits Government at Singapore? Is not justice administered by British officers, under the supervision of the Resident? Are not public works in the above States all designed, sanctioned, and executed by and under the supervision of the British Residents, subject to the control and approval of the Governor of the Straits Settlements? Do the British Residents report to and correspond with the Governor of the Straits at Singapore? If not, do they do so with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, or what is the machinery for supervising their policy and proceedings? Are the public accounts for each of those States audited; if so, by whom; and is the Audit Office at Singapore used for this purpose? Whether slavery has been or is about to be abolished in the States mentioned; if not, then what are the reasons which have led the British Residents, while taking over the administration of the revenue and justice, the control of the police, and of public works, to leave the question of slavery out of account? Have instructions been given to the newly-organized police force never to interfere to re-capture fugitive slaves; before what tribunal would a claim to a re-captured slave be tried; and what provisions have been made to protect the slave in such a case from being tortured and punished for the mere attempt to escape?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he must reply to the Questions of the hon. Baronet on imperfect information; but he believed the statements he should make would be found accurate as far as they went. With reference to the control of the police force, he thought it was practically controlled by the Residents, subject to the superior authority of the Governor of the Straits Settlements; but the officers were not appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The British Resident collected the revenue of each State and regulated the taxation. Justice was not administered solely by British officers under supervision of the Resident, but by the Native Judges in conjunction with the Resident. The accounts were audited first by the Resident, but were subject to further audit by the Government of the Straits Settlements. He (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) quite understood the object of the Questions as to slavery. The intention was first to suggest that the control of the Residents over the police, the administration of justice, and of public works, amounted to the entire government of these States, and then to argue that the Residents should also control questions connected with slavery. He could not quite admit the premise, for in various matters to which he could refer the authority of the Residents did not amount to supreme control. With regard to slavery, however, he felt the importance of this subject, into which he intended to inquire fully with the view of seeing what could be done; but it did not follow that though the Native Rulers of these States were willing to intrust other affairs to the practical control of the Residents, they would be equally prepared to sanction interference with matters of such extreme delicacy and difficulty as those connected with domestic slavery. Any hasty attempt at such interference might result in the impossibility of continuing the Resident system, and in the consequent loss of our influence. The Government must act cautiously in these matters, but the subject would not escape his attention.

MR. W. E. FORSTER asked, Whether there would be furnished annually some Report as to the state of matters in Perak?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he should endeavour to comply with the request of the right hon. Gentleman. He had omitted to state, in reply to the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, that no Papers on the question of slavery except those which had been presented had been received.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

## SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS IV. — EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, in moving the Education Vote for England and Wales, said, although the Education Estimates had, for reasons with which he was well acquainted, been postponed till this late period of the Session, he did not suppose it would be the wish of the Committee that he should forego the usual practice of making some statement when they were before the Committee. The total amount asked for the Education Vote amounted to £2,149,208, being in excess by £238,000 over that asked for by his noble Friend, his Predecessor in this Office, last year. But the amount he asked for was insufficient to meet the total disbursements of the year, and £60,000 of a Supplementary Estimate was voted towards the close of the late financial year. Including that Supplementary Estimate in the comparison of the two years, the amount now asked for was only £178,397 in excess of that required last Session. There had been in the hands of hon. Members for some time past statements relating to the progress of education during the school year ending August, 1877. Upon these figures had been estimated what demands would be made on the Education Department, not for the ensuing school year, but for the financial year beginning in April, 1878, and terminating in March, 1879. The Educational Estimates might be divided into two heads—first, that relating to administration and inspection; and, secondly, the sums that might, under Acts of Parliament or the Revised Code, be claimed by training colleges and elementary schools. The latter part of their disbursements for the ensuing year was one of estimate only. They calculated, as accurately as they could, on the actual figures of the past school year, what the wants of the ensuing financial year were likely to be; and those calculations were to a certain extent modified by any alteration in the Code, and by the operation of those sections of the Public Elementary Education Acts which had not yet fully come into force. The Estimates, therefore, now presented, were, as regarded administration and supervision, thoroughly reliable; as regarded the grant, they were based on Estimates which must, necessarily, be uncertain. Last year, for instance, the Department believed they had made sufficient allowance for the operation of the Act of 1876; but an agreeable surprise was in store for everyone, except the Treasury, for so much greater was the attendance and the results of that attendance, that a Supplementary Estimate of £60,000 was necessary to cover it. The increase estimated for the present year was almost entirely accounted for by the larger grant earned by schools and training colleges; but every great increase in the number of schools and children to be inspected entailed a slight increase in the administrative and supervising staff of the Department, yet that increase did not represent the additional work performed; so that, year by year, the percentage of the cost of administration was diminishing. The increase in the annual grant this year, over the total Estimates of last year, was £168,304, due to an estimated increased attendance in day schools of 140,000 children, and in night schools of 16,000, making a total of 2,388,174 in day schools, and 70,100 in night schools. This increased attendance was not the sole cause of the increase of the grant; for they calculated that under this year's Code, and also to the greater proficiency of the children presented for examination, there would be an advance of 5*d.* per scholar in attendance. A penny per head upon the estimated attendance was about £10,000. To give some notion of the nicety required in calculating the annual grant for the year, he need only mention two very slight alterations in the Code, but each of which involved, in the aggregate, a large sum. Under one section of the Code, an alteration was made by which a child must obtain a pass in two standard subjects and earn 6*s*., instead of being able, as under the old system, to pass in one and earn 3*s*. This slight alteration would, they believed, make a difference in the grant of £17,500 in our favour; whereas, on the other hand, an alteration made in a subsequent portion of the same section of the Code, by which a child would be able to earn 2*s*. for passing in one subject, instead of being required to earn 4*s*. by passing in two subjects, would make an addition of £20,000 to the sum which otherwise would have been required from Parliament. If they succeeded in realizing, during the present year, this progress, they ought to be fairly satisfied, as it showed, not only an increase of numbers, but a corresponding improvement in efficiency. Although in comparison between two years the advance might not seem very great, yet if they could in a number of successive years maintain, both in attendance and passes, this ratio of improvement, the progress made in the next decade would be marked and substantial. So much for what they hoped to do during the next few years. He would now turn to the figures which showed what they had done in the past school year. The Report which was in the hands of hon. Members gave such full information that he would not travel over its details; but there were certain salient points in it on which the Committee might require a little information, and which were worthy of notice and comparison. These were four in number—first, the teaching power and the supply of schools and teachers; secondly, the attendance at these schools and the results; third, the organization by which that attendance had been secured; and fourth, the school expenditure of the year and the sources from which it was met. First, as regarded schools and school teachers. In the school year ending August, 1877, the accommodation increased by 227,000 places, and amounted to a total accommodation of 3,626,000 places. The number of schools inspected rose from 14,273 to 15,187, of which 428 were new voluntary schools and 486 board schools. Of the schools inspected, 10,472 were connected with the Church of England, 1,976 were Wesleyan, British, and other schools unconnected with the Church of England, 659 were Roman Catholic, and 2,082 school board. They found that although there had been an increase of population, and the whole of that increase was necessarily amongst children, yet the school supply was increasing in greater proportion. During the last six years the increase of children between three and 15 years of age was about 500,000, or 8 per cent; the increase in school accommodation was 1,640,000, or 81 per cent. Unfortunately, this school supply was very unevenly distributed. There were certain parts of the country in which the supply was in excess of the demand, and others in which it did not at all equal the demand. This was one of the difficulties the Department had to contend with. In several districts in which application had been made to give annual grants the school accommodation had been in excess of the demand; but in another instance they had to provide accommodation for a considerable extra number. In point of the relation of supply and demand, there was a very remarkable feat performed in the school district of Lincoln. It was stated in the Appendix to the Report, and it was so remarkable that an inquiry was made by the Education Department to ascertain if there was not a mistake. The number of children in the district was 38,513; the accommodation was exactly the same. They had adjusted the supply to a unit. So that if other districts could adjust their arrangements so nicely as Lincoln, the greatest difficulty the Department had would be overcome. The supply of teachers would very shortly be—if it was not already—adequate to the educational wants of the country. There was no lack of candidates, either male or female, which was scarcely to be wondered at considering the very remarkable improvement that had been effected both in the position and prospects of certificated teachers under the recent Education Acts. No doubt, a certain number of complaints had been made as regarded the number of returns they were called upon to supply; but as the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) had been courteous enough to waive that subject until they were into Committee, he would wait to hear what he had to say, and if he had any suggestion to make, as complaints from a good many quarters had reached the Education Department. One of the causes of the greatly increased demand for teachers arose from the very large number of small schools in the country in receipt of annual grants, 700 having accommodation for less than 60, and 3,100 for 100, or under. Coming to the attendance, he found an increase on the register of over 7 per cent, of those present at inspection over 9 per cent, in the average attendance over 8 per cent; while the number of presentations was 16 per cent in excess over the preceding year. Out of those presented out of every 100 scholars, 85·78 passed in reading, 78·99 in writing, and 69·97 in arithmetic. These percentages showed a great improvement on the preceding year. The same advantage might be shown in the Return of night schools this year. Passing on from the attendance to the organization by which so great an improvement was effected, the population of England in 1871 was 22,713,266, of whom 13,517,585 were under school board jurisdiction, and 9,700,000 were under school attendance committees. Since the Returns from which those figures were taken were published, further Returns had been made to the Education Office, which showed that there was a considerable number of fresh districts which had come under bye-laws and school attendance committees; so that, out of 22,000,000, there were now about 15,000,000 under bye-laws. The number of parishes in England and Wales, which, under the Act of 1870, had placed themselves under the bye-laws of school attendance committees was 353, and of these no less than 80 were in the county of Lincoln, and 50 in the county of Kent; so that, of the whole of England, 36 per cent were in those two counties of Lincoln and Kent. When the Education Act of 1876 was under discussion, no section or clause was more fiercely debated than that permitting the dissolution of school boards. Over this section the House consumed nearly a week, and dire were the forebodings of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and somewhat heated their opposition. We had now had one year's experience under those Acts, and so far from the whole system of school boards being overthrown by this section, it was found that only two small school boards had been dissolved, one at Great Addington, and another at Waldron; and, as far as he could make out, these school boards had levied no rates, had no schools; and, in fact, he could find nothing respecting them, except their petition for their own dissolution. The great increase in the attendance at schools naturally necessitated increased expenditure. All schools, whether board or voluntary, had two sources of income in common—annual grants and school pence—the deficiency being met in voluntary schools by subscriptions and endowments, in board schools by the rates. All these sources of income were considerably augmented, the annual grant having risen from £1,316,863 to £1,543,226; school pence from £1,036,408 to £1,138,270; voluntary subscriptions from £751,800 to £786,245, and rates from £369,918 to £447,700. As regarded the grant, the children in board schools had turned the tables this year on children in voluntary schools. Last year the grant of voluntary schools was 13*s.* 3¾*d.*, as against 13*s.* 0¾*d.* of the board schools; this year it was 14*s.* 4*d.* as against 14*s.* 5*d.* to board schools. The cost of maintenance per child was estimated in voluntary schools to be £1 13*s.* 11*d.*, in board schools £2 1*s.* 4¼*d.* This comparison was, however, in one most important sense unfair. The only public money, with the exception of a few fees which voluntary schools received, was from the annual grant; the whole of the rest of their income was drawn from private sources. School boards, however, derived the chief part of their income from rates which was as much public money as taxes, though levied locally. Deducting all private sources of income, and dealing only with the public money, the education of a child in voluntary schools cost the country 14*s.* 4*d.*, in board schools £1 15*s.* 0½*d.* But even this comparison did not show the real cost of school boards, for he had excluded all expenditure except that for the maintenance of the school. On page 26 of the Report, it would be found that the annual expenditure—excluding loans—from the rates was 66 per cent of the total expenditure of school boards, the annual grant being 18 per cent, To put it in other words, the expenditure from the rates was 2⅔ as much as the annual grant; therefore, for every pound received from the annual grant, the school board spent £3 13*s*. 4*d*. out of the rates. He would particularly call attention to these figures, for the House would be warranted in drawing a certain conclusion from them. When the Bill of 1870 was under discussion, many Gentlemen on the other side were in favour of a more drastic measure for the extinction of voluntary schools, and the substitution of a uniform rate-supported school system. Suppose that such a measure had been passed, and that voluntary schools had been extinguished, they could now accurately estimate the cost of the experiment. The annual grant to schools this year, excluding all assistance to training colleges, grants under Acts of Parliament, &c., was £1,851,796. Multiplying that by three and two-thirds, they found that a system of education by which our voluntary schools would be extinguished would not be effected unless an additional burden was cast upon the rates of between £6,000,000 and £7,000,000. Supposing, therefore, that this enormous increase to the burdens of the poor ratepayer had been coupled with the compulsory attendance of his children at school, so that he could at once trace an arbitrary interference with his rights as a parent as the cause of his increased taxes, would there not at once have arisen a spontaneous and ubiquitous outcry, and would not a re-action against education have set in, which would have made it almost impossible for the Education Department—nay, even for Parliament—to have rigidly enforced such a measure? The Acts of 1870 and 1876 were framed and conceived in a different spirit, for they carried a wave of popular opinion with them; they utilized to the utmost existing agencies, and the Act of 1876 gave to the properly constituted local authority the power to enforce attendance. The results had been very remarkable. Taking the figures for the present year, and comparing them with the years 1870-1, before the latter came into operation, there was this extraordinary contrast. The amount voted in 1870 for Education was £804,000; it was now £2,149,000; being an increase of £1,345,000, or 167 per cent. The annual grant to day and evening schools was £614,000; it was now £1,857,000, or 201 per cent. The cost of administration was £82,000; it was now £175,000, or 201 per cent. The rate of grant per day scholar was 10*s*. 1¾*d*.; it was now 15*s*. 3*d*. The schools inspected were 8,281; they were now 15,187. The average attendance was 1,152,000; it was now 2,150,000. The number of certificated teachers was 13,957; it was now 30,400. The number of pupil teachers was 14,710; it was now 31,780. These were great results to have been achieved in so short a space of time; and when they had been accomplished by what had been sometimes sneered at as optional or permissive legislation, his two Predecessors in Office might fairly retort that so great an advance in so short a space of time without direct compulsion was never before made in the popular education of any country, and for this great progress they were entitled to the full credit. The House naturally took great interest in the religious instruction which might be given in schools under school boards. An annual Return was moved for by the hon. Member for Plymouth, which gave details as to the various schools, and the regulations made by school boards in regard to religious instruction. The other day, Sir Charles Reed, at the Crystal Palace, made so remarkable a statement of what the London School Board had done, that, perhaps, the Committee would like to have the observations of Sir Charles on the subject—

> "By the Act of 1870, it was left free to the School Boards either to give Bible instruction to the children in their schools or to withhold it. The School Board for London, without hesitation, decided that Bible instruction should be given to every child in the schools of London. Therefore, every day, in every school, a portion of the Bible was read, with explanations suited to the capacity of the children. In 690 departments in the London schools 188,000 children daily heard a portion of the Word of God read to them. The attendance upon religious instruction was perfectly voluntary; but he was bound to say that with that perfect option it was almost universal, for not one child in 4,000 was withdrawn from the schools on account of religious instruction, and no single complaint had yet reached the Board from any parent who had been offended by the instruction given to the children. He wished next to say what were the numbers of children who had voluntarily attended the examination in each year. In 1876—the first year of these examinations—42,000 children attended the examinations. In 1877 the number examined rose to 84,000, and this year the number was 105,000."

These figures showed clearly, that when school boards acted in the same spirit as that which had actuated Sir Charles Reed and the London School Board in teaching children in elementary schools the truths of Christianity, there would be a hearty response both from children and parents. The only other Vote he had to move was that which related to the teaching of Science and Art at South Kensington.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Does the noble Lord intend to take the South Kensington Vote at the same time?

The CHAIRMAN: The noble Lord would not be in Order in making observations on the South Kensington Vote.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, it would be hardly necessary, when that Vote came on, to allude to it at any length; and he thought that he would have been able at once to deal with Science and Art as well as elementary education; but he would accept the ruling of the Chair, and would not allude to Science and Art. He had now brought before the Committee sufficient facts and figures to show that the elementary education of the country—and if he might have alluded to Art and Science, he should have shown that technical education also—was steadily progressing. No doubt, much remained to be done both in filling up gaps in our elementary system, and in broadening and smoothing its upward gradations towards University education. If they could only continue for some years longer the present policy of utilizing to the utmost the various voluntary and endowed agencies willing to co-operate with the State, and thus perpetuate the present educational zeal, they ought to so perfect the whole educational system as to make it equal to the ever-increasing demands of a nation whose well-being depended on the maintenance of its industrial, manufacturing, and commercial supremacy.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £1,432,808, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for Public Education in England and Wales, including Expense of the Education Office in London."

Mr. MUNDELLA agreed with the noble Lord in his remarks on the progress of education during the last eight years. He had remarked that in many cases the school boards throughout the country had not a single school under their control. Had the noble Lord made a comparison between the results of board schools and voluntary schools, it would be found that the former produced results which had surpassed those of many of the best voluntary schools. He had only to congratulate the noble Lord upon his successful Statement, and the Committee upon the progress made year by year both in the increase and quality of education. He would have to trouble the House with a few words upon the Question which he had put on the Notice Paper, but which he had withdrawn to enable the noble Lord to get into Committee. He was very much obliged to him for his courtesy in anticipating what he wished to say, because it referred to matters of great importance to education. He knew at that period of the Session, and at that hour of the night, it would be unwise to detain the Committee by any long or exhaustive statement. The first part of his Notice referred to the excessive amount of labour imposed on teachers, which was in a great measure interfering with the quality of our education. The question, which was not merely a teachers' grievance, was necessary to be attended to both in the interest of education itself and with regard to the efficiency of the instruction imparted in our schools. The House had done much to increase the quantum of education, and bring it home to every child; but, in order to obtain this result, we had created most complex machinery. We were not merely content with the attendance of children at the schools, but we required a record to be kept of attendances and standard of attainments. We had one standard for half-time, another for full-time, and we had honorary certificates, the registration of which had imposed an enormous amount of labour upon our teachers. By the Act of 1867, the relations of the teachers were solely with the managers and with the Education Department, and the whole work of the school consisted of such registration as was necessary to obtain the grant, the requirements being of the most simple character. But the requirements under the new regulations had increased something like five-fold. In addition to this, we had the requirements of the local authorities of parents and employers of labour, from all which it would be seen that the Act of 1876 had largely increased the responsibilities of the teachers as well as the amount of clerical labour imposed upon them. He would quote some of the 27 new regulations. The first was that—

> "Any parent or other person interested in the education or employment of any child may apply to the local authority or local committee of the district, or to the managers of a certificated school in which the child is for forms of certificate of age, school attendance, and school proficiency."

The 5th clause said that—

> "Any parent or other persons interested in a child may require the principal teacher of any certificated school to furnish a certificate supplying the number of attendances of the child during each year since the age of five."

But the 8th regulation was one which imposed by far the largest amount of labour on the teachers, and it was really necessary that the Committee should know the amount of labour it occasioned. It required that—

> "In the month of January in every year the managers of every certificated school shall forward a list showing the name, residence, and age of every child above five years of age, who has attended school for any number of days, however few, in the course of the year, and the number of attendances made by the child in that year, and these registers were to be kept for a period of ten years, and at all times the teachers were bound to furnish copies."

The House would notice that the school year was made up to the 31st December every year, while more than eleven-twelfths of the schools in the country made up their registers to a different period. The new school year was the 31st August. The Inspectors fixed their own time as to the period of their examinations; but in the month of December the schools were mainly employed with their examinations. The result was that nearly all the schools in the country made up their returns to some period other than the 31st December, and the teacher had to keep a separate set of Returns, and a separate set of averages, the mere making up of which alone, in a school of 300 or 400 children, would employ him from 30 to 50 hours in the month of January. The House could hardly be aware of the amount of statistical and clerical work, with all its necessary correspondence, which they had year by year imposed on the teachers. But for most of this work the Act of 1876 was responsible, and a great deal of it was quite unnecessary. It answered no practical purpose, while it was very onerous to the teacher and quite immaterial to the efficiency of the schools. By the 25th clause, any teacher making a charge, or refusing to make an entry, would no longer be recognized by the Education Department as a teacher of a certificated school, while any certificates held might be suspended or cancelled. So that it would be seen that in addition to being obliged to make a vast number of Returns, the teacher was under penalties of a serious character for any neglect or inaccuracy by which he might be practically deprived of his certificate, and, consequently, of his livelihood. But there was a charge of a different character against the effect of the present system. He held in his hand the list of Returns that had to be made every year by teachers in connection with the London School Board schools, and these were of a more onerous character than were generally supposed. The Board Returns had not only to be kept for the purposes of the London School Board, but for the purpose of meeting the requirements of those districts not under compulsion, and many of them had to be rendered in duplicate and triplicate. These Returns, some of which were of the most difficult character, numbered 63 in the course of the year; and, as he had before stated, there were, in addition to them, the separate set of registers and averages that had to be struck in consequence of the 8th clause of the Act of 1876, in order to enable the teachers to arrive at the required results. But, perhaps, the female teachers were most heavily burdened, as they had, in addition, to register the amount of needlework done in the schools. He would point out the extra labour which this one branch of work entailed on the female teachers of the schools. The principal teacher was required to take an account of every article made, to take stock of the articles made, to distinguish the materials used, to bring forward the old stock, to value the old stock, to value the quantities taken from stock, to state the total quantities taken from stock, &c., and to make a Return of these twice a-year to the Board. This was but one additional item of labour imposed on the female teacher. The effect of all that was, in his opinion, to impair the efficiency of the instruction imparted in our schools, and to interfere with their character and discipline. As a consequence of the teachers being so thoroughly overworked, they had no leisure for the culture of their minds, for the preparation of their lessons, nor for healthy recreation, and the effect of this would be that the teaching would only become mechanical. He apprehended, therefore, that unless they relieved the teachers of some of these onerous and unnecessary labours, the worst results would accrue to education. He had endeavoured to obtain an estimate of the time occupied in this labour, and in order that he might lay it fairly before the House, he had obtained it from a variety of sources. The result of his inquiries was, that after delegating all the work that could be intrusted to pupil teachers, the principal teacher would be employed during one-third or one-fifth of her entire time in making up returns. Now, all this had to be done without fee or reward, for Parliament refused to recognize the teachers as servants, while they were really servants of the school managers and school boards. Without any Act of Parliament to warrant it, the Education Department was constantly issuing regulations which required more and more labour from the teacher, and putting them under the severest penalties if they did not comply with the regulations of the Department, or sent in erroneous returns. He had had occasion to apply to the Education Department to ascertain if they were willing that the teachers should be paid something for this work, and they were of opinion that the teachers should be paid. But while the Department were of that opinion, the Local Government Board said if the school managers paid anything they should disallow it. So the teachers had to do all the work he had described without fee or reward, and do it under such a very high pressure, that they had no time to acquire a knowledge of science of languages or of the higher subjects which had been introduced. Under these circumstances, the discipline of the school must suffer, and already there were complaints of broken health from the teachers, especially the females. He was aware that there were some who argued that payment should be immediately made to the teachers by the Education Department for the work done; but, as one who thought more of the interests of Education, he believed that such payment would of itself not compensate for the ill results that were accruing under the present system. Having increased the quantum of Education, they now wanted to keep up and increase its quality; and the only way to arrive at that result was to relieve the teachers of those onerous and burdensome duties which had been imposed upon them. Parents being ill able to afford to keep their children for many years at school, school life was necessarily short; and it was, therefore, desirable that we should as much as we could economize that time, and give the children as good and perfect an education as possible. The noble Lord had told them that 15,000,000 of the population were under compulsory education. He (Mr. Mundella) believed that this had resulted from the complex machinery which we possessed for bringing children to school. He hoped the noble Lord would not suppose that he was making any complaint with regard to that machinery. He believed that at the end of the year there would be 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 of the population under compulsory education, and that at the end of the next year there would be only 4,000,000 or 5,000,000, who were not under direct compulsion. In his opinion, the way to cut the knot of this question was to put the whole population under direct compulsion, and simplify the labour imposed upon the teachers; which latter was, in his opinion, sufficient to break down the whole system. He was sure the noble Lord did not want to perpetuate a system that would work injuriously on school education, and he believed he would agree that, as far as the teachers were concerned, the present system was highly unsatisfactory. With regard to the alterations which were required, he would leave the matter to the House to fill in the outline he had sketched, and find out a remedy for the evils which he had pointed out. The next subject he had to refer to was that of Inspectorships. At that period of the Session he thought the Committee would agree that the question could not be fully discussed; and he should, therefore, reserve much that he had to say until another opportunity. There was no doubt that the increased demand for teachers, referred to by the noble Lord, had also increased the emoluments of teachers, and that their position had been much improved during the last six or seven years; but there was undoubtedly a want of that stimulus which persons usually had in every other department in life. For the teacher there was no future, so to speak. A man of culture might become Prime Minister of England, a curate might become an Archbishop, and the soldier had the chance of commanding his regiment; but it might be said, once a teacher, always a teacher. He desired to know how long this system, which was utterly at variance with the whole practice of life, was to continue? In England, we always offered to good men the prizes of every profession, and why this should be the rule in the Army, at the Bar, and in the Church, and not in the profession of teaching, he was unable to see. The result of this was that many of the best men were now leaving the profession; and this was much more the case before the increased demand for their services set in, with better pay and other advantages, to the teachers. But the social position of those who remained was precisely the same as it was before, and they all knew how much that had to do with the character of a man. The teacher might say of his profession, in the words of Dante—

> "Lasciate ogni speranza voi che entrate."

We had in England something like 30,000 teachers. We had in the Education Department 118 Inspectors, with salaries rising from £300 or £400 to £900 a-year. We had a large staff of Examiners, senior and junior, with salaries of £400 to £800 a-year. We had Clerks with salaries rising to £500 a-year. But for not one of these places was the certificated teacher eligible, although he might be the most accomplished man in his profession. Could the noble Lord point to a single instance where a teacher had been promoted to an Inspectorship or an Examinership? He (Mr. Mundella) could learn of no instance of the kind. It was quite true that many teachers, ordained to the Church, had been made Inspectors. In every instance these men had turned out to be the very best of Inspectors. Why could not the teachers rise to Inspectorships? He was not asking the noble Lord to lower the standard. It was at present required that Inspectors should be men who had taken a University degree, and who were under 35 years of age. He was told that among our teachers there were scores of men who had taken their degrees at Oxford, Cambridge, London, and Dublin, but who had not the smallest hope of promotion to these offices. These appointments were made simply by political influence; but in saying this, he did not wish to imply that they were in the slightest degree corrupt, but that young men just fresh from the Universities were made Inspectors and Examiners over the heads of persons who had taken the highest degrees, but who, under the present system, had no chance of mounting the ladder. The result of this was the greatest discouragement to the teachers, who discussed the question at every meeting with the strongest interest and evidently with a great deal of pique. He had been informed that many of the young Inspectors, who had never before entered an elementary school, sometimes fell into the most ridiculous mistakes. He admitted that among our Inspectors we had had some splendid men, who deserved the highest praise and confidence; but during the last three or four years the number of Inspectors had been multiplied. He had heard teachers in his own constituency speak with pain and shame of the absurd questions which were sometimes put to the children by these young Inspectors. One Inspector put this question to children in Standard II.—"Suppose the north were where the south is, where would the east be?" Another set of children, in Standard III., had the following question addressed to them:—"If all the water were drawn off the Straits of Dover, what would be the name of the land that would be discovered?" "What is the colour of salt found in South Wales?" was also a question which was asked; and the interrogation, put to children in Standard II., "What is a steed?" at once elicited the answer, "A horse." That, however, would not do for the young Inspector from Oxford, who declared that a steed was "a horse in motion." A rocking-horse, perhaps, was meant. Anything more absurd he had never heard. Other questions were—"What Strait is there between Europe and America?" "What is the use of fire-flies?" and, "What is the character of the despotism by which India is governed?" Perhaps some hon. Gentlemen might be able to reply to the latter query; though he believed it would be found rather puzzling by a good many hon. Members of the House. No wonder, therefore, that the children could not answer it to the satisfaction of the undergraduate Inspector. What could be more ridiculous than to suppose that young men, who might, no doubt, have passed a very good examination, and have obtained, perhaps, a degree at Oxford or Cambridge, could all at once enter into the *minutiæ* of child life, and understand all these things without previous training? Some few years ago there were established what were called Inspectors' assistants; and, if hon. Members turned to the Estimates under this head, they would find that there were now 107 of those officials appointed at a minimum salary of £125 a-year. That minimum salary rose £10 annually for nine years, and then at the rate of £15 a-year, until a maximum was attained of £275. So that an Inspector's assistant, who was generally a man of marked ability, of discretion, and of good manners, and who was taken from amongst the best elementary school teachers, had to descend to a salary of £125 per annum before he could occupy that position. He knew one of the very best of Inspectors' assistants who had given up £210 a-year in order that he might hold, though at a considerably reduced figure, what he conceived to be a better social position. Not one of these men had ever yet been promoted to be Inspectors; and he asked hon. Members whether they thought it right that this should be the case? One very remarkable circumstance occurred to him at this moment in connection with this subject, and that was the case of a gentleman who was employed as an Examiner of the Education Department. That gentleman had taken a very different part in politics from that which he (Mr. Mundella) had done; he was a pronounced "Jingo," and went lecturing about the country; he had stormed platforms in Hyde Park; he had been in Servia; he had written capital newspaper articles; and now he was—an Examiner in the Education Department. How had he attained that position? Was it because he was an accomplished schoolmaster? Nothing of the kind. In 1874 he was an undergraduate at one of the Universities; he made good political speeches; he had considerable influence; and he was pitchforked into the position which he now held. The House could not imagine that that sort of thing could go on without teachers making their comments upon it, and without causing amongst them great bitterness and heartburning. He urged upon the Government the desirability and the justice of giving the teachers a better chance than they had at present of becoming Inspectors. He did not ask that the Department should lower the standard of education required of an Inspector. Let the standard be raised if necessary; but let the teacher who possessed culture, fitness, and merit, enjoy the advantage of his professional training as much as the man who was appointed to an Inspectorship merely because he had political information. He was much obliged to the Committee for giving him the opportunity of making these observations. He had touched upon a subject of much importance; and he might enlarge upon it at another time. Before resuming his seat, he might be allowed just one word more. It might be said that the majority of teachers were not cultivated men; but why were they not cultivated men? Why should the teacher not be a gentleman? In the best clubs of Germany and Switzerland, teachers associated, on terms of perfect equality, with officers in the army and with gentlemen in every rank of life; and if their position in this country were improved, as it might be, how much greater might be their influence upon the children with whom they came in contact—how much greater might be their effect, not only in regard to instruction, but in producing higher social aspirations, and in leading to greater refinement of manners.

MR. BOORD said, that after the very full statement of the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), he would only trouble the Committee with a few words in support of the complaint he had made on behalf of the elementary teachers in reference to the burdensome work thrown on them by the very voluminous returns they were obliged to send in. It was doubtful what precise proportion of the clerical work complained of resulted from the extended operation of the original Act of 1870, and what was due to the amending Act of 1876; but there could be no question that recent Codes had led to a considerable increase in such work, notably in the case of returns relating to needlework, on which the hon. Member had laid great stress. The returns must either be prepared in school time—in which case the attention devoted to the children must necessarily be diminished—or afterwards, when the leisure the teacher had for rest and recreation would be interfered with. Seeing that extra payment for such work might prove an incentive to neglect more important duties, he suggested that the better course would be that they should be relieved of all labour of the kind that was not absolutely indispensable to the Department, and he hoped that that proposal would be favourably considered by the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council. He had had several communications from elementary teachers in his own constituency and elsewhere, and amongst their grievances was one which had not been referred to by the hon. Member for Sheffield. It was that, in case of complaint being made against them by their managers to the Department, they had no opportunity of submitting their defence, and that instances had occurred where the Department had taken action, by suspending their certificates, on the *ex parte* complaint of managers, without appeal, and without the teacher having any opportunity of stating his case in reply. The position was somewhat anomalous, since the Department, although the teachers were not its servants, exercised considerable control over them. The remedy asked for was what was described as a Court of Appeal, in which cases could be heard on their merits. He was doubtful as to the possibility of doing anything in that direction; but if the noble Lord would give his personal attention to such cases, with a view to seeing that no injustice was done, he would probably do all that was at present desirable. He begged, in conclusion, to congratulate his noble Friend on the extremely lucid statement he had made, which must be highly satisfactory to the friends of education throughout the country.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he must also congratulate the noble Lord on the statement which he had laid before the Committee. That statement was, upon the whole, satisfactory; but, while he said so, he desired for the first time during all the years in which he had either brought forward the Estimates himself or had heard them brought forward, to give a little warning about the matter of expense. It seemed to him that the grant had now got as high as would be really useful for educational purposes. If they went further they would be doing out of Imperial taxes what ought to be accomplished and overtaken out of local resources; and that might eventually lead to centralization, which, though tempting, perhaps, at first sight, would be disadvantageous to the interests of education. With reference to the subject which had been brought under the notice of the Committee by the hon. Member for Sheffield, there could be no doubt that the question of school returns was one which deserved careful consideration. He had himself gone practically into it, and had been not only astonished but pained to find the great amount of time and labour which had to be given to the preparation of the returns. He did not know how far he himself might be answerable for that result in connection with the Act of 1870; but he thought it had been caused more immediately by the Statute of 1876. Indeed, he did not know but that all hon. Members were more or less responsible for the result to which he referred. They were all deeply interested in the subject of education, and this interest might have led to the preparation of returns which, perhaps, involved more labour than they were really worth. The head master of a large school had to devote a considerable number of hours every week to the preparation of these returns; and that to some extent necessitated his turning himself into a clerk, and calling upon assistants to do work which he ought to do personally. So far as this was the case, nothing could be a more foolish and wasteful expenditure of public money. If a master did such work outside of school hours, the loss to the public was still almost as great. The work of a master did not, or should not, end with school hours—he had to prepare for other lessons; he had to instruct the pupil teachers, which was a very considerable labour; and, in a good many instances, the management of Science and Art, and of evening classes, had also to be attended to. No persons worked harder than the masters or mistresses of large schools; and the fact was that they had not time to expend upon the compilation of these returns, except at the cost of their own health or of efficiency in the conduct of their establishments. He should not recommend that they should be specially paid for that particular work. The result of making a special payment would simply be to fasten the work upon them. But he would suggest to the noble Lord, whether the time had not come for thoroughly looking into the subject of the returns referred to, and whether a Commission might not be appointed—and it need not be a Royal, nor yet exactly a Departmental Commission—in order to ascertain whether some of the returns could not be simplified, or got rid of altogether? The main object of the Act of 1876 was to secure the attendance of children at school, and this purpose was one which was not to be frustrated. The Committee, however, would remember that compulsory attendance depended upon three things—first, the age of the child; second, the standard to which he had passed; or, third, the number of attendances he had made. That was to say, that no child should be allowed to work before he was 10 years of age, and that if he could not pass a certain standard, he would be kept at school until he was 14; while, if he came up to the mark, he would be allowed to work at an earlier age. But the Government thought it right to provide an alternative to the standard of proficiency in the shape of a certain number of attendances; and he did not believe the noble Lord would dispute the assertion that a large proportion of the returns consisted of statements as to the number of attendances made by each child during the previous five years. Although this was done, he believed that the number of cases in which the returns were found to be of any practical service was infinitesimally small; and he hoped the noble Lord would consider whether it was worth while continuing the stipulation as to attendances. Of course, this was an important question, and was not to be judged of merely from the point of view of the schoolmaster; but he should be very much surprised if, after careful examination, the noble Lord and the officers of the Department did not come to the conclusion that there was more trouble than use in retaining this stipulation with regard to attendance. With regard to the position of the teachers, and the possibility of their becoming Inspectors, he knew that there was a strong feeling on the subject, and he was not surprised that it should exist. He was strongly of opinion that there ought to be nothing to prevent a schoolmaster from being appointed an Inspector. If the schoolmaster fulfilled every other requirement, there certainly ought to be nothing to prevent it. He supposed his noble Friend, as Vice President, was like himself when he held that Office, and had none of the patronage. The patronage belonged entirely to the President. In his time, the rule that the Marquess of Ripon laid down was that no schoolmaster should be appointed an Inspector who had not taken a high University degree. He did not know what the present rule was, but if a schoolmaster had taken high honours he ought to have a chance. But he thought it would be misleading schoolmasters if they were led to imagine that many of them could fulfil conditions such as these; for, indeed, very few could ever become Inspectors, as there were only about 200 Inspectors. [Mr. MUNDELLA: There are 118 Inspectors.] Yes, and there were 15,000 schoolmasters or thereabouts, and so very few could look forward to being Inspectors. The real prize which, he believed, they would look forward to was the mastership of a secondary school, and that would be what they would aim at. The position of schoolmasters and mistresses required very careful looking at, for they were becoming a most important body in the State. Their position was better now they had better pay and a better social position; but it was not yet so good as it ought to be, and they were sensitive—naturally sensitive—on that account. He thought that they should acknowledge their position more and more every year; but the relations between them and the Inspectors did require great consideration, and, so to speak, the inspection of the Department. The Inspectors had been, and, no doubt, would be, increased, and it was difficult to make so good a choice as before; and he thought the schoolmaster—say with a large school containing 500 or 600 children, and who was a superior person—had a right to complain of the manner in which they were inspected by some young Inspector. That difficulty might, he thought, be met by the establishment of a sort of hierarchy in the Inspectorate; two ranks of Inspectors might be made, and they might have a few of the oldest and best Inspectors put in a position over the others, so as not to allow a young man to start as an Inspector until he had passed some apprenticeship under some of the most experienced Inspectors. He only threw out these ideas as suggestions, for no doubt these questions occupied the mind of the noble Lord quite as much as anyone outside the Department. Just one word more, and that would be as to the appeal of schoolmasters, and on this head he thought there must be some misapprehension. He did not suppose that the Department would suspend the certificate of a master without allowing him to be heard, or without looking into the matter, or someone high in authority reading carefully the Report of the Inspector. When they came to the managers, it was more difficult to deal with. When the managers dismissed a schoolmaster it was not easy to say how far the Department ought to interfere in the matter, for it came to this—that the masters must be employed either by the managers or the Department. If the managers employed the masters, they must have power to dismiss them; but then some said, why should not the Department employ the schoolmasters? That would lead at once to centralization, and the managers would naturally cease to take any interest in the schools, which would be practically taken from their control.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE said, that agreeing, as he did, for the most part with the views of the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) in reference to the status and pay given to requirements now demanded from teachers, there was an aspect of this business that he felt he should be derelict in his duty if he did not mention, and against which he must most emphatically protest. He alluded to the fact, unquestioned and unquestionable, that, instead of contenting themselves with putting into force the principles, powers, and provisions of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, a great many of the school boards, especially those in the North of England, were systematically departing from — nay, he would say actually infringing, the provisions of the Act and the objects they were supposed to have in view originally. In a large number of those boroughs there had been instituted by the several school boards, schools, under the designation of higher board schools, in which young ladies were taught the piano, and young gentlemen were instructed in Latin, Greek, Mathematics, Euclid, Gymnastics, and almost the entire curriculum of the most finished education. Now, what he (Mr. Wheelhouse) wanted to know was, how was it to be expected that the poor and indigent ratepayers of our large towns ought, in any reason, to be called upon to pay for the ornamental education of such children? Was that either the purpose or supposed intention of the Elementary Education Act? He ventured to think not; and he (Mr. Wheelhouse) also said, most decidedly, that had the promoters of this Bill, while it was passing through this House, dared to point out any such goal, they would never have been able to pass it at all. The Bill, while it remained such, was stated—even ostentatiously stated — to be a measure in aid of those who could not afford to give their children the fair opportunity of earning their own bread without such eleemosynary assistance; but the attempt to do more than that was, as he (Mr. Wheelhouse) contended, beyond the purview of the measure, wholly and entirely. Not only were the school-houses used, but prospectuses were printed and published, for the especial use of the better class of children at the cost of the ratepayers. These prospectuses spoke for themselves; and what he wished to know was, where, if this sort of thing was to go on unchecked, it was intended to place the limit, or where it was proposed that they should stop? He hoped he was—indeed, he thought he was—as strong an Educationist as any man in that House; but he thought it worse than absurd to make the poorer classes of ratepayers in the large towns provide not merely palaces as schools, but to seek to give an education—at the cost of those poor ratepayers—which, practically, fitted the children of the better classes for entrance into any one of our Universities. If they could do this legitimately under the provisions of the so-called Elementary Education Act of 1870, he could not see that there was anything whatever to prevent the application of that Act to the Universities of the three Kingdoms. Either that Act was—as he believed—intended for the education of the poorest classes, who could not afford to pay for their education, or it was not; but if not, and if the present state of things was not altered, all that he could say was that the sooner the attempt was made, legislatively, and in the face of day, to establish middle-grade schools, with something like free education for everybody, so much the better. He knew that was a doctrine which would meet with the approval of many hon. Members on the other side, but with those ideas he could not concur. Still, if it were to be, let the present—or any other—Administration say so boldly, and endeavour to lay down, and act upon, such policy. Let the ratepayers fully understand the position, and let them find what they were expected to pay, and then they would be able to cope with the difficulty. He had foreseen it long ago, had mentioned it long since, and the question of possibly prospective, if not present, expense, was apparently coming home to the mind even of the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). He (Mr. Wheelhouse) was beginning to doubt whether they had not gone far enough. He had no hesitation in saying they had already gone further than they were warranted in doing under this Act, and he must confess that he feared the action of the Education Department had not only facilitated, but fostered, departure from the original purpose of the Act of 1870. They had been told that the expenditure ought to be curbed. In that he fully agreed; but he told the House plainly that it was no good expecting any such curb to take effect, while such a derogation from the original principle and purpose of the measure was either permitted or sanctioned. So far as the ratepayer's pocket was involved, he could not see why he, or any poorer ratepayer than himself, should be called upon to put his hand into his purse to educate the child of any other man who was far better able to give such education as might be deemed necessary than he was. If it were a question of educating any child, who, without assistance, could not earn his own bread, then he would give the necessary aid most willingly; but if it were a question of rates, then even this aid must be given as economically as possible. Let those who wanted higher class schools by all means provide them; but do not let it be attempted by means, or at the expense, of the ratepaying community—a class already quite sufficiently burdened as it was. He did not desire to put a stop to education, but he was extremely anxious that the ratepayers' money should not be illegitimately or unreasonably spent. But he had another, and, as he felt it, a most serious charge, to bring against not only this, but the Education Department of the late Government. It was said that the object of the Act of 1870 was to insure "that every child in the Kingdom should be educated." Had the Government either done this, or sought to do it? Not a bit of it. Simultaneously with the Act of 1870, he himself had brought in a Bill providing for the education of two classes of children who required the necessary instruction more than any other—he referred to the blind and deaf-mute children of this country; but for eight long years he had begged Government either to do something itself for those classes, or give him (Mr. Wheelhouse) some assistance in doing it for them. Still, with the exception of allowing him to hope to pass a Bill, very much eviscerated from his original proposition, nothing had been done. He had no hesitation in saying that had these children not been poor and few, and weak and helpless, something would have been done for them. It must be borne in mind that the parents of such children were required to pay their quota to the new education rate, and yet in the case of each one of them every statutory assistance was denied. While such a state of things existed, it was worse than idle to speak of "educating every child in the Kingdom," since any such allegation was little more than a cold, unkindly, and uncalculating farce. He trusted that the attention of the Government would even yet be directed to both the matters of which he complained, without any further delay.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he rose for the purpose of supporting the recommendations of his right hon. Friend near him. His right hon. Friend began by pointing out that, for the first time, he experienced a feeling of apprehension with regard to the rate per head to which this subvention of the State in the matter of education had now reached. The hon. and learned Member who had just sat down referred, as one of the main sources of this difficulty, to the practice of introducing the branches of higher education into board schools, and the hon. Member urged that there should be something like an absolute prohibition put on that practice. He was not prepared to go to that extent, for it appeared to him that they were not reduced to a dilemma quite so embarrassing as that which the hon. and learned Member seemed to take for granted. They must consider the sources of income of the board schools before they could deal with that question. First, there was the Public Exchequer, then the rates which were locally levied and self-regulating, and, finally, the fees paid by the children. His right hon. Friend had pointed out that the duty of Parliament was to take care that the contribution of the State was duly watched and properly limited, was not allowed to go beyond certain bounds for the purpose of providing this extraneous and higher branches of education, or for any other purpose; and it appeared to him that, in making that suggestion, his right hon. Friend had said substantially all that was necessary in the case. Parliament could only deal with that matter, and they ought to see that the funds of the Exchequer were not made applicable for the purpose of conveying the higher branches of education. But with regard to the other two sources from which the cost of the schools was defrayed, it seemed to him that other considerations came into play. He should suppose that when it was thought fit to allow of the introduction of the higher branches of education, wise and intelligent boards would take all the care in their power to provide that, as far as possible, the charges of those higher branches of education should be met by extra fees. The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Wheelhouse) said that it was a hard case on the poor ratepayers to have to pay for the schooling of the children of those who were well able to pay for such education themselves; but the hon. and learned Member should recollect that the school boards were elected, and that there was a system of free representation, and surely, if any great hardship came to exist, it manifestly would make itself felt in the elections, and the board would be under the control of the ratepayers. All Parliament could do was to take care that the State contribution was not excessive; and they might consider that, on the whole, the self-acting principle would keep the other sources of income in order. He was also desirous of speaking on the point raised by the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) as to the extra labour imposed on schoolmasters by having to make returns. He would extend the *dicta* of his hon. Friend, that the schoolmaster of a large school, if he did his duty, was a very hard-worked man, by adding that the teachers of all schools, if they did their duties properly, must not unreasonably be called very hard-working men. Teaching of itself was among the most laborious of employments, and they should not tamper with the instruments which they had put into action for the purpose of discharging such duties. It seemed to be agreed that this matter of statistics had grown to a head which called for the careful attention of the Department. On many grounds, it was not desirable to consider a separate remuneration, because that would make a distinction of work—the conveyance of instruction and the making of returns. It was not desirable to have that competition which would inevitably arise. It was quite obvious, however, that they could not go on multiplying without limit these returns, and, at the same time, escape from being driven into giving additional emolument. He was startled and pained to hear from the computation of the hon. Member for Sheffield, that from one-third to one-fifth of the whole time of the schoolmasters was taken up by making returns. That was a very unsound state of things, and it certainly did need the careful attention of the Department, and for these reasons—First of all, with the view of doing justice to the claims of the schoolmaster, as far as they might require it; and, secondly, with a view especially of preventing such an amount of interference with the discharge of his proper duties, as must necessarily be very injurious, in the vast majority of cases, to the manner in which they were discharged. There was one other point on which he wished to say a few words, and that was with respect to the conduct of the Department in respect of complaints made against schoolmasters—in fact, whether the Department was to be a Court of Appeal. If schoolmasters conceived that they ought to be made servants of the Department, he thought the observations of his right hon. Friend on that subject were conclusive. They could not alter the present state of things, with regard to the appointment and dismissal of schoolmasters, without fundamentally altering their entire system. He thought that after the fullest admission of that principle, it was still in the power of the noble Lord, if he would kindly use it, to give considerable relief and satisfaction to schoolmasters on that subject. He was convinced that it would be a matter of comfort and satisfaction to the schoolmasters, if they were assured that whenever the Department was called upon to act in cases of imputation or charges made against them the Department would not rest satisfied either with the *ex parte* statement of the managers, or even with the official statement of their own Inspectors; but that the noble Lord would take such measures and cause such care to be had of the investigation of the case, that he could feel himself that he could become responsible for its determination. With regard to the principle of promotion among schoolmasters, it was impossible, in considering a question between schoolmasters and the Inspectorate, not to be reminded of the question analogous to it in so many senses, of the relation between commissioned and non-commissioned officers in the Army; but, after all, the first promotion of a non-commissioned officer was not such a great step; it was important because it introduced him to a series of steps. He did not attempt to dogmatize as to the conditions upon which that principle could be best applied to the Inspectorate; but he was sure that among all employments there was none that more absolutely required for its efficient discharge to be sustained by a reasonable hope of promotion, and, perhaps, in some degree, accompanied by change and relief, than that arduous duty of the schoolmaster.

Mr. E. HUBBARD said, they were granting a Vote of £2,145,000, and he wished to inquire whether they were getting good value for their money. Were they training up for a future generation boys who would become kind and sober husbands, and girls who would become good housewives? He thought that as long as children remained uninstructed in the art of swimming, which he had found to be taught both to boys and girls in the London pauper schools, one important part, at all events, of their education was neglected. He was aware that the construction of baths in large towns would be attended with expense; but, on the other hand, he was of opinion that in a great many country schools a bath might be made with very little outlay. Again, with regard to the crime of drunkenness, he suggested that the noble Lord should embody some of the results of the inquiries of the Commission of 1864, which sat upon that subject, in the form of an inventory, so that every child might be taught to avoid the consequences of drunkenness. He looked forward to the time when it should be as impossible for a man to lose his life by drowning as it would be for a man or woman to be brought before the bench for drunkenness.

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH said, it seemed to him that so long as the Education Department had to call on teachers for the returns, so long, probably, must the penalty of the withdrawal of their certificate be attached. That seemed to him to be, amongst other objections, fatal to the plan of obtaining those returns directly from teachers; because that penalty was out of all proportion to the offence of omitting to make those returns. He thought that there really ought not to be any difficulty in requiring the local authorities to furnish returns which, in his opinion, might be greatly reduced and cut down, or in getting the managers of the voluntary and board schools to make them up. But, if the teachers were called upon to furnish them, they should, of course, be remunerated. He passed on to say a word for trained teachers in industrial schools. Some years ago it was impossible for teachers serving some time in industrial schools to have that time counted to them for the purpose of their certificates. That was now altered—the time spent in teaching in an industrial school was counted; but the certificate was not given to a teacher engaged in an industrial school; and, in order to obtain his certificate, a teacher was obliged to leave the industrial school, and go into an elementary school. This was a great disadvantage to the industrial schools, and was also most unfair to the teachers. He suggested that the Education Department should get over any jealousy or distrust that they might have of the Home Office Inspectors, and accept their Reports on the merits of teachers, so as to enable the teacher to get his certificate without being obliged to leave the industrial school. He would not say more upon that point, except to express his hope that the noble Lord would give an assurance that the subject should receive some attention. He ventured to ask the noble Lord whether it would not be possible to produce the Reports of the Inspectors at an earlier date than that at which they were now forthcoming? The Reports presented to the Education Department for the past year—1877—were dated in January of the present year, but had not yet seen the light, and might, probably not be in the hands of Members till their return from the Recess, when the Reports would be quite stale. He did not see why the Reports of the Inspectors should not be printed at the same time as the annual Report of the Education Department. He had looked into the Report of last year with very great interest, and had compared it with that of 1870; and he must congratulate his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford and the noble Lord on the very great progress made since the passing of the Act of that year. He found the school accommodation had increased from 1,878,584 to 3,146,424, or about double, for the year 1877. There was still a want of school room, however, for 181,000 children; the corresponding want in 1870 having been for 1,577,000. There was one point in which we were receding, rather than advancing, and that was, that in proportion as we built more schools and provided more places in schools, the average of empty seats constantly increased, because the attendance of children did not keep pace with the increase of accommodation. He found that whereas the number of empty seats in 1870 was 726,195, the number of empty seats in 1877 was over 1,500,000. Now, that fact pointed to the importance of measures for securing that the attendance at the schools should be more regular. It was most important to consider how this was to be effected. He was very much struck with the advance made during the last two years in the adoption of bye-laws for compelling attendance; for while, in 1876, 10,500,000, out of a population of 24,000,000, were under compulsory education, we were now told that bye-laws had been practically adopted for more than 15,000,000, out of a population of 24,500,000; the result being that whereas, in 1876, 13,500,000 were not under compulsion, at the present time only 9,500,000 were not under compulsion. He could not help thinking that the time was coming when no districts would be allowed to remain outside the operation of compulsory education. He thought it worthy of the consideration of his noble Friend, whether the time was not approaching when this question should be settled by the establishment of one general law of compulsory education, which should supersede bye-laws. He did not think we should attempt to move too much in advance of public opinion, although it was the duty of the Department to lead it. He would have liked to say a little more upon the subject of the great progress that had been made under the two Acts of 1870 and 1876; but, at that hour, would do no more than commend the suggestions which he offered to the consideration of the noble Lord.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said, of all the modern instruments of torture, by which the labours of school teachers were aggravated, *The Child's School Book*, which he held in his hand, was the worst. But that book was connected with the whole school life of every child. The book was in itself of the most flimsy material, and never could last for the period of nine years, for which returns might be asked. But what he (Mr. Dalrymple) referred to in the book was the excessive amount of returns which it necessitated, and if there was to be an inquiry into the painfully minute returns which had been referred to by the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), he asked the noble Lord to allow that book to be made one of the first subjects to be inquired into. It gave an immense amount of unnecessary labour to the teachers, without any corresponding value being derived from it.

Mr. WHITWELL said, the subject of the returns referred to by the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) was an important one in two respects, inasmuch as it imposed upon the schoolmasters a great sacrifice of time. The matter had been properly dwelt upon; but perhaps some hon. Members might not be so thoroughly convinced of the difficulty as were those who had investigated the question. He had found that the entries required to be made by schoolmasters might be called forth as legal evidence at one time or another; and it was, therefore, absolutely necessary that the greatest exactitude should be observed with regard to them, while it would be wrong to delegate them to anyone else. It was very important that the Department should see whether these returns could be reduced in extent, and yet be accurate. With regard to the other question raised by the hon. Member for Sheffield, as to whether educated schoolmasters were competent to perform the duties of Inspectors of schools, there could not be the slightest doubt that it ought to meet with the attention of the Department. Since the recent increase in the supply of teachers, some of them had, by the management of very large schools, proved their competence and qualifications for these appointments; their education had been thoroughly evidenced by the degrees taken by them in our Universities, and he could not see that there ought to be any hesitation on the part of the Education Department to investigate the question whether these men might not be wisely introduced into our Inspectorships. The young undergraduates appointed as Inspectors were necessarily inexperienced, and in other respects not properly educated for the purposes required. There was another question to which he would call the attention of the noble Lord, with the hope of modifying the conditions upon which pensions were granted to teachers. Some years ago, the Department became convinced that it was time to take into consideration the necessity of granting pensions to teachers who had fulfilled certain conditions. The Department most satisfactorily granted the request of the teachers and their friends, and established 270 annuities for a corresponding number of teachers. With that grant were incorporated some very suitable conditions, for it was quite necessary that these pensions should not be thrown right and left to anybody who asked for them. When the grants were first made, they were much more easily obtained than they were now; because, under the present Code, they were not given to a teacher who had not been, at the time of applying for the grant, continuously a teacher since the year 1862. He believed the Department had not rejected many applications; but it was true that some rejections had been made, and, to his knowledge, there had resulted some cases of very great hardship. He thought the Department should take into consideration that the grant was not exhausted by a considerable amount, and he hoped the noble Lord would be able to see his way to some relaxation of the hard-and-fast line which had been applied. He trusted the Committee would be ready to recommend the noble Lord to look upon the cases he had referred to with favour, and with readiness to include as many of them as he could in the future administration of the funds.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON thanked the Committee for the favour with which it had received his statements on education. He would now proceed to refer to some of the observations which had been made by hon. Gentlemen. The hon. Member for Buckingham (Mr. E. Hubbard) was anxious that children should be taught to swim. It was hardly possible, however, in small towns, and even in the country, to provide swimming baths, where all children could be taught to swim, without enormous expenditure. The hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) had called attention to the advanced education that some school boards were giving in certain parts of England, and had expressed a very strong opinion that the ratepayers should not be forced to contribute towards the education of persons who were far better able to pay for education for their children than they themselves were. He quite agreed with a great deal that the hon. and learned Member had said; but the principle on which the Education Department had acted in such cases was this—that where a school board had established advanced schools, care was taken that those schools should not become a greater burden to the ratepayers than ordinary elementary schools. The Department insisted that such fees should be levied upon the children attending those schools as would pay for the higher class education which they received; and so long as the Education Department insisted upon this principle being enforced, he did not think that the ratepayers had any cause of complaint. For his hon. and learned Friend must remember, at the present moment, any person had a right to send his son to the elementary school; and if he were prepared to pay sufficient to enable his children to get a higher and a better education, he could do so. Thus, a higher education could be obtained by anyone who chose to pay for it, without any additional expenses being thrown on the ratepayer, who, therefore, had no reason to grumble. A great part of the discussion which had taken place had been with respect to position and fees of teachers, and three questions had been prominently brought forward. The first point had reference to the claims of teachers to become Inspectors; the second related to the power of suspending the certificates of teachers; and the third referred to the number of returns which teachers had to make. As regarded the first point, he might inform the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) that there was no bar whatever to teachers becoming Inspectors; they were eligible, and the rules which his noble Friend the Lord President had put in force were precisely the same as those previously in use. In those rules, it was insisted in every case that Inspectors should have taken very high University honours. The Lord President was quite ready to admit that, in any exceptional cases, teachers might become Inspectors. But, as a matter of fact, the duties of Inspectors were very different from those of teachers. They had to decide upon the proper amount of school accommodation in a district, and they had to discharge a variety of other duties, involving considerable experience. Because a man was a good teacher, it was not certain that he would make a good Inspector; and the number of teachers was so great, and of Inspectors so small, that very few only from among the teachers could ever be selected as Inspectors. It must be remembered that the teachers were an organized body, and he could not conceive anything more dangerous than that the House of Commons should pass a Resolution giving teachers a priority of claim to become Inspectors. The result would be very undesirable, for then the whole body of teachers and Inspectors would become a close corporation. With regard to the suspension of certificates, he might inform his hon. Friend that in every case which had come before him, the rule he had applied was, that when an Inspector made a charge against the teacher, such as involved suspension of his certificate, the teacher was called upon to explain the matter; and not until such an explanation had been received, in any single case, had any decision been arrived at. With regard to the returns which were required to be made to the Education Department, there seemed to be a strong feeling on the part of the Committee that it would be unwise of the State to undertake to pay persons to furnish those returns. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) admitted that the way in which the grant was spent must be narrowly watched, and that at present the country was paying almost as much under the head of managers of schools as was proper. It must be remembered that the State entered into a contract with the managers of schools at so much per child, for the children conforming to certain conditions. Of late, the managers had considerably increased the amount which they obtained under their contract. The teachers were the servants of the managers, and their complaint was, that in a Circular recently issued by the Education Department, insisting upon certain returns being filled up by teachers, and not by managers, they had had extra work placed upon them without remuneration. He was quite prepared to consider whether the onus of filling up the returns could not be put upon the managers instead of upon the teachers, so long as terms of the Act were complied with. He should also be disposed to consider whether some alteration should not be made with regard to the local authority. He had a list of the returns which the Education Department required; they were divided into three heads. Those under the head of Inspectors were furnished by the Inspector. Possibly, the manager or the local authority might hit upon some plan by which the other heads of returns could be furnished without burdening the teachers. Some plan might be devised by which the managers could do what was necessary. Attention had been drawn to the regulations drawn up by the Education Department under Section 25, by which teachers were put under regulations with respect to making charges for certificates. He would explain the reason of that requirement. Complaint was made to the Department that in agricultural districts children, or the guardians of children, were unable to obtain certificates from the teachers; and in one case that came under the notice of the Education Department, the teacher had made a most exorbitant charge for giving this certificate. This regulation was, therefore, put in force for the purpose of preventing the recurrence of the practice. He would assure the Committee that during the Recess the question of the returns would be very carefully considered by him. He did not think that the proposal to appoint a Royal Commission, independently of the Education Department, would answer; because those returns were for the purpose of affording the Education Department certain information. Therefore, it would be impossible to arrange the Returns except with the knowledge of the exact purposes for which the information was required by the Education Department. But he would undertake, during the Recess, to look very carefully into the question of the returns, with a view to the amelioration of the hardships of which complaint was made.

Mr. MUNDELLA wished to assure the noble Lord that all he desired the House to express an opinion upon was that it was desirable that the office of Inspector should be thrown open to the teachers. He did not, for one moment, wish the teachers to have any preference over anybody else, but simply that a teacher should have equal right of competition if he could show the same University honours and experience.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE had certainly not said, nor did he wish to be understood as describing the Education Act of 1870 as a farce; he only intended to imply that the mode in which some children were now educated under it was, so far as the ratepayers were concerned, a farce.

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH observed, that the noble Lord had omitted to answer the point he had raised with reference to the industrial schools.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON apologized for having forgotten the matter; but before he could give an answer to the question, he should be under the necessity of consulting the Secretary of State for War, and the President of the Local Government Board. There were a certain number of schools in connection with the Local Government Board, and with the Admiralty and War Office, in which there were teachers who might be entitled to the certificates granted by the Education Department. But they must do nothing which would, in the slightest degree, diminish the value of the certificates now given by the Education Department; and, therefore, he must consult with his Colleagues before he could give any definite answer as to whether or not the Department was prepared to recognize teachers in their schools in the same way as teachers under the Education Department. With respect to the remarks of his hon. Friend as to compulsion, he would remind him that, at the present moment, only small parts of England were not under bye-laws. In the opinion of many persons, in the agricultural districts education was progressing too fast. He might say that he did not share that opinion; but if the public were found to send their children to school voluntarily, he thought it would be dangerous to apply compulsion. At any rate, it was an extreme measure, and one upon which he should not like to express any opinion. As regarded pensions, as his hon. Friend was aware, 14 years ago the system in force was suspended by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe). The Education Department had since been constrained to lay down certain regulations with regard to pensions. He did not know whether the hon. Member proposed that pensions should be given to all persons who would have been entitled to them under the regulations which were suspended. Under the present system, pensions were only given in certain cases; so that, in any distressing or hard cases, the Department was always prepared to strain a point. At the same time, he might observe that the Department always considered the claims to pensions on the basis of the rules which they had laid down.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £205,014, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Science and Art Department, and of the Establishments connected therewith."

MR. ERRINGTON said, that there was a question with reference to this Vote that could not be passed over. He did not raise any objection to the purpose for which the money was voted; on the contrary, he would be delighted if the sum voted should be increased, provided it was properly spent. The accounts given by the Science and Art Department were very complicated. Within the last year there had been a very grave irregularity in several particulars which he did not think ought to be passed over. The Estimates last year for the South Kensington Museum amounted to £315,673. But beyond that, there was spent £15,000 for purposes not mentioned in the Vote, and which had not received the authority of Parliament. About £18,000 was borrowed on the Vote, and that enabled the £15,000 to be spent, and left a surplus of £3,000. When it was considered that these Votes were intended to give Parliament some sort of control over the way in which money was spent, it was not too much to say that nothing could be more unsatisfactory than the mode in which these Votes were prepared and the money spent. It appeared that this money had been spent on the Loan Exhibition. The original intention was that this Loan Exhibition should cost £500; and that sum was so small that it was probably thought not worth while to increase the Votes on account of it. He made no imputation that this money had been dishonestly made away with; but he did say that it had been spent in defiance of ordinary rules. The matter was investigated by the Committee of Public Accounts, and the impression produced upon the Members of the Committee by the answers given to them by the head of the Science and Art Department was so unsatisfactory, that he felt bound to call attention to it as a mode of protesting against the illegal way in which this money had been spent. There was another instance he would mention. The sum charged in the Accounts for the preparation of rat-guards was £366 5*s.* 3*d.*; but the Estimate was £1,700, which made a very considerable difference. When the Chief of the Department was examined before the Committee, he stated that this was due to the expenditure on the rat-guards required by the Loan Exhibition which had outgrown its anticipated limits. But when the Accounts for the Exhibition were examined, it was found that only £841 in respect of rat-guards was due to the Loan Exhibition. Thus there was actually the sum of £1,100 to be accounted for; and when the official was asked about this, he admitted that he had not looked into the matter, and could not explain it. The Committee considered that this matter showed so exceeding a laxity on the part of the Department, that they felt bound to take notice of it. Under these circumstances, the Committee expressed their strong opinion which was concurred in by the Treasury as to the unsatisfactory nature of these Accounts. Supposing they thought it would never occur again, there would be no necessity to go back again to what had passed. But that was hardly the case, and the Accounts were still exceedingly complicated. He thought there should be some security that these things should not occur again, and that the way in which the money was spent should be shown by the Science and Art Department. There was another matter in the Accounts this year. He found a sum charged for police. Last year it was £6,630, and that included the extra amount for the Exhibition. But this year the sum amounted to £8,040, being an increase of £1,410. There were no Estimates to show the reason for that increase, or whether the police were not being paid at too high a rate. At all events, there were then very large Estimates over which Parliament had no sort of control, and there was no guarantee that whatever had occurred last year would not happen again. He had felt it his duty to bring the subject before the Committee, in order that they might have some assurance from the Treasury that the matter should be carefully considered. His Colleague, who was unfortunately absent, took the same interest as himself in this matter, and he had given Notice to reduce the Vote by the sum of £10,000, and he justified that reduction under the principal heads with which he had reason to find fault. Under all the circumstances, although he did not desire to reduce the expenditure, yet, in order to bring the matter before the Committee, he felt that the proper course for him to adopt would be to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £10,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £195,014, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Science and Art Department, and of the Establishments connected therewith."—(*Mr. Errington.*)

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, that there was no ground for the statement that the Accounts were presented to Parliament in a confused manner, and that while the Estimates for last year showed a saving, there was an excess of £16,000. The fact was, that in these Votes too much information was given. The principal object was to show, as a general result, at the end of the year, the manner in which the Department had spent the sum which had been voted. It was a necessary consequence of the expenditure of the Science and Art Department being divided into so many heads and sub-heads, that there should be a considerable difference between the Estimates and the Expenditure. With regard to the principal complaint made by the hon. Member—that certain sums had been spent last year without the authority of Parliament—he thought he could clear that matter up. It was proposed that there should be a general Loan Exhibition of Scientific Apparatus at South Kensington. The proposal was immediately taken up by the different Scientific Societies of London. There was no reason to suppose that the Exhibition would be very large, or would occasion any great expenditure. The sanction of the Treasury was given to an expenditure of about £2,000 on it; but after the announcement of the Exhibition, various Scientific Societies of Paris, Berlin, and other places, took the matter up, and requested permission to send scientific apparatus to South Kensington. The Science and Art Department were put in the position of having to choose between two things—either to stop the Exhibition altogether, or to incur a largely increased expenditure in holding the Exhibition. It was decided that it would be best to hold the Exhibition, and that determination of the Department was communicated to the Treasury, who where also informed that the expenses would be largely increased. The moment the Science and Art Department found they had exceeded their estimated expenditure, they at once set to work to cut down the expenses under other heads, and they succeeded in doing so to a considerable extent. As regarded the item to which the hon. Gentleman had called attention—the increase in the Vote over last year—it was entirely due to a proposal to which the Treasury had assented, which was, that this year an extra shilling wages should be paid to the constables on duty on public occasions. Hoping he had given a satisfactory answer to all the points raised by the hon. Gentleman, he trusted he would allow the Vote to pass.

Mr. ERRINGTON felt it his duty, after the statement of the noble Lord, to call attention to the Treasury Minute, in which the Science and Art Department were severely rebuked for exceeding their expenditure without the sanction of the Treasury. He objected to the noble Lord's proposal that, in future, a sum of money should be placed at the disposal of the Science and Art Department to spend as they liked; and he thought the money should be under the control of Parliament, in detail. Still, under the circumstances, he would withdraw his Motion.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT thought the hon. Member was perfectly justified in bringing the matter before the House. He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had mentioned the subject before, and he was sorry his noble Friend the Vice President of the Council had made the reply he had. As a Member of the Public Accounts Committee, he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) was bound to say that a gross irregularity had been committed by the Department of Science and Art. The Committee had thought when any extra money was required the Department was absolutely bound to get the sanction of the Treasury before spending a penny. The Committee could not help feeling that the accounts had been manipulated in a way in which they ought not to have been, and they had expressed a hope that no such occurrence would have to be complained of in the future.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £331,812, to complete the sum for Public Education, Scotland.

(4.) £1,835, to complete the sum for the Board of Education, Scotland.

(5.) £84,790, to complete the sum for the British Museum.

MR. SPENCER WALPOLE observed that the increase of the Museum Estimates this year was mainly owing to the arrangement which the Treasury had sanctioned in the salaries of the keepers and other officers of that institution; and he was sure that the House would not grudge an improvement in the salaries and positions of these gentlemen, whose duties were discharged to the entire satisfaction of the country. He wished to mention to the House what he considered to be a rare circumstance. Perhaps few hon. Members or persons in the country were aware that about 200 years ago the then Emperor of China ordered the commencement of a remarkable work, embracing all scientific researches and learning of the country from a period of 1,000 years before Christ down to the year 1720. The preparation of the work was ordered in 1662, and the labour on it was continued for about 60 years. Special types were struck for the purpose, and as these were subsequently broken up for other requirements, there was no chance of any further number of copies than those originally printed. The work so printed consisted of 5,120 volumes, not ordinary volumes like those we were accustomed to in England, but about double the size of the present number of *The Nineteenth Century.* There were 100 sets of these volumes printed, and the existence of one set for sale in the market became known to the Trustees two years ago. They secured it, and, although they gave £1,550 for it, he was sure everyone would feel that the nation had thereby secured a valuable contribution to Oriental literature; and those interested in the matter would have an opportunity hereafter of acquiring a knowledge of the Eastern world and its literature, not as seen through European spectacles and from European observation, but written by the Chinese themselves in their own words and with their own habits of thought and observation.

MR. W. M. TORRENS believed he was one of the few Members of the House who sometimes availed himself of the opportunity of doing work at the Museum, and he bore testimony to the efficient service rendered by the officials, and he was glad of the increase of salaries to them. And while he did not grudge the expenditure upon Chinese literature, he must express his regret at seeing so many gaps in the historical library of the institution, especially of works referring to the history of our own country. He called upon the Trustees to give attention to the matter.

MR. SPENCER WALPOLE was not aware that such gaps existed, but he assured the hon. Member he would call attention to them.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £9,133, to complete the sum for the National Gallery.

(7.) £1,500, to complete the sum for the National Portrait Gallery.

(8.) £12,850, to complete the sum for Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation.

MR. WHITWELL asked the Secretary to the Treasury for explanations as to the increase to the Meteorological Office.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON was informed that the increase occurred in consequence of a number of special researches and experiments, for which an additional sum of £500 had been granted. There had also been an increased payment to the extent of £250 made to the Council, while the telegrams of storm-warnings had cost about £200 more. Then there was the additional amount of £250 for paid Inspectors in Scotland and Ireland. Great advantage had been derived from the extension of this particular branch of scientific investigation, and owing to the extra work of the Council, it had been found necessary to increase their salaries.

MR. WHITWELL assented to the great usefulness of investigations under the observation of such a Society.

Mr. M'LAREN observed, that the £1,000 voted last year to the Scotch Meteorological Society had been omitted this year. He knew the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not promise to continue it, but he should like to say a word on the subject. They had heard that evening of increases of salary to the officers of the English Meteorological Department; whereas it was well known that they were already well paid, one man having as much as £900 a-year. The Meteorological Society of Scotland paid no salaries except to the Secretary; and all the observations made, and which were so valuable, were obtained and paid for by voluntary contributions. That being so, he thought it very unfair that the Scotch Society should be treated so shabbily.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, a Committee of the Treasury was appointed in 1875 to consider the whole matter, and they sat until 1877. They considered the whole matter, and recommended that a single Vote should be taken, the money being disposed of by the Meteorological Council in London. It was on the recommendation of that Committee, the Members of which had gone carefully into the whole subject, that the amount was voted, and they also recommended the appointment of a Council, at salaries, to administer the sum voted.

Mr. M'LAREN was quite aware of the Report when he had first spoken on the subject. It was a Committee, not appointed by the House, but by the Treasury—a Committee of scientific men, with only one Representative of Scotland, and they reported that they should have so much money to spend themselves. The Secretary to the Treasury had not said a single word of the injustice done to Scotland by the withdrawal of the £1,000, seeing that so much valuable work was done by that Society.

Mr. VANS AGNEW said, it was not of the Report that they complained, but of the decision of the Government founded on that Report. The English Meteorological Society availed themselves of the observations made in Scotland, and yet the Government gave no assistance to the Scotch Society. The Meteorological Society of Scotland got its valuable Reports gratuitously, the only expense they were put to being the small salary of the Secretary. He confessed he thought there were very strong grounds for complaint as to the way the Government had dealt with this matter, and great dissatisfaction had been caused in Scotland thereby.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, hon. Members were labouring under a misapprehension when they said a grant was made to the English Meteorological Society and not to the Scotch Society. There was no grant of any sort or kind made to the English Meteorological Society. The English Meteorological Council was a different thing altogether. [Mr. M'Laren: I admit that I made a verbal error.] It was more than a verbal error. It was an entirely different thing. The history of the case was this. Certain work used to be done by the Board of Trade through Admiral Fitzroy, and, after his death, the work was still carried on by the Board of Trade. But, after some time, the Board of Trade found they were not very competent to do that kind of work, and that it would be better to hand it over to some other body with scientific attainments. They went to the Royal Society, and asked that Society to undertake to do the work, a certain sum of money to be paid by the Government, equivalent to the work performed. That went on for some time, and, subsequently, the work was taken from the Royal Society and placed in the hands of a body constituted for the purpose—the Meteorological Council. This was, in fact, a body in the nature of a Government Department, which received a certain sum for doing certain work for the Government. No grant was made to the Society, for the purpose of encouraging that Society, as some hon. Gentlemen seemed to imagine. The Department was constituted for the purpose of doing certain Government work. Undoubtedly, the Scotch Society was a very excellent body. It was a body which deserved the highest respect. But it was impossible for the Government to make grants to all scientific societies. They made none whatever to the Meteorological Society of England. With regard to the Society of Scotland, its services had, to a certain extent, been made use of by the Government, and a certain sum given in compensation for those services. He was not quite sure what the arrangements were as to the employment of the Meteorological Society of Scotland; but he believed, to a certain extent, there were services rendered which were paid for.

MR. MELDON said, that the explanation was, no doubt, a correct one; but he hoped that next year the country would know what it was getting for its money.

MR. WHITWELL observed, that the Accounts stated that the expenditure was on behalf of certain Learned Societies in Great Britain and Ireland. If any error had been made by the Committee in supposing the money was voted to Learned Societies as such, it arose from the mode in which the information was given.

Vote *agreed to.*

(9.) £8,244, to complete the sum for the London University.

(10.) £3,010, to complete the sum for the Deep Sea Exploring Expedition (Report).

(11.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £24,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Royal Commission appointed in connection with the International Exhibition at Paris, 1878."

MR. MELDON said, he should have to move to reduce this Vote. The Royal Commission charged with the conduct of this matter had voted the sum of £100 for the purpose of sending British artizans to the Paris Exhibition; voluntary associations were also got up for the purpose of obtaining subscriptions to enable artizans to visit the Exhibition. When he had asked a Question of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with regard to this matter, the right hon. Baronet had informed him that the Royal Commission was an independent body, and that he had no authority on the subject. By the courtesy of another hon. Member, he was informed that the sum of £100 was granted for the purpose of enabling artizans from the United Kingdom to visit the Exhibition, and that it was possible to have a portion of that money allocated for the purpose of sending Irish artizans to Paris. Accordingly, considerable pressure had been brought to bear upon the Commissioners to induce them to assist in sending Irish artizans. They refused to do so without receiving a subscription, and he thought it invidious that a Commission of this kind should make any distinction between English, Scotch, and Irish artizans. He did not know whether any application had been made on behalf of the Scotch; but by reason of the slight put upon Irish artizans, he felt compelled to move that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £33, that being the estimated share of the Irish artizans in the £100 granted to assist artizans in visiting the Exhibition.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £24,467, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Royal Commission appointed in connection with the International Exhibition at Paris, 1878."—(*Mr. Meldon.*)

MR. M'LAREN was quite sure that no more benefit had been obtained from this grant by the Scotch than by the Irish artizans.

MR. MUNDELLA said, that he had the honour to be a Member of the Royal Commission, and also of the sub-Committee appointed to superintend the sending of British artizans to the Paris Exhibition. He could assure the hon. and learned Member that the Royal Commission knew no distinction between Irish, Scotch, and English artizans. A sum of between £2,000 and £3,000 had been raised entirely by voluntary contributions; and that, with the £100 voted by the Commissioners, was the amount which was available for sending artizans to the Paris Exhibition. He did not know any more arduous task than that which the Commissioners had had to perform, having to pay their own expenses to Paris, and being called upon to give subscriptions out of their own pockets in addition. And he could not but mention the praiseworthy part taken by their Chairman, the Prince of Wales, in this matter. Anyone who had been in Paris must have seen the way in which he had discharged his duties, and must have admired his excellent conduct of the whole arrangements of the British section of the Exhibition. The French people had been more gratified with what the Prince of Wales had done, in regard to the Paris Exhibition, than they would have been by years of diplomatic negotiation. His general conduct of the business was excellent, and his affability and courtesy to everyone had given the greatest satisfaction. With regard to this miserable £100, it had been voted by the Commissioners out of the paltry sum granted them. He would explain the matter to the Committee; and he would say, in passing, that he knew some gentlemen on the Commission, though without seats in that House, who had been ashamed at the expenses which had been thrown on the Prince of Wales. If a reception were given to the French Commissioners, the Prince of Wales had had to pay for it out of his own pocket. But out of the paltry sum allowed them, the Commissioners had granted this £100 towards the expenses of artizans. They had asked the great towns in England to subscribe, and many towns had subscribed, and sent 20 persons each to Paris at their own expense; but what had Dublin done? No money had been raised from her for the purpose of sending artizans to the Exhibition. The money voted by the Commissioners had been spent in making arrangements for the artizans when they reached Paris. The Commission had arranged that for 20*s.* they should be carried to Paris and back, and £100 was all that was available towards paying the extra expenses. Any sum that the city of Dublin might subscribe would go towards the expenses of the Dublin artizans, and they would receive the benefit of the £100 subscribed by the Royal Commission in the facilities which had been provided for them in Paris. Not one shilling of the money had gone especially for English artizans as distinguished from Scotch or Irish; and Ireland would obtain its full share, not only of the £100, but of the English subscriptions.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON hoped that the Motion would not be pressed. The £100 had been added by the Commissioners to sums they had received from subscriptions towards sending artizans from England, Scotland, and Ireland to the Exhibition. With regard to what had been said as to the amount of the sum allowed to the English Commissioners at the Paris Exhibition, he would observe that it was equal to what had been voted in the cases of the Vienna and Philadelphia Exhibitions.

Mr. MUNDELLA thought that the Paris Exhibition could not be put upon the same footing as those at Vienna and Philadelphia. It was necessary for England to make a better appearance at Paris than at either of the other places.

Mr. MELDON could not admit that the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) had in any way given a satisfactory explanation. His statement was that subscriptions were raised in England for the purpose of sending English artizans to the Paris Exhibition, and that the Commissioners gave £100 to the fund. It was said that the Commissioners had provided certain facilities for artizans, and that they were intended for Irish and Scotch, as well as English, workmen. That was scarcely an accurate statement, after what had taken place, for the managers of the Irish subscriptions made a communication to the Commissioners with reference to sending Irish artizans. They were willing to accept aid in any shape or way; but they were told that unless the Irish Committee was prepared to guarantee £10 for each artizan sent from Ireland to Paris, they would receive no aid from the Royal Commission. Considering that the amount necessary for sending Irish artizans to Paris was £7, it was hard to ask the Irish Committee to spend £3 more before it could receive any benefit from the sums voted for the express purpose of sending artizans to Paris. It was unfair to limit the money for the benefit of the British artizan, for Irish artizans had the same right to the fund. He should take the opinion of the House upon his Motion.

Mr. BELL would be sorry if a division were taken upon this Motion. He had the honour to be one of the Royal Commissioners, and could say that no distinction was made between English, Scotch, or Irish artizans. With regard to the sum voted by Parliament towards the expenses of the Commission, it would fall short by £10,000 of what was required.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, that if the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) would write to him, he would communicate with Lord Spencer, the Chairman of the sub-Committee, and care should be taken that Irish artizans should have the same advantages as the English and Scotch; and the hon. Member should be satisfied that the Committee made no distinction between one nationality and another. He could assure him that there was no intention to show partiality to any branch of the United Kingdom.

Mr. MELDON said, that, perhaps, the hon. Member would state what facilities would be given to Irish artizans visiting the Paris Exhibition. He should also like to know what conditions they must comply with to get the same facilities as English artizans?

Mr. M. BROOKS was under the impression that funds were subscribed specially for English workmen. He understood now that, although subscriptions had been given towards artizans from any particular place, yet that artizans from any town would be sent to Paris by means of subscriptions of the towns generally.

Mr. MUNDELLA stated that the facilities given to artizans consisted of cheap travelling, guides, and catalogues. The journey cost them £1; and, in this respect, Dublin enjoyed the same facilities as Sheffield.

Mr. MELDON said, that, after that explanation, he would withdraw his Motion. The fact was that in Dublin they could send their artizans to Paris for £7; but in England they had to pay £10 before they could be sent.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(12.) £14,074, to complete the sum for the Universities, &c. in Scotland.

(13.) £1,580, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, &c. Scotland.

Class III.—Law and Justice.

(14.) £50,788, to complete the sum for the Lord Advocate and Criminal Proceedings, Scotland.

(15.) £46,223, to complete the sum for Courts of Law and Justice, Scotland.

Mr. M'LAREN wished, before this Vote was taken, to draw the attention of the Lord Advocate and the Government to the grievance under which the clerks in the Sasine Office and the Department of the Lord Clerk Register in Edinburgh suffered. These clerks were very badly paid, and their case was the stronger from the fact that, while the expenditure in the Department of the Lord Clerk Register and Sasine Office was £36,000, the fees from registration amounted to £44,000. There was, therefore, no ground for saying that the clerks in the Office were asking for money which was not gained on their establishment. Now that the Bill in reference to these matters had been stopped, he wished to know whether the arrangement formerly entered into would be carried into effect. A number of these clerks had been in the Office many years, at salaries of £90 a-year; and one, who had been 50 years in the Office, was recently dismissed without any pension or allowance whatever. Altogether, the matter required a good deal of investigation.

The LORD ADVOCATE very much feared that the object which the hon. Member for Edinburgh was anxious to obtain could not be effected without the authority of Parliament. There were now a number of clerks in the Office of the Lord Clerk Register in Edinburgh who were not Civil servants, and that was the position in which they had been placed by the Act of Parliament passed in 1868. Under that Statute, a public officer in a Department receiving about £30,000 a-year was made personally responsible for all mistakes made by his clerks. The head of the Department could hardly be held responsible if he were placed in the position of having Civil servants under him. It was a question very much debated before the Act was passed, whether such responsibility should attach to his office, and it was obvious that so long as a man was placed in that position, he must be allowed facilities in the appointment and management of those he employed. So long as clerks were placed in that subordinate position, they could not be looked upon as Civil servants. It was not in contemplation by the Government to make any alteration in that respect, nor was it in the power of the Government to make it of their own accord, for it could only be done by the sanction of the Legislature.

Mr. M'LAREN observed, that the Lord Advocate had made it clear that the Government could not make these men into Civil servants without an Act of Parliament. But what the Government might do was to raise their salaries. These gentlemen were doing the work required at very miserable salaries, and he could see no reason why their salaries should not be increased by the Treasury in the same manner as would have been done if the Bill had passed.

The LORD ADVOCATE thought the hon. Member was somewhat under a misapprehension. He believed the whole of the salaries paid in that Office were quite sufficient for the services performed. On the other hand, no doubt, grievances existed which had come under the notice of the Government, more particularly that promotion did not go on in that Office in the usual way. The clerks in the Office in question alleged that they did not get promoted, and the reason was that, as the head of the Department appointed the clerks, and was alone responsible, he might bring in any outsider, and put him over the heads of those already in the Office. The grievance complained of was not that the salaries paid to the officials were insufficient, but that the clerks in the Office earning a certain salary had no certainty, such as Civil servants possessed, of rising into a higher class.

Vote *agreed to.*

(16.) £27,380, to complete the sum for the Register House Departments, Edinburgh.

(17.) £61,160, to complete the sum for Prisons, Scotland.

(18.) £65,678, to complete the sum for Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland.

(19.) £29,867, to complete the sum for the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. Ireland.

(20.) £21,169, to complete the sum for the Queen's Bench, &c. Divisions, Ireland.

(21.) £8,662, to complete the sum for Land Judges' Offices, Ireland.

Mr. WHITWELL asked, in what position the House was likely to be in regard to this Court? Although so large a sum was asked in the House, the income received by fees and stamps was only £5,650. As this Court was established for the convenience of the owners of land in Ireland, he hoped, as soon as possible, the fees would be sufficient to recoup the expenses of the Court. He hoped the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland would be able to hold out a hope that this would soon be the case.

Mr. MELDON said, he might state to the hon. Member who had just sat down that the Landed Estates Court in Ireland was a great convenience, and likely to be more so; because, under the Irish Judicature Act, the work of the Receiver Master of Chancery was also done by that Court. Therefore, it was not fair to set off the cost of the Court as against the receipts for fees and stamps. Besides, it must be borne in mind that the Court had produced large sums for the Exchequer in times past, when the work was vastly in excess of what it was now. The work varied from year to year, one being very light, and the other very heavy. There was one question to which he wished to call the attention of the Attorney General for Ireland. By the Judicature (Ireland) Act, one of the Judges of the Landed Estates Court was liable to go circuit, and at the recent Assizes one of the Judges did go circuit, the result being to create enormous inconvenience in the Court. True, one Judge remained constantly at the Court, and it ought to be provided that he should discharge any pressing duties which the other Judge would be called upon to perform. He said this with all the more reason, because, previous to the appointment of Judge Ormsby, Judge Flanagan intimated over and over again that he was quite able to discharge the entire duties of the Court. Under those circumstances, it was only fair and reasonable that when one of the Judges was called away to do Common Law business in his absence, the business of the Landed Estates Court should be discharged by the remaining Judge. Great inconvenience had now been caused by Judge Ormsby going circuit, and as his work had not been discharged in his absence, the Judge, at great inconvenience, had had to go to Dublin to hear the cases which would otherwise have to stand over until after the Vacation. He hoped this would not again arise, and it need not if Judge Flanagan were ordered to do the whole of the work when Judge Ormsby was away.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) thought the Landed Estates Court worked very well, and very efficiently, and was not more expensive than anyone would expect it to be, having regard to the work cast upon it. There were few Courts—and he did not know that it was desirable there should be more in the interests of justice and of suitors—which were practically self-supporting. As had been pointed out by the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon), the receipts of the Landed Estates Courts varied very much. Sometimes they were high, and sometimes low; but whatever was received went to the reduction of the cost. And as the hon. and learned Gentleman had pointed out, since the passing of the Judicature Act a very large and a rather expensive Department had been added to the Landed Estates Court, thereby saving the salary of a Receiver Master in Chancery, and giving a substantial proof of the fact that economy had not been lost sight of in the matter. In reference to what had been said as to the inconvenience of one of the Judges going on circuit, he could only say that he did not think any inconvenience would be experienced. This Session he had introduced a Bill which had received the Royal Assent, by which it might be arranged that other Judges might go circuit, and if a Land Judge could not be spared, the Lord Chancellor could readily see that other arrangements were adopted.

Vote *agreed to.*

(22.) £8,567, to complete the sum for Probate, &c. Registries, Ireland.

(23.) £7,738, to complete the sum for the Court of Bankruptcy, Ireland.

(24.) £1,280, to complete the sum for the Admiralty Court, Registry, Ireland.

(25.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £14,672, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office for the Registration of Deeds in Ireland."

MR. ERRINGTON asked if any progress had been made with the scheme as to retiring the clerks in this Office. A Commission met some time ago, and he desired to know what they had done in the matter—whether they had altered the pay or position of any clerk?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, a Committee had been appointed, but their Report would hardly be presented much before January next. The Commission, presided over by the Chief Justice of Ireland, had been working steadily, taking evidence and making close inquiries.

MR. MELDON said, two points arose under the Vote on which he should like to have some explanations. In the first place, all promotion amongst the clerks in the Office had been stopped for two or three years. It was a rule and matter of right that when a senior clerk died or retired there should be promotion amongst the junior clerks. But this arrangement had not been adhered to; because, for three years past, there had been a vacancy amongst the first-class clerks to which no one had been promoted. When this question was agitated two years since, the answer given was that there was to be an alteration in the Office; but that had not yet taken place, and there were two clerks in the Office who had been illegally deprived of their promotion. There was certainly no just reason for this. The other question to which he wished to refer was of even greater interest. The number of clerks in the Registration of Deeds Office was put down as 15; but, as a matter of fact, there had been only 14 there for some time. One had for years past been drawing the whole of his pay; while, as he had been informed, he was not doing an atom for the Public Service. That clerk was, he believed, engaged in making experiments for lifting the *Vanguard*, and did nothing in the Office, even when it was said that the staff was short-handed. Two years ago, when he drew attention to this, he was told that there was a Committee appointed to inquire into some new plan for the registration of deeds, and that this official was engaged with that Committee in making experiments. That Committee had now discharged its functions; but still this gentleman drew over £300 a-year for doing nothing. In fact, it was actually said he had had £5,000 out of the Government for doing nothing. He (Mr. Meldon) wanted to know why the Registration of Deeds Office should be insufficiently manned and have faults found with it, when a member of its staff was doing nothing, He had no objection if a gentleman discharged duties worth £300 a-year that he should be paid that sum; but he did object that he should appear as one of the clerks in the Office, and yet do no work.

Major NOLAN said, the gentleman to whom the hon. and learned Member referred had for some time been engaged in inventing a process by which the work of the Department could be much more rapidly done than by a staff of clerks. Having succeeded in completing his plans, how could it be said that the public time had been wasted, whereas the public must be the gainers? The invention was said to be a very valuable one, and he (Major Nolan) believed that a great deal of jealousy had been created against the inventor, because it was known that by its use many clerks would be discharged.

Mr. MELDON said, he admitted that two years ago a Committee had been appointed to report on this invention; and Mr. Dillon, the clerk he alluded to, was given leave of absence for the purpose of completing the machine. Although he did not then think it was at all satisfactory that he should be drawing a salary from the Registration of Deeds Office, he did not then discuss the matter. But the Committee had reported, and, of course, since then, Mr. Dillon could not have had anything to do. He certainly had good ideas of raising ships, and he thought of raising the *Vanguard*, and a variety of other matters. Certainly this was not proper, and he challenged anyone to say that Mr. Dillon had been doing the Government work. He objected to a man having £300 a-year and doing nothing, and such a state of things ought to be put an end to.

Mr. M. BROOKS said, he was able to state, from his own knowledge, that there had been great neglect in carrying out the rules of the Office relating to promotion. Two years ago he waited upon the then Secretary to the Treasury and now the First Lord of the Admiralty in relation to the matter, and a promise was given that the grievance the clerks suffered under should be remedied. As he (Mr. M. Brooks) felt so strongly on the subject, he was greatly disposed to move the reduction of the Vote by £630, the salary of the two clerks. He was reluctant so to act, and so to delay the time of the Committee; but it appeared to him that there was no other mode of altering the present state of things in the Department. Remembering that at present there was a great delay in the work of the Department, he would, to protest against the action of the Government, move to reduce the Vote by £630.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £14,042, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office for the Registration of Deeds in Ireland."—(*Mr. Maurice Brooks.*)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, the matter would have consideration.

Mr. M. BROOKS said, he had been told that, in consequence of the changes proposed by Mr. Dillon, promotion was stopped in the Office. There was no reason why that promotion should be any longer retarded, and the grievance should be remedied at once.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, the hon. Member for Dublin was mistaken in stating that he had said the matter should be remedied. What he did promise was that justice should be done, and a Royal Commission was appointed to deal with the whole question. But nothing could be done until their Report was received.

Mr. MELDON believed there was no legal right to keep men from their promotion. When a first-class clerk died or retired, a second should take the place, and a third be removed to the office of the second. Well, three or four years ago, a first-class clerk in the Registration of Deeds Office died; and a second-class clerk, who was entitled to be promoted, asked to have his place. This request was refused, the applicant being told that certain arrangements were about to be made. Hon. Members of that House had interfered in the matter with a view to getting the decision of the Government altered. They, too, were told that changes were to take place; but nothing had been done, and now there was more than one vacancy. They were told that the Commission would report next year; but he was positive that nothing had been arranged to provide a substitute for the present system of registration. Under those circumstances, he thought it exceedingly hard that for three years gentlemen entitled to promotion should have been kept without it. And even if ultimately they were raised to the positions they ought to occupy, they would have lost an increased salary for three years. That was a great hardship, and the Treasury ought not to be so hard on their *employés.*

Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(26.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £2,155, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses in the Office for the Registration of Judgments in Ireland."

MR. HOPWOOD observed that there was a long list of Orders to run through, and he thought sufficient progress had been made for that night. He should, therefore, move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON hoped the Committee would proceed with the Votes.

MR. MELDON said, that on one of these Votes — Miscellaneous Legal Charges—a very important discussion would arise. It would facilitate discussion if the accepted Votes were taken, and the House adjourned.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he was willing to go on with the unopposed Votes only.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(27.) £103,885, to complete the sum for the Dublin Metropolitan Police.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow ;*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

## CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL — [*Lords*] — [BILL 286.]

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

### CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

A Clause (Declaration of infected area in foot-and-mouth disease by Privy Council,)—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson,*) —*added.*

Amendments made.

Clause 35 (Local authorities to be treated as incorporated).

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON moved, in page 19, at end, to add as new paragraph—

> "(3.) Where the district or part of a district of a local authority, described in the Second Schedule, is or comprises, or is comprised in a port or part of a port, the Privy Council may from time to time, if they think fit, in relation to that port or part of a port, by Order, make any body, other than the body constituted the local authority by the Second Schedule, the local authority for the purposes of the provisions of this Act relating to foreign animals, and, in connection with the local authority so made, prescribe the local rate, if any and the clerk of the local authority."

MR. WHITWELL thought that this clause had the appearance of enabling the Privy Council to punish a local authority by superseding their authority, though legally constituted.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the clause was amended from that which was struck out of the Bill when passing through Committee. The object was in certain ports, such as Liverpool, Birkenhead, Sunderland, and Hull, where the local authority were not the controlling authority, to enable the Privy Council to put them in that position. At first it was intended to limit the clause to the ports he had quoted; but, on consideration, he had extended it to all.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 60 (Application of Parts II. and III. to Scotland).

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON proposed, in page 28, line 23, to leave out "made under this Act," and insert, as new paragraph—

> "(ii.) If, where required by this Act to keep an animal separate so far as practicable, or to give notice of disease with all practicable speed, he fails to do so,"

Major NOLAN said, he objected to the alteration proposed to be made in this clause, and thought it was better as it stood. The effect of the alteration would be to give a local authority power to make any regulations it pleased.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON remarked, that there had been no real alteration; but the words "made under this Act" were only struck out as unnecessary.

Mr. MELDON said, that as the only objection to the clause as it stood rested on tautology, it would, in his opinion, be better to leave the words in rather than run the risk of passing a clause giving to the local authority power to make any regulations they liked.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 29, line 5, to leave out after the word "suspected," to the end of the Clause, and insert as new paragraph,—"(2.) And on a second conviction within a period of twelve months of an offence against any one of the sub-sections of this section, he shall be liable, in the discretion of the court of summary jurisdiction before which he is convicted, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding one month, with or without hard labour, in lieu of the pecuniary penalty to which he is liable under this Act."—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Major NOLAN proposed, as an Amendment, to strike out the words "with or" from the clause, thus making any person re-convicted liable only to imprisonment without hard labour. He did not wish to divide upon the matter; but he thought it was too much for a second offence to make a person liable to hard labour. Imprisonment to a person in his position would be quite sufficient punishment.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 5, to leave out the words "with or."—(*Major Nolan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'with or' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he would tell the hon. and gallant Member why the Amendment could not be accepted. He had endeavoured to limit, as far as possible, the penalties in these cases. He had provided that the punishment of imprisonment with or without hard labour should only be inflicted for the second offence within a period of 12 months of a similar one. It was not to be a second offence against any section, but an offence similar to the one previously committed. Under these circumstances, magistrates were given discretion to deal with offences as the justice of the case required, and anyone offending in the way he had stated would be justly considered a persistent violator of the law, and should be punished accordingly. For the first offence confinement for one month was the limit.

Mr. MELDON observed, that to those who would probably come under the operation of the Bill imprisonment alone, without hard labour, would be a sufficient degradation. The subject was one of very considerable importance, and if the Government pressed the clause, he would move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. COURTNEY seconded the Motion. He said that, according to the clause, a man was liable to imprisonment with hard labour upon a second conviction within 12 months of any offence against "any one of the subsections of this section." He did not, therefore, understand how the Secretary to the Treasury could say that the second offence must be a similar one to the first.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Meldon.*)

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that he had been informed by the draftsman to whom the preparation of the clause had been intrusted that it carried out the instructions he had given, and that the only cases where imprisonment with hard labour could be inflicted for a second offence, was if such an offence be against the same section as that under which the previous conviction had taken place. The Government had adopted these provisions on the suggestion of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), although they had not carried them out so stringently as he had recommended.

MAJOR NOLAN thought that the debate should be adjourned, and that a provision by which a man could be sentenced to hard labour should not be passed without full consideration. Those Members who represented the agricultural interests would incur much odium, if they permitted such a clause as this to pass.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at half after Three o'clock.

---

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Tuesday, 6th August*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading—Committee negatived—Considered—Third Reading*—Consolidated Fund (No. 4) *, and *passed.*
*Second Reading*—British Museum (Transfer of Collection) (183); Commons Regulation (Expenses) * (181); Statute Law Revision (Ireland) (185).
*Committee* — Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) (130-193).
*Committee—Report*—Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) * (176).
*Report*—Highways (192).
*Third Reading* — Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) (180); Idiots, &c. (Ireland) * (187); Elders Widows' Fund * (182), and *passed.*

## DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARNE (ESTABLISHMENT) BILL—(No. 180.)

(*The Earl of Beaconsfield.*)

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON (for the Earl of BEACONSFIELD) moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, before this Bill passes, I should wish to make one remark, and that is with respect to the future residence of His Royal Highness. Of course, His Royal Highness will have a residence in England; but I am sure it will give great satisfaction to the people of Ireland if His Royal Highness will give preference to that country in any future residence that he may establish at a distance from the Palace of Westminster.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read $3^a$, and *passed.*

## TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL—(No. 130.)

(*The Lord Henniker.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

LORD NORTON expressed his regret at the course taken with respect to this Bill in striking out the clauses with reference to the use of steam power. He must say that, in his opinion, the promoters had been hardly dealt with. The question was not whether to give general powers for the use of steam upon tramways, but when any locality unanimously desired that tramways in their district should use steam power, he thought it rather hard that their wish should be interfered with by Parliament. He thought that the effect of leaving out these clauses had hardly been sufficiently considered, and wished to point out that the probable result of striking them out would be exactly contrary to that which was intended, because it would lead to any locality that wished to have tramways with steam power having them without the authority of Parliament; and, consequently, without any of those restrictions and regulations which were thought so necessary, and which it was the object of these clauses to provide. He knew that this was the case already to a considerable extent, and he thought that the striking out of these clauses would have the effect of still further increasing the use of steam unauthorized and unregulated by Parliament. The judgment in the Swansea case showed distinctly that where any use of steam was a private nuisance, the existing law was quite sufficient to put it down; but wherever the localities were unanimous in desiring the use of steam in tramways no prosecution was likely to take place. He really thought that if their Lordships considered what had passed upon this subject, they would hardly insist upon the rejection of these clauses. The hardship upon Tramway Companies would be very little mitigated by allowing them to come with these clauses again next year without making any further deposit. The Tramways Act of 1870 contemplated the possible use of steam, and of any other than animal power, and in the year 1876, the Wantage Bill and the Vale of Clyde Provisional Order Bill granted the use of steam in both cases under certain conditions; and the success of these Bills was so great that, in the following year, numerous applications for the use of steam power were made. Those applications, however, were deferred expressly on the ground that further inquiries should be first made. That further inquiry was immediately made by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and their Report was favourable to the use of steam power on tramways; but they suggested certain restrictions, and recommended that the Board of Trade should have the power of licensing tramways for experiments in the use of steam. Bills were brought into both Houses for that purpose, but dropped for want of time. After what had passed, it seemed to him that there was a sort of expectation held out which could not be withdrawn, except on fresh ground. Everything asked for having been favourably reported on by the Committee, these promoters ought to be allowed to proceed with the clauses authorizing the use of steam power on stated terms where the locality desired it? Another Select Committee of the House of Commons sat this year, and their Report was that the evidence was overwhelming against refusing leave. It appeared to him that that Report was perfectly unanswerable. It recommended that steam should be used when unanimously desired under certain stringent conditions; and he really did think that if at the last moment they threw these clauses over, it would be something very like a breach of faith sufficient to make the promoters despair of ever obtaining any Parliamentary sanction or authority. Those who argued that streets in towns belonged to the public at large were altogether against tramways, not specially against them; and the arguments of those of their Lordships who, in the last discussion in that House, spoke on the part of the railways, and objected to have the competition of the tramways argued in favour of an objection which they never admitted on the part of the road traffic as against themselves. In his opinion, no weight could be attached to arguments against steam trams founded on the fear that they would be competitors with the railways. The question was whether there should be authorized or unauthorized use of steam in those places where no objection to it was entertained, and, consequently, no prosecution could be apprehended.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Lord HENNIKER stated that the Amendments which he proposed were framed simply for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees and the wishes of their Lordships' House, which were agreed to on a former occasion, and would allow of further inquiry.

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 193.)

## BRITISH MUSEUM (TRANSFER OF COLLECTION) BILL—(No. 183.)

(*The Lord President.*)

### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, stated that its object was for the transfer of the Natural History Collection from the British Museum to the place prepared for it at South Kensington. He believed that there was no objection whatever to the general principle of the Bill, and he thought it extremely advisable that this Collection, as well as the National Portrait Gallery, should be placed in a position in which they could be best seen. There was also power given to transfer portions of Collections to other Museums; but all special bequests were excluded, and it was necessary to put in words to that effect, because otherwise donors would not secure that their donations should be applied for the use of the public generally in the manner they desired. If their Lordships agreed to the Bill, he was quite sure that the

Natural History Collection would be placed in a position in which it would be much better studied than in the temporary building allotted to its reception in the Meseum. The Bill would be of considerable advantage to those engaged in study; and he, therefore, asked their Lordships to give it a second reading.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

## STATUTE LAW REVISION (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 185.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, stated that the object of the Bill, which had come up from the Commons, was simply for the revision of the Statutes of Ireland, in conformity with the system adopted for revising the English Statute Laws, and it would effect a very important reform.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

## HIGHWAYS BILL—(No. 192.)

(*The Viscount Cranbrook.*)

### REPORT OF THE AMENDMENTS.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

EARL FORTESCUE expressed his gratification at the progress which the measure had made. It was a Bill of great importance, as establishing the county and the union as the bases of rural local administration. He hoped that the Local Government Board would take into their consideration the desirability of making the boundaries of the counties and the unions coterminous wherever it was practicable so to do. He quite admitted that it was hardly possible in all cases; but in most they might make arrangements that they should be so, without any great difficulty. Now that the County Government Bill was given up, he looked upon this as the first instalment of measures for the more efficient local administration throughout the rural parts of the Kingdom; and he would only express a hope that the highway laws generally throughout the country might undergo a consolidating process, which would prevent the necessity of their being obliged to refer to so many Statutes. He also hoped that some opportunity would be taken of insuring a more efficient discharge of the duties of surveyors of highways than at present. He thought there ought to be the power—in addition to that of dismissal of the surveyor, which the authorities hesitated to adopt, because it was, of course, very difficult for a surveyor who was dismissed to obtain another appointment—of fining him to some appreciable extent where he neglected to repair the roads. Formerly, under the old Turnpike Acts, surveyors, on conviction before the justices, were liable to a slight penalty, not exceeding 40*s.*, for neglect of duty, which they cheerfully paid rather than give up their appointment; and that, he thought, would, in the case of highway surveyors, now be found sufficient to keep them up to the efficient discharge of their duties. At present, as they could not punish the whole of the Highway Boards, who alone were legally responsible for the acts and neglects of their servants, he thought that it would be very convenient if some such provision as that which he had suggested were hereafter enacted. At all events, it would be desirable to make the provision under the old law which related to the surveyors applicable, rather than that under the new one.

A further Amendment made: and Bill to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

## ARMY AND MILITIA RESERVES.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN, in rising to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, If he could give any information as to the number of men belonging to the Reserve Forces who had lost their civil employment in consequence of their having been summoned to join the Army? expressed a hope that their Lordships would excuse him for addressing them on a subject on which he had no special information. His reason for putting the Question was that the subject was one of considerable national importance, and one which would naturally interest their Lordships generally. It was now nearly seven years since the organization of the Army underwent an entire change by the adoption of the short-service system. They had already seen the use of that system. It had been attended with great success in the Army. As their Lordships were aware, the Reserve Forces had been this year called out, and it was only a week ago that the men were dismissed to their homes. Their Lordships would remember that when the short-service and Reserve system was first introduced by his noble Friend near him (Viscount Cardwell), all sorts of objections were raised to the idea of the formation of the Reserve. It was said, in the first place, that the men would not be kept together, that an efficient discipline could not be maintained unless the men were kept with the colours, and that the Reserves, if they should be called out, would be found to constitute no Reserve at all, because they would not respond to the call. He thought that it was a subject of great national gratification that those doubts, which were so lavishly raised, had been found to be erroneous on the late occasion when the men were called out, and that they had responded with the most loyal alacrity. With regard to their discipline, he would prefer not to make any remark to their Lordships, because he was not sure that any observations that he could make on that subject were entitled to any weight; but he must ask them to listen to the General Order that was published when the Reserve Forces were dismissed, and in that General Order, His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief conveyed to the officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers, Her Majesty's gratification at the manner in which they performed their duties to the country, and the cheerfulness and alacrity with which they had responded to the call, and which had made the deepest impression on Her Majesty. Then followed a paragraph to which he invited their Lordships' special attention, in which the Queen trusted that the men, who had, in many cases, left their various avocations in civil life for the purpose of fulfilling their duty to their country, would soon find employment again, and that the employers of labour would freely avail themselves of the services of those who had displayed so loyal and patriotic a spirit. A wiser or more judicious Order never was issued, nor one in which it was possible to put the case of the Reserve Forces in a clearer or more significant manner before the country. It was now seen that, for the future, the short-service and Reserve system would be the system of the Army of this country. At the same time, he must remind their Lordships that short service and Reserve were correlative terms, and that the short-service system could not exist unless there was a system of Reserve. An Army of short-service men was an Army of faith. In time of peace that Army would be attenuated in its ranks to the last degree; but when time of trouble came, it would be necessary to strengthen it immediately from the Reserve Forces, and call in those men who spent most of their time in the ordinary avocations of civil life. If anything occurred to interfere with the efficiency and prosperity of the Reserve Forces, their Lordships would see at once that a considerable danger would threaten this system on which the English Army was now founded. It was impossible to impress too strongly on the general employers of labour in this country the opinion expressed by Her Gracious Majesty in Her General Order; and he was quite sure that it was of the utmost consequence for the future prosperity of the Reserves that there should be as few men as possible who should find, on returning to their homes, that they would have to suffer for having done their duty by obeying the call of their Queen. The prosperity of the Reserve Forces depended upon the employers of labour. He did not possess any general information on the subject, but he should listen with great interest and attention to the answer of his noble Friend. He had heard that the railway companies and public bodies had displayed a praiseworthy spirit in the matter; because they had endeavoured to minimize the loss which had been sustained by the Reserve, and they were employed as soon as they could be after their return home. It was, however, to their own interest that they had done so; because, by so doing, they had avoided the necessity of resorting to that system which had always been looked upon with disfavour in England—namely, compulsory military service. If hindrances were thrown in the way of those who wished to join the Army, if it became more and more difficult to obtain men willing to serve Her Majesty, if men who joined the Army, and afterwards the Reserve, found that they lost their employment, and that there was a difficulty in obtaining other employment, simply owing to the fact that they belonged to Her Majesty's Reserve Forces, their Lordships would agree with him that most unfortunate hindrances would be thrown in the way of the maintenance of Her Majesty's Army, and there would be no other means to resort to but the Continental one of conscription. These remarks applied to the Reserves generally; but in regard to those men who had just returned to their homes, he must say that they had done their duty to their country most loyally and most cheerfully, and he felt quite sure that the House would fully recognize their services to the country. It was true they had only done their duty; but, at the same time, they had performed it at great inconvenience, which inconvenience might not now be at an end; but, in any case, he felt sure that they would feel gratified that their services were not forgotten by their Lordships.

Lord NAPIER of MAGDALA: My Lords, you will remember that the noble Viscount now presiding at the India Office, when taking charge of the War Department, declared his intention to carry out his Predecessor's plan of a Reserve Force, and give it every assistance towards success. The noble Viscount has loyally fulfilled his promise, and the success, so far, of the Reserve, must be most gratifying to himself as it is to the country. But the experiment is not yet complete. The two first acts—the formation of the Reserve and their return from their colours—have been thoroughly successful; and it would be very unfortunate if the last should not be equally so. The extent to which the Reserve men have returned to their employments cannot be thoroughly known until they apply for their first instalments ef pensions; but information has been received that many employers of labour have re-employed their Reserve men; other large firms have come forward to offer employment, and there appears to be every hope that the men will soon settle down again to their former, or to similar occupations.

Viscount BURY: My Lords, I am sorry I can give no very correct information to my noble Friend with regard to the Question he has put. I cannot yet say what number of men belonging to the Reserve Forces will have lost their various employments from being called upon to join their colours, because it is quite impossible to trace the men so soon after they have left the Army. Of course, they will go to their various districts, and they will be under the cognizance of the drill officers in those districts, so that we shall soon know how they are employed, and whether they have suffered any injury from responding to the call of duty; but, at the present moment, we must remain in ignorance on that subject. It may, however, be interesting to your Lordships to know how the men were employed before they were called out, and I have here a Return showing these particulars in respect to the First Class Army Reserves, which will, of course, give some sort of clue as to the kind of employment in which the men were engaged at the time they were called upon to join their colours. The total number of the First Class Reserves who were engaged at the time the call was made upon them is 9,318; unemployed, 139 only; so that we now know that the Reserves were in actual remunerative employment. Of that number, there were employed by railway companies, 295; as prison warders, 24; in the police force, 230; in private employment, as grooms, waiters, &c., 588; in trades, 3,321; as labourers, 4,804; as letter carriers, 31; and by public bodies, 16. Now, that will show the nature of their employments when the call was made upon them—and I have quoted it for the purpose of showing the proportion of the Reserves who may be said to have been employed in various civil employments—and from the Returns it will be seen that the larger number were employed as labourers in the agricultural districts. Perhaps the House would like to know the number of persons who responded to the call for the Army and Militia Reserves generally. The number who joined from the Army Reserve was 13,094, and from the Militia Reserve 21,692; the total was, therefore, 34,786. I can only add that the conduct of the men during the time that they were in the Army was very praiseworthy, especially those who joined as non-commissioned officers, and who were employed as non-commissioned officers in the Line by the commanding officers. They behaved exceedingly well. They had only two days' drill after they were summoned to join, and it was thought that many points would have escaped the men's minds; but it turned out that they proved themselves thoroughly efficient, and that both as regards the non-commissioned officers and the rank-and-file, their conduct was admirable. There may have been some isolated cases of disorder, but no fault was found with them, as a general rule, during the whole time they were engaged; and it is my good fortune to say, which I do with great gratification, that, as a body of men, they were especially well-conducted. There may have been some few instances among the Irish regiments in which there was some slight noise, owing probably to the effervescence of their national temperament; but it never approached disorder or want of discipline. With respect to the probability of the men obtaining re-employment, now they have returned home, I can tell my noble Friend and the House that I have been in communication with the managers of the different railways, and they inform me that they are taking their Reserve men back again as fast as they possibly can. My right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War has it in contemplation to send a circular letter, not only to the managers of railways, but to the large employers of labour, urging upon them the desirability of taking the Reserve men back. Of course, it will be necessary that we should have all the information as to the number not going back, before we can form any idea as to the general result of calling out the Reserves; but from the conversation which I have had with managers of railways and large employers, I think that such a communication from my right hon. and gallant Friend will be received with favour. From the conversation which I have had with my right hon. and gallant Friend, he seemed to be well inclined to issue such a circular letter; and therefore I am in hope that the Reserve men, who have shown themselves so efficient and so deserving of encouragement on the part of the country, will soon find themselves again in full employment. The Returns which I have read will tend to show the respectable character of the Reserve men generally, and will convince employers that they will form valuable and reliable servants. I must apologize to the House for dwelling on this subject; but it is one of so much importance, that I am sure your Lordships will excuse my repeating that the conduct of the Force has been so excellent that I sincerely hope and believe that they will experience no difficulty in at once obtaining re-employment. The time will come when we shall have to consider the position of the short-service men, and the amount of money which they are able to put aside for the support of their wives and children; and therefore I may mention that Returns are being made, showing the estimated weekly wages of a private soldier in the Royal Artillery, horse and foot, the Life Guards, the Line, and so on, and what he can lay by; and there is a General Order published by the illustrious Duke the Commander-in-Chief—who I am glad to see has now arrived in the House—stating that it is calculated that a prudent soldier can now deposit 3*s*. a-week in the savings' bank, and consequently become master of £50 on the termination of his six years' period of service. I will not enter into this part of the subject at present, because I think it is more than probable that the whole subject of our Reserve Forces is likely to be matter of discussion at a more convenient period than the present. I am sorry my answer now has been so imperfect.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, I am sorry I was not here at the early part of this discussion to express my views with regard to the general advantages of the Reserve men, whether of the Army or Militia. I entirely endorse the remarks of the noble Lord, who has just spoken, when he says that the conduct of the Reserve men has been excellent, and that we military men have no sort of fault to find with them during the period they have been engaged. I have had an opportunity of inspecting a very considerable number of the regiments whose ranks have been largely filled by these Reserve men, and I must confess that in my opinion, and in the opinion of all military men, nothing could be more satisfactory than their general appearance and the condition of the regiments in which they were. As regards the future, it is of immense importance that the men should go back to their homes satisfied; and I venture to hope that the regulations which have been made, and the advantages which have been given to the men, will be found to be both liberal and judicious. And liberal and judicious though they may be, depend upon it, it is money well spent; because if the men were to go back dissatisfied with this great experiment which has been made, the future prospects of recruiting and the general principle of the organization of the Army would very much suffer. Something has been said about the conduct of some of the men connected with the Militia Reserve. That arose from some misapprehension as to the regulations which it was intended to carry out. The men were paid at the head-quarters of the regiments with which they were serving, instead of being paid at their own quarters, when they were being discharged. The consequence was that they were rather flush of money, and they had an opportunity of spending it freely, and not very advisedly. The whole thing, however, was due to a misconception of the instructions, and this is the only fault which can be found with the men, everybody, as far as I am aware, being otherwise satisfied and very well pleased with their service in the ranks. Now, as to the civil life of these men. The question is one of very great importance—it is whether they will find themselves rejected from the position, occupation, or employment which they were in, or will they find every facility given them to go back to their previous situations? That is a matter which must, of course, be decided by the general public. A great number of these men belong to large establishments, such as railway companies, and the police force; and if the various employers of labour will take a patriotic view of the circumstances, and will take the men back at once, or, at all events, as soon as they have vacancies, then I think the system will have been fairly tested, and that it will have been found to work satisfactorily. If, on the other hand, the men find there is no likelihood of their getting employment, considerable mischief will be done. I cannot sufficiently urge upon your Lordships this point. The State takes care not to call upon these men without there being an absolute necessity for it; and when, in this instance, they were called upon, they responded in the most admirable manner, and it is now for the country to show that they appreciate these men's services to their country. They are reliable men, and they have received that amount of discipline which is always of value. That accounts for the facility with which they accommodated themselves to the ranks when they joined. As regards the Militia Reserves, they have not had the same advantage, in this respect, inasmuch as they have not had the same amount of training, as they are only out for one month in the year; and, therefore, they cannot be expected to have the same amount of experience. We are extremely indebted to the noble Earl for bringing this subject forward, and I can only repeat that I hope employers of labour will take a patriotic view, and give as many of these men employment as it is in their power.

VISCOUNT CARDWELL said, the illustrious Duke had told them everything which they could desire on his high authority. It appeared that, with some slight exceptions, the conduct of the Army Reserve men had been excellent, and those exceptions were due rather more to misadventure in the detailed arrangements, than to the fault of the men themselves. They could not, however, expect, at the first moment of trying a great experiment of this kind, under difficult circumstances, that everything would be perfect. What they wanted first to know was the real character of the men, and on that point nothing could be more satisfactory than the testimony which they had just heard. The next important thing was the future. The most critical question had already been decided in the most satisfactory manner. But for the perfect success of the whole experiment, much depended upon that which was now taking place. Would the men act on future occasions as they had acted now? That must, in a great degree, depend upon their experience of their treatment on the present occasion by the Government, and upon the manner in which the great employers of labour acted. The Army and Militia Reserve men had shown great loyalty to the Crown, and they had come forward, at great risks and sacrifices to themselves, honourably to discharge the duty imposed upon them. The men were, for the most part, in a comparatively humble position of life; and he should like to ask were the loyalty, patriotism, and public spirit of the country to be limited to these men, and were the great employers of labour, whose wealth depended upon the industry of those below them, not to show an equal amount of loyalty, patriotism, and public spirit? He thought their Lordships could not doubt for one moment that they would come forward and do what was asked of them. In the General Order which was issued to the Reserves by the illustrious Duke, Her Gracious Majesty the Sovereign approved in the highest terms of the conduct of the men; and that Order, he might be permitted to say, gave to the employers of labour a most valuable practical suggestion, that, even looking to their own interest only, they ought to employ the men now they had been discharged. He could only say that if those employers desired to obtain the faithful services of a trustworthy body of men, they would consult their own interests by employing men who had had the great advantage of training and discipline in the Army, and such were the Reserve men who had just left their colours. They would thus not only show their approval of the patriotic conduct of the men, but do a national service by encouraging those who would hereafter join the Reserves to follow the example which had just been so well set.

Lord WAVENEY observed, that in the case of the Militia Reserve men, their services would doubtless be required at this time of year in the agricultural districts, and he was glad the harvest would fall so early. He thought that Her Majesty's Government would do well to consider the question of deferred pay in the case of the Militia, who stood in the same position, in many respects, as their comrades of the Line.

The Duke of BUCCLEUCH said, great pressure had been put upon the employers of labour to take back the men, and he wished to say a few words as to the position of the employers. Many of these Army and Militia Reserve men occupied positions of trust, and when they were called out it was impossible for the employers to keep their situations vacant. They were obliged to fill them by engaging others equally trustworthy; and these men, who had discharged their duties properly, could not be got rid of to make way for the return of the Reserve men unless a great injustice was committed by the employers. He mentioned this fact to show that it was not quite so easy for the employers to take the Reserve men back at once as some seemed to think. He would also point out that many of the men had to serve in the ranks of the Reserves, although when they were in either the Army or the Militia they had been non-commissioned officers. This entitled these men to some consideration from the Government. With respect to the payment of the men on leaving the colours, he could state that in one instance, at least, the men had received the arrears due to them in an envelope after they had entered the train for home, and that no case of drunkenness had occurred among them.

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE said, there could only be a certain number of non-commissioned officers on the establishment of the Reserves, and that was why some of the men who had formerly been non-commissioned officers had to serve in the ranks.

Viscount MONCK entirely agreed with the remarks which had been made, that the public spirit of the country ought not to be confined to the lowest classes; and it was to the interest of the employers of labour to take these men back into their employment at the earliest opportunity. Another reason which ought to weigh with the employers was this. It should be remembered that if the new system failed through the discontent of the Reserve men, owing to want of re-employment, or from any other cause, the only alternative step would be a recourse to compulsory enlistment. Compulsory enlistment must be applicable to all classes, and under compulsory enlistment employers would be as liable to serve as their workmen. He would, therefore, put it to the employers whether, to avoid the necessity for, or the possibility of, such a state of things, they would not exert themselves to find employment for the disbanded Reserve men as quickly as they could? It certainly seemed a strong motive to induce the employers to treat these men well as soon as they returned.

## ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE MILITIA—FINES FOR DRUNKENNESS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord WAVENEY asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether any portion of the fund credited to the public arising from fines for drunkenness in the Militia Service had been or would be applied for the benefit of soldiers of the Militia generally, as provided by Militia Orders, 1878, sec. 108? According to the terms of a Militia Order, he said, sums credited to the public were to be formed into a general fund, and to be applied, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to objects tending to the benefit of soldiers and of the Militia generally. In the Regular Army good-conduct gratuities and badges were given. In the Militia the non-commissioned officers were deserving of very considerable credit for the efficient performance of their duties, which were incomparably more difficult than those of corresponding officers in the Regular Army. Good men had been known to decline the stripes rather than face the difficulties. It was important to encourage such men, and to recognize their services in a substantial, as well as in an honorary manner. He had always thought it would be a difficult matter to apply the fines in a way that should be altogether satisfactory, and he now pointed out a destination for the money which would be satisfactory to the country at large.

Viscount BURY said, during the early part of this year a Committee sat at the War Office to consider the way in which this fund, amongst others, should be administered; and that Committee reported that the accumulated amount, in their opinion, should be given over to the stock-purse funds of the Militia regiments—so much to each company—the amount per company to be settled annually. The recommendation of that Committee had been approved by the War Office; but before it could be acted upon the confirmation of the Treasury was required, and the matter was still under their consideration. The Report was sent to them in April, so that they might shortly expect that the destination of the fund would finally be settled. As yet none of it had been expended for the benefit of the Militia; but the fund would be applied to the Militia regiments as soon as the Treasury approval had been received.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (NO. 4) BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order); Committee *negatived;* then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, at a quarter before Four o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Tuesday,* 6*th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* —Army Estimates; Civil Services—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings; Class II. —Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments; Class III.—Law and Justice.

*Resolutions* [August 5] *reported.*

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee*— Exchequer Bills and Bonds (£2,000,000).

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Bankers' Books (Evidence) * [293].

*Committee—Report*—Foreign Jurisdiction* [267].

*Considered as amended* — Contagious Diseases (Animals) [286].

*Third Reading*—Marriages (Fiji) * [285], and *passed.*

## QUESTIONS.

## INDIA—FINANCE—ANGLO-INDIAN BALANCES.—QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether there exists any solid objection on the part of the Imperial or Indian Governments to lay before Parliament all the documents, or a selection of the documents, which will enable Members to obtain information about the extensive money claims which have for so many years remained unsettled between India and England?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am exceedingly sorry that the hon. and gallant Baronet should be under the misapprehension that there is any unwillingness to produce the Papers relating to this subject. I cannot help thinking that he is under some mistake as to the nature of the Papers and documents he asks for. The state of the case is really this. For eight years there has been great difficulty between the Imperial and the Indian Governments with regard to the settlement of the balances on the one side and on the other. That has been the subject of a good deal of communication between the different Departments, and various attempts have been made to arrive at a mode of settling the question. The matter has been two or three times before the Committee of Public Accounts, and it has also been noticed by the Controller and Auditor General. Ultimately, an arrangement has been come to, suggested by the Treasury and accepted by the War Office and the India Office, which will form the basis both of a settlement for the past and of future arrangements, which will prevent the recurrence of these difficulties. The matter was brought before the Committee of Public Accounts a few weeks ago, and a Memorandum, which sets forth the whole matter, has been printed by them in the Appendix to their Report; and they state that, inasmuch as it has only just been referred to the Controller and Auditor General, they would prefer to reserve any remarks upon it until they heard what he has to say. That will be done next Session, and the matter will then be before the House. I do not think there would be any advantage in laying all the intercommunications between the Departments on the Table, while there would be some inconvenience in doing so.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR: Am I to understand that I am not to have the Papers?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: What Papers?

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR rose, and was about to specify what he wanted, when——

MR. SPEAKER said, he must give Notice.

## CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF G. W. SMITH.—QUESTION.

MR. MILBANK asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Why a boy named G. W. Smith (though young, of notoriously bad character), sentenced by the Chairman and Bench of Magistrates at Northallerton Petty Sessions to the York Industrial School until he attained the age of sixteen for robbing his father's till, was liberated on the recommendation of several Memorialists without any of the committing magistrates being consulted, who could have proved that the father of the boy had been convicted of drunkenness, and that on three recent occasions the police had been called to his house, where they found the man intoxicated, and his wife wounded and bleeding through his violence; and, whether the correspondence and names of the Memorialists will be given to the Bench of Magistrates, including the Chairman of the North Riding Quarter Sessions and the Chairman of Petty Sessions at Northallerton?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that he quite agreed in the spirit of the hon. Member's Question. No doubt the magistrates ought to have been consulted, and it was through an inadvertence that that course had not been taken. In the case of reformatories, when a boy was reported to have behaved well in school, the managers sometimes recommended that he should be released, and their recommendation was occasionally acted upon. In the present case the Rector of Northallerton, the national schoolmaster of that place, and Mr. G. W. Elliot, the Member for the borough, signed a Memorial in favour of the character, not of the boy, but of his father. He did not think that there would be any advantage in laying the particulars of the case before the Bench of Magistrates.

## IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES COMMISSIONERS—PERPETUITY RENTS.

### QUESTION.

MAJOR O'GORMAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to the statements in the last Report of the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland, showing that the sales made by them in the Landed Estates Court realised under twenty-two years' purchase of the rental, and that out of the 1,116 perpetuity rents offered to the tenants only twenty-six have been sold, the rate demanded being twenty-five times the annual value; and, whether he is now prepared to advise the Commissioners to accept offers from the tenants for the purchase of these perpetuity rents on terms similar to those on which the Commissioners have sold the tithe rent-charges; and, if not, can he state what course is intended to be taken in respect to the sale of these perpetuity rents?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: My attention has been called to this matter, and I find that the facts are correctly stated by the hon. and gallant Gentleman in the first part of his Question. As to the latter part, it would be impossible to advise the Commissioners in the sense suggested by him, as if the hon. and gallant Gentleman turns to Section 34 of the Irish Church Act, he will find the following provision:—

> "Perpetuity rents shall be offered to the owner of the land out of which they issue at a capital sum equal to 25 times the annual amount of such rent."

The Statute, accordingly, establishes a minimum value below which the Commissioners are unable legally to go. I therefore see nothing to be done but to allow the matters to proceed according to the Act of Parliament.

## THE ESTIMATES—REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.—QUESTION.

Mr. MUNDELLA asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the sum of £81,019,000, stated as the estimated expenditure of 1878-9, in the weekly account of Revenue and Expenditure, is not merely the estimate of ordinary expenditure only; whether the sum of £30,066,878, stated in the account for the week ending July 27, to have been the "total issues out of Exchequer to meet payments," includes any part of the issues on account of extraordinary expenditure; and, whether the account will be so altered in future as to show the whole estimate of expenditure, whether ordinary or extraordinary, and the actual total issues both ordinary and extraordinary to date?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes, the hon. Member is quite right in the Question he has put. The sum of £81,019,000 does include the estimate of ordinary expenditure only; and the further sum of £30,066,878 includes all issues on account of extraordinary expenditure. The principle upon which the Treasury always go in preparing these accounts is that up to the passing of the Appropriation Act they put the figures of the Budget, and that after the passing of that Act they give the revised figures. That course will be taken in the present instance; and after the Appropriation Act is passed, the weekly accounts will show the whole expenditure for which provision has to be made.

## CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS ACT—CARLISLE.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What course the Government intend to pursue with regard to the case of alleged corrupt practices at the municipal election at Carlisle?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that he had not yet received the opinion of the Legal Advisers of the Crown on the case; and that he therefore could not say what action would be taken by the Government in reference to it.

## INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. NEWDEGATE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, as the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill stands for consideration to-morrow, At what stage of that Bill he will give the House the names of the Commissioners proposed to be appointed under it?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I stated yesterday that it was proposed to fix that Bill for Monday next. I shall be prepared on the Report to state the names of the Commissioners—that is to say, on Monday, not to-morrow.

## ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION.

### OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. FAWCETT said, that as he believed it would be for the convenience of the House that no Motion put down for Supply should interfere with the discussion which was to take place in Committee of Ways and Means, he willingly acceded to the appeal made by the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) on the previous evening, and he would not bring on his Motion relating to the Anglo-Turkish Convention that evening. He should, however, if possible, move it on Thursday next; but he might state that it was not his intention to revive any of the issues which had been decided last week by so large a majority.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

---

### WAYS AND MEANS.

Ways and Means—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I propose, Sir, to detain the Committee for as short a time as possible in the Statement I have to make. I think it would not be convenient that the House should, in the first instance, enter into anything in the nature of questions of policy, or discuss the reasons for the expenditure which has taken place. The Motions which will be made in Committee by my right hon. Friends the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War will, of course, require explanation, and when those Votes are moved will be the natural time, as far as the Government are concerned, for stating the object of the proposals they make. But although I do not, of course, intend to deny that it may be perfectly right for Members of the Committee to raise questions of general policy, and challenge the expenditure which we have incurred, in Committee of Ways and Means, I think that, as far as I am concerned, it would be right that I should abstain from opening a discussion, and that I should simply state what the present financial position is, and what the financial proposals of the Government are. Well, I may remind the Committee that when I introduced the Budget, on the 4th of April, I found I had to provide for an estimated Expenditure of £81,020,000, exclusive of £2,750,000 of Exchequer Bonds, which were issued last year to meet the charge of the Vote of Credit, and which fall due in the course of the present financial year, and also exclusive of an unascertained amount of Supplementary Estimates, which I then stated to the Committee I hoped would not exceed £1,000,000 or £1,500,000. But I also stated that I was necessarily somewhat in the dark as to what that might be. To meet that charge, I provided, by the additional taxation that was proposed, and which the Committee accepted, for a Revenue of £83,230,000. That would leave a surplus for the ordinary expenditure—on the Estimates of the year—of £2,210,030; and if my estimate of the Supplementary Estimates, which I hoped would not exceed £1,000,000 or £1,500,000, had not been exceeded, I should be able to pay off the whole of the Supplementary Estimates, and have something like £700,000 left to be applied towards the reduction of Exchequer Bonds. That was the position in which we stood on the 4th of April. But since that time there has been, from causes which I need not trouble the Committee to go into now, a larger expenditure than was then contemplated, and we have now on the Table Supplementary Estimates which amount, in the whole, to £2,618,000; and, besides that, we took, some weeks ago, a sum of £748,000 in respect of the charges for bringing the Indian troops to Malta. The Supplementary Estimates are made up of a charge of £1,845,000 for Army Services; £678,000 for Navy Services; £75,000 for Civil Services; and a balance of nearly £20,000 for winding up the old Abyssinian account. Taking these Estimates and the £748,000 that was voted for bringing the Indian troops to Malta, we have, as additional expenditure incurred since the passing of the Budget in the beginning of April, a total of £3,366,895. Of course, it is obvious that if we deduct that sum from the sum of £2,210,000, we should be left with a balance against us. We should not only be without any balance to apply to the redemption of the Exchequer Bonds, but there would be a deficit of £1,156,000. That deficit is occasioned mainly, but not entirely, by the additional expenditure which has been incurred in what may be called the Vote of Credit Services. I think that is a convenient term to use, and that it will be perfectly understood. The Vote of Credit was for Services connected with the movement of troops, the preparation of stores, and so forth, in connection with the condition of affairs in Europe. There is also a sum of about £400,000 due to other causes, and of these causes the principal one is the charge for the Kaffir War, which stands at about £344,000. It is right, as I am speaking now in reference to our position in the year, that I should tell the Committee that I shall probably have to ask, before the end of the financial year, for a further sum in connection with this expenditure on account of the Kaffir War. There is a sum which belongs to the previous year which has not been perfectly explained; but I believe it will amount to something less than £400,000. I put it at £400,000 for convenience, but that is an outside figure. That will raise the Supplementary Estimates to £3,767,000. If we add to them the unredeemed Exchequer Bonds issued last year, and which stand to be redeemed this year—amounting to £2,700,000—the total charge to be met is £6,517,000, against which there is a surplus of revenue of £2,210,000. That leaves a deficit upon the current year of £4,307,000. The same result is arrived at if we make the calculation in a different form. The expenditure, if we do not include the Exchequer Bonds, will be £84,786,000, and the revenue being £83,230,000, the deficit would be £1,556,000. If we include the Exchequer Bonds, the expenditure would be £87,536,000, and the revenue being £83,230,000, the deficit would be £4,306,000. That is the position in which we stand. I have stated the figures in a plain and simple way; and I have stated the case in what is, perhaps, the least favourable form for myself. I should like to be allowed to present it now in another light. It will be remembered that, in the month of February, the Government applied to Parliament for a Vote of Credit for £6,000,000. Well, that sum was granted; but the Vote expired on the 31st of March, and by that time there had been spent of it £3,500,000. Since that time we have spent on services similar to those for which the Vote of Credit was taken—on Vote of Credit Services, so to speak—a sum of £1,545,000 for Army Services, or, to speak more correctly, we have incurred expenditure to that amount. We have also expended £634,000 on Navy Services, and £748,000 upon the bringing of troops from India to Malta. That makes a total expenditure of £6,427,000 for the Services in contemplation, and which have reached a sum greater than that for which we originally asked, or a Vote of Credit, the Vote having been for £6,000,000. I think, however, the Committee will see that the original Vote has been very close to the amount which has actually been found chargeable against it. Of course, although we originally expected that the sum might be required, and we thought it right to ask for it, we entertained, at the same time, a hope that it would not be expended. [“Hear, hear!”] Hon. Gentlemen opposite cheer. No doubt, it was in our contemplation that the course of public events might be very different from what they proved to be. But things did not turn out as well as the more sanguine among us may have hoped; yet the sum asked for, and originally contemplated, and the sum we have actually found ourselves called upon to meet, are not very widely apart. £6,000,000 was the sum asked for, and £6,400,000 is the amount of expenditure we have incurred. That is the amount we have expended in what I will not call War Services, but in Services that were intended to prevent war. I am confident that they have been mainly instrumental in averting war. I will not go into that discussion at present; but I mention it for the mere purpose of adding that it was never intended—and hon. Gentlemen will, perhaps, remember this—that it was never intended that that charge should all fall upon a single year. At the time the Vote of Credit was originally asked for, I stated that we proposed that the whole sum required should be spread over three years; and, in point of fact, we asked for, and obtained, a Vote to issue Exchequer Bonds for the purposes of the Vote of Credit, to be repayable at any time not exceeding three years. We did not, however, exercise the power given to us in that form. We thought it fairer to the House, and better that we should only issue Bonds for one year, and we did issue them in that form. They would all fall due by the 31st of March, 1879; but we had it in contemplation that the whole charge should be spread over three years. When we came to the Budget Statement in April I was more sanguine, and I thought the amount would probably not be so much, and that the expenditure might be under £5,000,000 altogether. In that case we should be able to pay it off in two years. But the matter has not turned out well, or, at any rate, as well as I thought. To go back to the sum of £6,427,000, which represents the expenditure incurred in connection with the Vote of Credit, let us see what has been already raised and paid. £750,000 was paid out of the surplus Revenue of last year—1877-78—so that there remains due this year the balance of £5,677,000. Then, how much of this £5,677,000 will our present Ways and Means enable us to pay in the present year? Some of it, of course, we shall be able to pay. Let us, therefore, look at the estimated Expenditure for the current year—1878-79—exclusive of what may be required for the Vote of Credit Service. The original Estimates, we know, were £81,020,000. Supplementary Estimates have been presented to the House, excluding all that relates to the Vote of Credit Services, which amount to about £439,000, and we have made an allowance for a further charge in connection with the Kaffir War of £400,000. That brings up the Expenditure, exclusive of the Vote of Credit payments, to £81,860,000. The Revenue was estimated at £83,230,000, and, therefore, there is a balance of £1,370,000 left in this year, which would be applicable to the payment or redemption of Exchequer Bonds, or the payment of the Supplementary Estimates. Deducting this sum from the balance of £5,677,000 which remains due, that would leave us with a deficiency. It would bring us to the same result which I have before shown in another way, and would leave £4,300,000 deficit unprovided for. Now, having arrived at that conclusion, I ask the Committee for one moment to let me invite their attention to what our position and prospects will be next year, supposing the Revenue and Expenditure to remain constant—I mean, allowing no spring for the Revenue and no alteration of Expenditure, either for the better or the worse, except, of course, the cessation of the extraordinary demand for what we have called Vote of Credit Services. We should have a surplus of £1,370,000 to begin with, even if we do not exclude the provision, which we have had to make this year, for so large a charge as £800,000 for the Kaffir War. I reckon that we should have that surplus, and, in addition, a sum of £700,000 for the remanet on the additional Income Tax. [Mr. CHILDERS: £600,000 is, I understand, the amount.] Supposing we take it at £700,000, that will give a total surplus of £2,070,000, which is not far from one-half of the £4,300,000 that has to be provided for. Of course, what may be the case this year may be expected to be the same in the following year. [Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON here made a remark to the right hon. Gentleman.] I am told that I am wrong, and that the remanet on the Income Tax should be £600,000 instead of £700,000. Therefore, the surplus would be £100,000 less, and would be £1,970,000, or nearly £2,000,000. It is sufficiently near to one-half of the total amount to be provided for, especially as we shall not have to provide next year, I hope, for any such expenditure as the Kaffir War. I think, therefore, we may fairly estimate that we shall be able, next year, to pay off about one-half of the £4,300,000 to be left over from this year; and in the year following that we shall be able to pay off the remainder. Now, as the Vote of Credit was asked for, originally, for three years, and as the amount which has been brought to charge in respect of it is very little more than the amount of the estimated Vote of Credit itself—being only about £400,000 more—and as, moreover, without any disturbance of our financial position, we may hope to be able to redeem the pledge we gave, that this money should only be voted for three years, I think the Committee will agree with me in considering that it is not desirable to alter our Revenue system, or to impose new taxes; but that we should allow the original arrangement to stand, and that we should make provision by the issue of a proper amount of Exchequer Bonds for the immediate service of the year, spreading the repayment over the next two years. That being so, the amount of Exchequer Bonds I propose to ask the authority of the Committee to issue is £2,000,000, or a sum not exceeding that amount. Of course, before the end of March, it will be necessary to make some provision for the £2,750,000 Exchequer Bonds which fall due at that time, and which it will be necessary to renew, unless we are able, by good fortune, to pay off any portion of them. That would be an operation that would come later; but the issue of the £2,000,000 Bonds, if the Committee accept my proposal, would be an immediate operation, with a view to our immediate necessities. This, I think, embraces all that I have to say to the Committee. I am aware that there are one or two other remarks that may be made. I may be told that I ought to make allowance for any possible failure in the Revenue. I do not think, looking carefully at the matter, that there is anything in the present appearance of the

Revenue that should induce me to alter my Estimates. Undoubtedly, there are some branches of the Revenue in which the receipts are not coming in as fast as I should have wished. In regard to one of them—in fact, the principal one —I daresay some hon. Gentlemen may take a different view. I mean the Revenue from spirits, which is particularly falling off; but, in regard to the Revenue generally, my estimate of Revenue was made very carefully under the different heads; and as I do not at present see any sufficient reason to alter my calculations, I do not propose in my Statement to make any allowance for any possible falling off. I do not expect that there will be much falling off. Another point which may be raised is the question which many have asked—namely, whether we have come to the end of our Supplementary Estimates, or whether there will be any further charge which will fall on the present year? Of course, I have taken all the pains I can to ascertain how that matter stands; and I believe that I am perfectly justified in presenting the Estimates which are now presented with confidence to the Committee, and in the full belief that they comprise the whole of the charges for our Military and Naval Services. The Supplementary Estimates, unfortunately, are of an ordinary character. They are constantly recurrent, and it is very difficult to make sure that some small Supplementaries may not spring up, and I do not like to say with too much confidence that there will be none. But I hope, if there are any, they will be only of the ordinary moderate character; and I present these Estimates to the Committee with full confidence that we are making adequate provision in the proposal I now make. I do not think there is really anything more I need to present to the Committee. Of course, it will be my duty to give such answers and information to hon. Members as I can; but I should only be taking up the time of the Committee unnecessarily by going into questions which hon. Members may not think it necessary to raise, if I were to attempt to make any further observations. I place in your hands, Mr. Raikes, these Resolutions.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to raise any sum not exceeding Two Million Pounds by the creation of securities chargeable on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. CHILDERS: Mr. Raikes, I propose to deal with the question before the Committee purely as one of Ways and Means, and to keep within the lines of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Statement. I am sorry that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not carry out the promise he made to the Committee in commencing his remarks, because he has favoured us with several political allusions which were loudly cheered from one part of the House. I promise him, however, that I will not follow him in that respect; but that I will treat the matter purely as a financial question. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has to-day recapitulated briefly to the Committee his previous Financial Statements of this Session—that which he made in February when he placed before the House the Vote of Credit for £6,000,000, and the general Statement which he made in April in introducing the Budget. According to the Statement made on the occasion of the Budget, my right hon. Friend explained that out of the £6,000,000 Vote of Credit, £3,500,000 had been spent during the year 1877-8, to which it was limited, and had been met to the extent of £750,000 by the surplus on last year's account, leaving a balance of £2,750,000 to be carried forward as a debt to this year's account. In passing, I may say that the correct figure, according to the accounts laid on the Table, is £110,000 less, or £2,640,000. My right hon. Friend then estimated the ordinary Revenue of the present year at £79,460,000, and the ordinary Expenditure at £81,020,000, showing a deficit of £1,560,000 on the ordinary account, quite irrespective of any special charge in connection with the state of affairs in the East of Europe. But he said that there would be extraordinary charges to be provided by Supplementary Estimates; and that these might possibly amount to £1,500,000, but would probably not exceed £1,000,000. To meet these and the ordinary deficit, he proposed additional taxes producing £3,770,000; which would give us on the year's account a surplus of from £1,210,000 to £710,000, to go in reduction of last year's deficiency brought forward, leaving it at something between £1,540,000 and £2,040,000. He added that the following year's income would be further increased by £600,000 on account of the Income Tax; and as this would bring the ordinary surplus up to £2,800,000, the past deficiency would be more than made good. It is important that the Committee should be reminded of these figures, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to-day spoken as if the expenditure under the Vote of Credit had been agreed to be spread over three years. This is not the case. Some mention was made of three years in February, when the amount to be spent under the Vote of Credit was uncertain; but this was dropped before the Budget, when only between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 was found to have been spent. The Bonds to make this good were issued for one year only, and not a word was said in the Budget Speech of any postponement except to the extent which I have named. Let us see, however, how the present figures tally with the Budget promises. The whole Supplementary Estimates were to be, probably, £1,000,000, possibly as much as £1,500,000. Now, in the month before the Budget was introduced—in March—it had been decided, in principle, to bring the Indian troops to Malta. The expenditure consequent upon taking that step must have been known by the Government to be large; and the amount must have been included in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's forecast of the Supplementary Estimates. I would remind the Committee also of what has been said in "another place;" that the occupation of Cyprus was discussed by the Cabinet in the month of March, and that the discussion was carried to such a point that the noble Earl who was Foreign Secretary at that time on this account resigned Office. That being so, either the Chancellor of the Exchequer should also have included some provision for the occupation of the Island in his Supplementary Estimate, or the Budget was utterly illusory, and its construction deserved severe condemnation. It now appears that as against £1,500,000, which was to be the outside Supplementary Expenditure, the Malta Expedition will cost £748,000; that the Supplementary Army Vote will be £1,845,000; and the Navy Vote, £678,000. Besides these, we now hear, for the first time, that there is a further charge of £400,000 on account of the Kaffir War, making the total charge for this year on account of that war £743,000. Sir, I think we have some cause of complaint with respect to these expenses at the Cape. A short time ago, when a Question was addressed to the Government on the subject by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), we were told that an extremely small sum would be necessary for this war; and, relying upon that assurance, our vigilance was somewhat relaxed, and no further Questions were put. Now, we hear suddenly that the Government require close upon £750,000 on account of the expenditure for the Kaffir War. What, however, is the result of these figures? The Supplementary Estimates are more than the Budget figures, loosely as they were stated, by from £2,767,000 to £2,267,000. Instead of a surplus on the year's account of £1,210,000, or £710,000, there will be a deficit of £1,577,000. Last year's deficiency, instead of being reduced, will be increased, and will mount up to £4,307,000; and yet not a farthing is to be provided by additional taxation, but all is to be postponed to future years. Let me point out to the Committee in a few words the strange effect of this change. The extraordinary military Expenditure of last year amounted to £3,500,000; that of this year to £3,670,000, making a total of £7,170,000; or, deducting the cost of the Kaffir War, of £6,430,000. How does the Chancellor of the Exchequer propose to meet this? The extraordinary Revenue which we voted under the scheme of the Budget was £3,170,000. But, of that amount, £1,560,000 had to be provided, in any case, to meet the deficit in the ordinary Revenue, and £740,000 for the Kaffir War; so that, of the total amount of extraordinary Revenue, £2,300,000 was required for other purposes, leaving £1,440,000 only as the amount raised by additional taxation in 1877-8 and 1878-9 towards meeting the additional expenditure in connection with the Eastern Question. In other words, you are going to charge on special taxation in the two years little more than one-fifth of that extraordinary Expenditure. Sir, such a proceeding is quite unparalleled. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may claim to put the matter in what he called "another light;" but I prefer a plain statement of actual figures; and I think I have shown that the present proposal of my right hon. Friend must be wrong, if the principle on which he founded his Budget was right. Will the House now bear with me for a few moments while I point out what has been done in previous cases of this description by Chancellors of the Exchequer and Prime Ministers of both political Parties, in dealing with special charges analogous to this—even though, in several instances, they had to be met towards the end of the Session, and unexpectedly. I might refer to two notable cases of earlier dates; but I will simply take the precedents of our own generation since the Crimean War. In 1859, there was a very analogous case to the present. A sudden and special increase of military Expenditure was considered necessary by both Parties in the House during that year. At the beginning of the Session of 1859, Gentlemen on the other side were in power; at the latter part of the Session, Gentlemen on this side. The present Lord Beaconsfield was Chancellor of the Exchequer in the beginning of that year; and my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) was Chancellor of the Exchequer in the latter part of the Session; and there was, practically, no dispute about the Expenditure. What was the proposal which was then brought forward almost at the end of the Session, and which received great care and attention? Owing to the sudden increase in the Army and Navy Expenditure, the estimated Revenue for the year was expected to fall short of the Votes by £4,867,000. What was done to meet the deficit? Was that Expenditure spread over the resources of three years, and popularity gained by avoiding the rightful increase of taxation? Not at all. On the 18th of July, when the Session of 1859 was as advanced as the present, my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone) proposed that this deficit of nearly £5,000,000 should be met by the imposition of a 4*d.* Income Tax, and by shortening the malt credits. My right hon. Friend, on that occasion, said—

> "The sum which is required is between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000. It is certainly a large sum to demand from the taxpayer at a short notice. But, on the other hand, it is a sum which has never driven a British Parliament to the expedient of augmenting the National Debt."—[3 *Hansard*, cliv. 1395.]

Mr. Disraeli supported the proposition, saying that "to raising this sum by taxes, not by loan, he gave his unqualified approbation." In the following year, a large charge was anticipated in connection with hostilities in China, the deficit being estimated at £2,336,000. On the 16th of July, 1860, the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in a Supplementary Budget, not proposing to charge on the following year any part of his deficit, but to take part of it out of the large surplus of 1859-60, and to obtain the balance by adding to the spirit duty. Coming a little later to the case of the Abyssinian War, the Committee will remember that under the Supplementary Statement made by Mr. Hunt, in November 1867, and the Budget Statement of April, 1868, it was anticipated that there would be an extraordinary expenditure during the year 1867-8 of £2,000,000, and, during the following year, of £3,000,000. Those sums, as the Committee are aware, were very much exceeded, and the succeeding Government had to provide for £4,000,000 more. But with respect to the £5,000,000, what was done? The Government of Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli carried, at the end of November, 1867, when only four months of the financial year were left, a special addition of 1*d.* to the Income Tax, and in the following year an addition of 2*d.*, estimated to produce £4,350,000, the balance being met out of the surplus of the previous year. These proposals were made and carried with the consent of both sides of the House; and, in reference to this very expenditure and the plan for meeting it, on the 28th of November, 1867, my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich said, and perhaps the Committee will forgive me for quoting him again; but he is so high an authority on such subjects that I cannot refrain from doing so—

> "Of all financial errors there is none so seductive, none so plausible, and, therefore, none so dangerous, as making a short postponement of the provision for your expenditure."—[3 *Hansard*, cxc. 346.]

Thus, the large extraordinary expenditure for the Abyssinian War was met, not by loan, but by taxation. Another case, still later, was that which occurred in 1870 and 1871, when there was again a sudden increase in our military and naval Expenditure, caused by the apprehensions which were raised by the Franco-German War. In 1870, at the end of the Session, a Vote of Credit was asked and granted, to the amount of £2,000,000; and the Army and Navy Votes for 1871-2 exceeded by no less than £3,870,000 those of the previous year's Budget; or, in all, an extraordinary Expenditure of £5,870,000 had to be met; but not a farthing was postponed to the following year. The whole was met in the first year by using the available surplus, and in the second by an increase of 2*d.* to the Income Tax, which was taken off when the Estimates were reduced by £1,500,000 in the following year. In every one, therefore, of the four cases which I have mentioned, provision was made for meeting the entire extra expenditure out of the surplus Revenue of the year by increased taxation. There may be two answers to my argument, which I shall venture to notice. It has been hinted that we may fairly postpone some of this burden, because there is a reasonable chance of the Revenue rising, and because, after this year, there probably will be a decrease in the Expenditure. Now, I will put it to hon. Gentlemen —especially those who are acquainted with mercantile affairs, or who are employers of labour—whether there is any reasonable ground for anticipating an increase in the Revenue on the ground of improvement in trade, and especially in that part of the Revenue which is made up of the contributions of the consumers of spirits, beer, tea, tobacco, and other taxed commodities? This is certainly a matter on which it would not be wise to prophecy; but from such information as can be derived from the perusal of trade circulars, and from the accounts which come to hand from the manufacturing districts, I should doubt whether anyone be disposed to be very sanguine on the subject. As a matter of fact, is the Revenue rising? It is the Chancellor of the Exchequer's misfortune to have to bring in his Supplementary Budget after four months of the financial year have expired. We have, however, the advantage of verifying, for four months at least, the estimate of Revenue. He estimated that, in the Customs, Excise, Stamps, and the House and Land Tax, there would be an increase for the year over 1877-8 of £601,000; but, whereas the Revenue for the first four months of the financial year ought thus to be £200,000 more than for the first four months of last year, there is actually a decrease of £488,000; so that, under these heads, we are £688,000 worse than the Estimate for the first four months, which is equivalent to a falling off of £2,100,000 a-year. If the Customs and Excise alone be taken into account, the falling off is £463,000, or at the rate of £1,400,000 a-year. Of course, the comparisons which I have made do not amount to anything like actual proof that the Revenue will fall off; but they afford evidence in that direction, and I think they call for an answer from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But then my right hon. Friend says that in the year 1879-30 there will be a considerable falling off in the Expenditure, and so if we keep up the taxes at their present rate, a surplus will be shown.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I did not say there would be a considerable falling off in the Expenditure. I said the probability was that the extraordinary charges would not recur.

MR. CHILDERS: Well, but is it clear that this is so? Are we only pledging ourselves to expenditure in the present year? When the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced his Budget for the present year, before the new taxes were imposed on the one hand, and before this extraordinary Expenditure was taken into account on the other, he contemplated a deficit on the ordinary Estimates of £1,560,000. I should like to know something from the Government as to what will be the probable cost of the occupation of Cyprus? How much do the Government expect to spend annually on that Island? Her Majesty's Government have had the matter in their minds since last March; and now that August has been reached, I think they ought to be in a position to give us some general idea—I do not ask for precise details—of what their contemplated expenditure on that Island is. What scale had they in their mind when they decided on the occupation? In the first place, we have heard that the number of men to be employed is to be 8,000. I do not know whether that is true; it may be that it is to be 10,000, but I will take the smaller number, and if it should turn out to be the larger, it will make my argument all the stronger. The military charge for

8,000 men on the scale of expenditure in Malta—and there you have everything to your hand — would be £500,000. Then what civil expenditure are you going to incur? First of all, what is Cyprus going to be? Is it to be a Colony? By which of the great Departments of State is it to be administered? Will it come under the War Office, the Colonial Office, the India Office, or, as I heard the other day, is it to be administered by the Foreign Office? Whichever it is to be, the Committee must be aware that, considering the condition of its harbours and internal communications, its sanitary deficiencies, and general state of ruin, it cannot be administered without very considerable expense. I take it at £500,000. That may be very much too little; but even taking it at that, that brings up the expenditure, for civil and military purposes on the Island of Cyprus, to £1,000,000. In regard to the expenditure at the Cape, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has expressed a hope that it will soon be over; but the news of the last few days is very deceptive if this should turn out to be the case. I might, with safety, have put down a larger sum; but I will assume, for the probable expenditure on that head, the sum of £300,000. Then there is the nominal increase in the Education Expenditure. That expenditure has been increasing at a rate of something like £300,000 a-year; but I take it at £250,000, a moderate estimate. If to these items for Cyprus, the Cape, and Education, you add the deficit on the ordinary Expenditure, and you only allow £1,000,000 for the fall off in Revenue, the sum to be met by the new taxes will be £4,060,000. But the whole of the new taxes will produce but £4,370,000, and thus only about £300,000 will be left to meet the postponed liability of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000. Is it wise, then, to postpone this large charge in such a manner? I think what I have said affords fair material for an answer from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or from someone on the Front Bench. I will now only, before I sit down, refer to one other argument, which I know will not be brought forward from the Front Bench, but which may come from another part of the House. It may be said that, after all, we are paying at the present time, through the new Sinking Fund and Terminable Annuities, so much towards the reduction of Debt, that the rule laid down by previous Chancellors of the Exchequer, in 1859 and since, need not be followed. I will show the Committee how entirely fallacious that argument is. I have already given the Committee several instances in which the House, both sides assenting, has refused to postpone special charges of this kind, and I will tell the Committee what the debt charge was on those occasions. In 1859, the old Terminable Annuities had not fallen in, and the net charge for principal and interest of Debt was £28,567,000; in 1867-8, when the new Annuities had been introduced, the net charge was £26,460,000; in 1871, it was £26,680,000; and though I have not, of course, the figures for this year, I have those for 1877, when the charge was £27,305,000, or £1,200,000 less than in 1859, when the House of Commons did not hesitate to provide by taxation in the year for all the special Expenditure. However, as I have said, this argument will not come from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have now discharged my duty in protesting against a proceeding in direct opposition to all the canons of sound finance, and to the policy of all Governments during the last quarter of a century, and which will form a most dangerous precedent in future years. That such a proposal should have come from the founder of the second Sinking Fund, is to me inconceivable. But here my responsibility ceases. We can do no more than record our protest against what appears to us a most dangerous precedent, which both sides of the House will some day regret to have established.

MR. GOLDNEY said, while the right hon. Gentleman dealt with figures, he was entitled to great respect; but when he indulged in the spirit of prophecy, he thought the Committee was entitled to pause before accepting his conclusions. He remembered more than one occasion last year when the right hon. Gentleman's calculations were entirely wrong. He predicted, on the introduction of the Budget, that all the sources of Revenue were likely to diminish; and he thought the Committee would acknowledge how the circumstances had entirely falsified his forecasts. The right hon. Gentleman said there was no precedent for the course proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he quoted instances from 1859. The right hon. Gentleman had evidently gone carefully into this matter, and he could, therefore, hardly think the omission was accidental; but if he had gone four years further back, he would have found that in 1855—the last year of the Crimean War—Sir George Cornewall Lewis, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer under Lord Palmerston's Administration, came down to the House in April and said that, after careful and long consideration, he estimated the Expenditure for that year at £86,339,000, which he proposed should be met by £63,000,000, the taxes for the year supplemented by a loan of £16,000,000, new taxes amounting to £4,000,000, and a temporary loan by means of an issue of Exchequer Bills to the amount of £3,000,000. But, in the following August, Sir George Cornewall Lewis came again to the House, and said that, as the charges had been increased, he was compelled to increase his Estimate by £6,139,000. How did he propose to meet that additional sum? By increased taxation? No; but by a further increase of the power to issue Exchequer Bills to the amount of £6,000,000. When the right hon. Gentleman said that no precedent existed, he was bound to tell him that he considered the two cases almost exactly parallel. The Chancellor of the Exchequer still proposed to carry out his original proposition, and to place £2,000,000 of Exchequer Bonds upon the charges of this year; and he assumed that the fair average amount of reduced Expenditure for the ensuing two financial years might be taken, with convenience and safety, at the figure which he had placed. He thought the proposal justified by the precedent of 1855, a case which seemed to him to be entirely on all-fours with the present one; and he was quite sure that it was more likely to meet the views of the country than if at this moment it was sought to impose additional taxes to meet the Supplemental Charges.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I confess, Mr. Raikes, it appeared to me, upon listening to the statement of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Childers), that it absolutely demanded an immediate reply from Her Majesty's Government. I do not think I can recollect a case in financial debate when figures and facts so formidable were allowed to come before the House, with various Gentlemen connected with the spending Departments sitting on the Treasury Bench, and not one word has been said. It appears as if they thought it necessary that some hours should elapse, in order to allow the effect of my right hon. Friend's statement to be lost, before they ventured to touch it. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down appears to me most effectually to have proved the case which he set himself to argue against. The kind of assistance which he has brought to Her Majesty's Government has, I think, dealt them the heaviest left-handed blow which it is possible for them to receive. How does he justify the proceeding of the Chancellor of the Exchequer?—a proceeding taken at a time of profound peace, or at a time which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has described as one of profound peace. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has said, that by the wise expenditure of £6,000,000 peace has been secured. Well, if peace has been secured, the finance with which we have to deal is the finance of peace; and yet, with what finance does the hon. Gentleman compare it? He compares it with the finance of the most desperate crisis in the Crimean War. Sir George Cornewall Lewis proposed, in the month of August, in order to meet the necessities of that War, to take power to raise £6,000,000, which happens to be almost the same sum as that now required, by the issue of Exchequer Bills. [Mr. Goldney: I said the War was then over.] But the War was not then over. Sebastopol was not taken till September. Nor was the War over when Sebastopol was taken. The taking of a fortress does not close a war; the expenditure of the War had not began sensibly to diminish till months after; and, therefore, this instance cannot be pleaded as a justification for the course of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I know that it is not fair to lay the whole of the blame of an expenditure on so great a scale as this upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer can do a great deal by hard fights in the Cabinet—he can materially reduce the Expenditure, provided he sets about the matter with great resolution, and great resolution, I know from experience, it requires. But when we are dealing with the question in Parliament, we must treat the proposals as the proposals of the Cabinet. Instead of allowing the justification which has been made—if it be a justification—to pass for them, it appears to me that some Member of Her Majesty's Government ought to rise and give the reply to the attack—if it can be so called—of my right hon. Friend near me. But this justification which has been made is founded entirely on a misconception; because, by what they call a wise expenditure, they have secured what they call—and what we all must hope—is peace, and yet the comparison is made with one of the most momentous crises in the Crimean War. What was the state of taxation when Sir George Cornewall Lewis made that statement to which the hon. Gentleman has referred? The Income Tax, if I mistake not, had been raised to 1*s.* 4*d.* in the pound. I think I cannot be wrong in my recollection, for, in the previous year, I myself had raised it to 1*s.* 2*d.*, and Sir George Cornewall Lewis had, in April, imposed an additional 2*d.*; and it was, therefore, an absolute necessity that the great bulk of this additional expenditure should be provided for by loans. And yet this is the state of things which the hon. Gentleman compares with the present time, and claims as a precedent for the action of the Government. If I was at all disposed, on the present occasion, to discuss the purposes for which this money has been spent, I have been a little provoked to do so by the declaration which the Chancellor of the Exchequer made, that the wise expenditure of this money had secured peace to the country. I will not go beyond the trespass—if it be a trespass—which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has himself made, in saying that, in my opinion, every shilling of this money—I do not include that which has been called for by the Kaffir War—but every other shilling of this money is money used in support of a policy which we believe to be needless and mischievous. Our conviction is that every valuable object which has been gained might have been obtained at less outlay, and with much less of human suffering—indeed, with much greater certainty—if we had never been led into the course of policy which has caused the spending of this money. At the same time, while I make that statement, I do not wish myself to discuss again the points which have already been so fully debated. I see behind the Chancellor of the Exchequer the Judge Advocate General and other Gentlemen, who have special cause to support the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have no doubt that the whole of that magnificent majority which supports him on the present occasion will show the same unflinching support when the new taxes have to be imposed, and it becomes necessary to enforce the painful lesson that we must pay our way. I trust not one of them will be found to flinch from this task; but that they will consistently rejoice at being able to carry to the fullest extent the consequences of their policy. But while I do not intend to touch at greater length upon the policy which has led to these proceedings, I am prepared to make a few remarks upon the financial aspect of the case. I hope the statement which has been made by my right hon. Friend will attract the attention of the people of this country, and that what he has said will sink deeply into its heart. Her Majesty's Government, it appears to me, are sapping by regular and constant progress the principles of financial responsibility and control in this country. In the first place, I cannot help seeing that there is a practice growing up of holding back from Parliament, until a very late date, the knowledge of expenditure that is coming on, and the tendency is indulged in of under-estimating that expenditure. I think, with the Estimates before us, we are justified in looking back to the Estimates given in the Budget. We were told that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not exactly say what the extent of those Supplementary Estimates would be. He said they would amount to £1,000,000, or, to put it moderately, £1,500,000, instead of which they come to between £3,000,000 and £4,000,000. I wish to say that it is a very novel and doubtful practice to submit Estimates in that form. When it is said it may be £1,000,000 or £1,500,000, it is casting abroad, and preventing the House of Commons discharging its duty; for in order to discharge its duty to the Throne, it must have before it definite statements. I do not mean that it is the duty of the

Chancellor of the Exchequer to say—"I may not be uncertain, but I cannot tell you what the sum will be;" but I hold it is for him, in conformity with precedent, usage, and principle, to state the outside amount; whether it is £1,000,000 or £1,500,000. I think the mode adopted most objectionable. The statement was not only erroneous, but also, as far as we have been able to judge, it is impossible to conceive what excesses can have occurred since the period of the Budget, which required the Estimate then to be kept down to £1,000,000 or £1,500,000, and which have now raised it to £3,000,000 or £4,000,000. I must likewise object to the phrase, and the practice indicated by the phrase, about spreading the charge over three years, or two years. And I am obliged to my right hon. Friend (Mr. Childers) for quoting a passage from a speech of mine which I had forgotten, in which I made a strong declaration to that effect. This delusive method of dealing with a question of charge—it is of all methods the worst. It is far better to say, as Sir George Cornewall Lewis said—"I have got here a deficiency, which I do not think it is convenient to supply just now." Call it what you like, you have made an addition to the Debt of the country; you have spent money, and you have not replaced it in the pockets of the people. Talk about spreading it over one or two years! These are empty phrases—empty bubbles. It cannot be spread over a term of years. It is money spent, and it is money not replaced. It is an addition to the Debt of the country, and so you ought to treat it. Now, with regard to precedents. I am afraid Her Majesty's Government are perfectly sick of all references to precedents. In other times it used to be considered material and important to refer to these precedents. It was the pride of the House of Commons—and it has been believed to be, in a very great degree, the safety of Parliament—that in all matters of public importance it was distinguished beyond every popular Assembly for the attention it paid to precedent, and for its wise and instinctive reluctance to be led beyond the bounds of precedent. You have heard a precedent from my right hon. Friend (Mr. Childers). In 1859, on the 18th July, having a deficit of £4,800,000, I proposed to raise Revenue to the extent of £5,100,000, in order to meet it. Do not suppose I take any merit for that; it was no merit of mine. I believe Lord Palmerston, Lord Russell, and my other Colleagues would have drummed me out of the Cabinet if I had proposed to deal with that deficit in the way that the present deficit is proposed to be dealt with. Such is the change of the times. I venture to make a further allusion, because it is necessary to do so in order to get a full view of the state of affairs in 1860. My right hon. Friend says truly that we took £1,300,000 out of the balances. The plan, in July, 1860, was to find £1,150,000 to meet the spirit duty, and we took £1,300,000 out of the balances. That was, of course, an addition to Debt, being so much diminution of the means of the country. But under what circumstances did we make that addition? What was the total amount of the charge for the China War in that year? In the beginning of the Session of 1860, we had to add to the Estimates of 1859 the sum of £850,000; we then placed upon the first Estimates of the year—1860-1—the sum of £1,700,000, and we had to provide, in July 1861, for a further sum, which raised the entire charge for the China War, for the Session of 1860, to the sum of £5,850,000. We provided for that entirely from Revenue, excepting only the sum of £1,300,000, which, as I have said, was substantially an addition to Debt. Such was the entire cost of the China War. So that in 1859, having a deficit of £4,800,000, we provided for the whole, excepting the sum of £1,300,000. These are the old principles of British finance. They may not be very palatable to right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The right hon. Gentleman said he had no doubt his proposal would be very palatable. I think, if he had come down to-day and said he had reduced the Income Tax to 2*d.* in the pound, in order to compliment the people upon the excellent feeling they had shown, and that with regard to any deficit resulting from this reduction, he would spread it over four or five years, his proposal would probably have been very popular. But what said my right hon. Friend in 1860? That year was one of the greatest severity I ever passed through in my life—it was a year of extreme Parliamentary labour, with the greatest possible anxiety. We raised the Income Tax to 10*d.* in the pound; we laid a new tax on spirits; and with that immense taxation—an Income Tax of 10*d.* in the pound—we had likewise to cope with the favourite scheme of those days, which was known as the "fortification scheme." By dint of great efforts, the original Estimate for that scheme was cut down to £5,000,000. But how was it to be provided? The Government determined that they could not carry on the taxation, and the £5,000,000 was made up by Annuities, extending over a limited number of years. I remember very well the admirable speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer criticizing that method of procedure, and showing what a dangerous thing it was not to meet the expenses of the year within the year. Although we had an Income Tax of 10*d.* in the pound; although we had to meet three-fourths of the China expenditure out of the Income Tax; so rigid and Puritanical was the financial virtue of my right hon. Friend that he was not satisfied with the additional burden for fortifications—not, perhaps, a very wise scheme, but a scheme that 99 out of every 100 Englishmen desired to have—and made an excellent speech, setting forth his objections to our proposal. I recommend that speech to the consideration of everybody in this House, and to the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself. I think it would be a very good thing indeed if he recurs to that speech, and refreshes his mind on the subject of the dangers of tampering with the principle on which all sound finance and all true financial control rests—that is, the principle of keeping the expenses of the year to the plans and projects of the year, and not professing to throw them upon one or two years to come, about which you can know nothing. As has been shown by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Childers), in speaking of the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it leads to the most disagreeable supposition with regard to the Revenue of the next year. I will not question the Estimates of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He is in a different position in the present state of trade in the country; still, I heard with satisfaction the declaration which he made—and I am sure he would not have made it except on serious consideration—which conveys to me some comfort as to our financial situation. It is a marvellous thing if we are to get through, as he supposes, 12 months all for nothing; because the assumption of my right hon. Friend is not reduction of general Expenditure in 1879-80, but the total sweeping away of the extra expenditure which has brought upon us the special necessities of the present year. I understand the whole of that is to be swept away bodily. My right hon. Friend has attempted to make an estimate of the expenditure on Cyprus. I have not the smallest idea what that expenditure will be; but it appears to me, if you are going to have Cyprus, and if it is to be a military centre—a centre from which you may rapidly send forth your Military and Naval Forces—it is difficult to understand how you can get over the necessity of a large outlay in the first instance. I will not speak of buildings and telegraphs; but what of harbours? It is admitted that you have not got a harbour in the place. You have got roadsteads, it will be said. Well, the Downs is an admirable roadstead; but what would be the condition of this country if, when we wanted to send out a Military Force, we were obliged to embark men and stores from Dover? These matters are not at all tempting; but certainly one's mind is possessed with a very disagreeable anticipation; and I feel some surprise at the boldness and courage with which my right hon. Friend assumes that the whole of this expenditure is to be swept away as regards 1879-80. I go back beyond the Crimean War; I look back over my very long Parliamentary experience, extending over a period of 39 or 40 years, for a proceeding which, in the slighest degree, resembles this. This proceeding is one in which we have before us an expenditure, incurred and to be provided for, reaching £6,000,000; we provide one-fourth of it, and the other three-fourths we send on, to be dealt with in future years, as those years will be able to meet it. That is to say, having a heavy deficit, we do not like to meet it; and that, laying claim to the acquisition of a great deal of glory, still our confidence in that glory, and our confidence in the affections of the people about to be consolidated by that glory, is so moderate that we think it better not to try their patience. This is the condition in which we stand; and as for precedent, the only precedent I can recollect—and it is one, I believe, not in the recollection of any other man now in Parliament—will be found by means of *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates* for the year 1839. In that year, there was a small deficiency upon the ordinary Expenditure; and the independent Liberal Party in this House were eagerly set upon obtaining the introduction of a very important change —a change which, perhaps, of all the changes that have been introduced in our times, has been the most extensive and the most beneficial in its effects relatively to the amount of inconvenience and loss which, in the first place, it occasioned. I suppose there were inconveniences in those days, just as there are in these. I am no more responsible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer in those days than I am for the present Chancellor of the Exchequer; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer then found, like my right hon. Friend, a great difficulty in saying what was the loss to the country by the introduction of the Penny Post. The rest of the world knew tolerably well that they would lose £1,000,000 to £1,500,000; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not like to assume responsibility of any kind. In the first place, I believe he put in a Resolution; but afterwards, in the financial Bill which he passed, he recognized the whole deficiency of the year, but said that he bound the House solemnly to provide for it next year. For the last 38 years, however, that precedent has been remembered only to be eschewed, avoided, and condemned; but it is now renewed in a much larger form. One thing I do not recollect. I do not think I ever saw Sir Robert Peel, who was a calm and self-sustained man, moved with such indignation as on that occasion. I remember how he then said—"The finance of this Government will be the ruin of this Government;" and so it was; and how he also said, speaking of that very declaration of the House of Commons, that, having a deficit, they would not provide for it, but hand it over to the coming year—

> "His opinion was, that it was the worst thing that had been done by the Reformed Parliament."

I wonder with what sort of mind he would now contemplate the heirs of his Conservative opinions and his Conservative practices—and among them there was none so strict as the rigour of his unbending obstinacy about his country's finance—adopting the proposal of a Conservative Government for dealing with the finances of the country. No doubt, it is disagreeable to the Government to hear this incessant series of complaints. I have no alternative but to join with others in complaining and protesting. We can, at the outside, but protest verbally; we have not the smallest chance of making any impression upon Gentlemen opposite; we care no more for the finance of Sir Robert Peel than for the finance of William Law and the Mississippi scheme. A time of war, and wholesale preparation for war, establishes a set of rules and necessities that have no reference at all to the present state of things. The blame I lay is upon the policy of Her Majesty's Government collectively, not upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and when I reflect upon that policy, and the triumphant success which it has met with upon every occasion on which it has been challenged, down to last Saturday morning, I cannot at all wonder that Her Majesty's Government, after the proofs that they received of the unswerving fidelity of their followers, should expect of them what I have no doubt will be the case—that they will receive an account, making provision for one-fourth of the deficiency of £6,000,000, and leaving the remaining three-fourths to the tender mercies and contingencies of the future.

Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD remarked, that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) had not been successful in his reply to the statement of the hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney). If, in 1855, when, as the right hon. Gentleman stated, we were in the midst of a great war, and could not possibly foresee the amount of our ultimate deficiency — the Liberal Government of that day nevertheless thought it consistent with sound finance to borrow a large sum, and spread its repayment over a term of years—how much more was the present Government justified in adopting a similar course now, at a time when they had every reason to believe that peace had been assured. The right hon. Gentleman had objected to the precedent quoted by the hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney); but he would not, perhaps, think it unfair to be reminded himself, with respect to the Income Tax, that he promised to take it off altogether without telling the country how it was to be done; the one case might, therefore, be set against the other. In his opinion, the question of principle, and the amount of the excess in the Supplementary Estimates, were fair and just points to raise questions upon; but he had no doubt that right hon. Members on the front Bench would give some reasons why these Estimates were as they were. He thought that, considering the application which had been made of a large portion of the Expenditure, which none liked, but which he believed to be necessary, to supply material for the Naval and Military Services, of which they were greatly in need, and which had placed them in a state of unprecedented efficiency, the sum required by Her Majesty's Government was reasonable. He hoped, with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that our Expenditure would not be so great as some hon. Members supposed, and, with regard to Cyprus, that it would rest upon a fair and sound basis. He should have agreed with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) in his objection, on financial ground, to spreading expenditure of a normal kind over future years; but he ventured to submit what he believed to be a common-sense view of the case—namely, that the present Expenditure would not recur, and that it might be recouped out of the ordinary taxation of the country by judicious economy. He did not wish to be understood to mean the application of a system of unwise parsimony. He thought the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for dealing with the money was a perfectly right one, and he gave him his full support.

MR. W. HOLMS said, the Statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a very unsatisfactory one; he had a deficit of £6,516,000, and even with the estimated surplus of £2,210,000, a charge of £4,307,000 would be thrown on the country. It was proposed to meet that charge by the surplus of the two succeeding years. There was a barometer, by which he could estimate how far the working classes could endure increased taxation; that barometer was the revenue obtained from Customs and Excise for each of the five years preceding 1876. The average increase from Customs and Excise was £1,800,000; whereas last year, if they estimated, not only the actual falling off, but deducted the extra amount paid into the Exchequer during the two closing days, because of anticipated advances upon certain articles of Excise and Customs, they would find that the actual deficiency was £570,000; or, in other words, instead of an annual increase of £1,800,000, they had a deficit of more than £500,000; and, as had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), it looked as if the deficiency this year would be even greater. What reason had they to suppose that next year the Expenditure would be the same as that of last year, or even of this year? They had every reason to anticipate that it would be greatly increased. It had been pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract, that Cyprus alone must cause a considerable increase in our Expenditure, not to speak of the steady increase of the Education Estimates; so that he (Mr. Holms) ventured to say that the estimate formed by the right hon. Member for Pontefract was likely to prove very much under the mark. What was really the position? As yet they had had no Estimate furnished them of the probable expenditure in connection with the Eastern policy of the Government; at least, he did not recollect that any statement had been made by any Member of the Government on that subject. He had been surprised that during the four nights' debate so little had been said on the financial aspect of the whole of the Eastern Question. Let them look at Cyprus. The Government had taken 10,000 soldiers to that Island. He found that a British soldier, on an average, cost £106 per annum. This alone would give an expenditure of about £1,000,000 a-year, apart from any expenditure in connection with the Civil Service of Cyprus. That was not all. The Government had undertaken to defend Asia Minor—and, in fact, the whole of Turkey in Asia—against Russia; and in doing so they must, of course, incur a further expenditure. Cyprus was 600 miles from the Turkish frontier in Asia. Were the Government to wait with their 10,000 troops in Cyprus until Russia invaded Asia Minor?

He should think that no prudent Government, which really meant to carry out its engagements, would do anything of the kind. He would remind the Committee that Turkey in Asia was not now the same as it was a year ago. Kars and Ardahan had been given up to Russia; and the consequence was that the Government had undertaken to defend Turkey in Asia without forts and with a feeble Ally. If they were really to undertake the defence of that country, he ventured to say that the Government would very likely have to do what had been done in India—namely, endeavour to raise a Native Militia, which should fight side by side with British troops. Well, all that would cost money—how much no man could tell. But that was not all. They would have the First Lord of the Admiralty coming down to the House and telling them that the Navy required to be strengthened, because of the engagements into which the Government had entered. Further, they had undertaken to insure that the Government of Turkey in Asia should be reformed. They were told the other night by the Secretary of State for the Home Department that Turkey herself would effect the reforms referred to in the 1st Article of the Anglo-Turkish Convention; but he did not say how it was possible for her to do so. The Marquess of Salisbury, however, took a different view; and, as he was at the head of the Foreign Office, they should rather be guided by his opinion, on this particular matter, than by that of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. The noble Marquess said that—

> "Asiatic Turkey contained populations of many different races and creeds, possessing no capacity for self-government, and no aspiration for independence;"

and he went on, in a business-like way, in his despatch of the 30th of May, to state the particular course which he proposed to take for the purpose of effecting these reforms. But could anyone who had studied the history of India doubt that, in dealing with the Turkish Government, weak and in difficulties, the result would be that, in the end, the government of the whole country would fall into our hands? In the meantime, the system of carrying out reforms must cost this country a considerable amount of money. Therefore, they had to anticipate a charge, which they must look in the face, for the Army, probably for the Navy, and certainly for carrying out these reforms. He should like to know from the Government, whether they had formed any estimate whatever of the probable cost? If they estimated it even at £2,000,000 a-year, he ventured to ask how they could possibly have any surplus, under the most favourable circumstances, next year to meet the large deficit of £4,307,000? He thought that the only honest course was to raise the Revenue within the year which was necessary for defraying the Expenditure of the year. He confessed that if he was in the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he should hesitate to raise the amount required by an additional 2*d*. or 3*d*. in the pound from the Income Tax; because such a course would make the Eastern policy of the Government unpopular. At the same time, he had no hesitation in saying that the proper and fair mode of dealing with this matter was to raise within the year the money required to be expended.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Of course, I recognize entirely the spirit in which my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone), spoke when he said just now that he did not charge upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer personally, but upon the Government as a whole, what he objected to in their financial policy. At the same time, I am the organ of the Government in this matter, and I must take upon myself the responsibility for all that is done in regard to it. With regard to the observations which have been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), there is no doubt whatever that he has made—as he always does upon these occasions—a very able financial speech; and I am quite ready to admit that he does good service in bringing these matters, from time to time, before the notice of the House, and of the public, and of the Government, in the clear way in which he makes his statements. Nevertheless, I cannot assent to all he has endeavoured to impress upon us this evening. I admit, of course, the accuracy of his figures, generally speaking; but I think he misunderstood—and, certainly, my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich misunderstood—one thing which I had said with respect to next year. In speaking of the prospects for next year, they seemed to think that I had excluded the possibility of any expenditure which could be set off against the £800,000, of which we have spoken as the Kaffir War expenditure in this year, and that I had relied on the Estimate for next year on the assumption that I was to get rid of that expenditure. I have no doubt I expressed myself badly; but what I said was that, taking the surplus of £1,370,000, which is what I get this year, even although I have this year to provide £800,000 for the Kaffir War, and adding to it £600,000 as the remanet of the additional Income Tax, I get very nearly £2,000,000 of surplus to reckon upon next year, without taking into account the chance of the non-recurrence of any such charge as that for the Kaffir War; and it was upon the assumption that I could reckon upon such a surplus that I thought it safe to spread the £4,000,000 over two years; because if we had to meet any more Kaffir War expenditure—which Heaven forbid!—or any other item of extraordinary expenditure, that sum of £800,000 would go some way towards meeting it. If, on the other hand, we are fortunate enough to escape any expenditure of that kind, my position, of course, will be so much the better. Then there was another point upon which the right hon. Gentleman dwelt—and I admit that he was within his right in making the observations which he did make—and that was the prospect of our not realizing the Revenue that we have estimated we should realize this year. Well, I spoke with some little hesitation in my opening address; because I felt myself obliged to admit that in some branches of Revenue—especially on spirits—I might almost say entirely on spirits—there is a falling off. The other branches of Revenue are keeping up; and we have a very good prospect of realizing the Estimates upon everything, as far as I can see at present, except, perhaps, spirits, and a portion of the Stamp Revenue. I do not wish to go into details; I think it would be inconvenient; but I wish to state generally that I have gone into this matter with my Revenue advisers, and I have come to the conclusion that these are the two points upon which there is danger. But we hope to do better on the Post Office; and we have also reason to think that the calculations with regard to certain items of Miscellaneous Expenditure are more careful than they might be. Upon the whole, therefore, I see no reason, without anticipating any great revival of trade, for being apprehensive that our Estimates will not be realized. Both of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite have made some rather severe remarks upon the insufficiency of the provision which I made at the time of the Budget Statement; and it has been said that I ought to have known, and must have known, that we were likely to incur a much greater amount of expenditure. [Mr. Childers: Ought to have known; not must.] Well, that I ought to have known; but I think that if the Committee will really look broadly at what has been the course of affairs in connection with this expenditure, they will see how peculiarly difficult—I might say absolutely impossible—it was this year to forecast, from one month to another, what our expenditure would be. Just bear in mind what was the general policy of Her Majesty's Government with regard to additional expenditure. What was the reason for that expenditure? It was this. We were anxious to keep out of war; but, at the same time, we felt it was necessary to take certain steps to endeavour to arrest the progress of the war that was going on, and to prevent certain consequences which we were afraid might arise. We believed that, by showing that this nation was in earnest, and prepared firmly to make certain demands—and if they were not conceded, to take the necessary steps to enforce them—we should succeed in bringing about the result which we desired; and I am not going too far in saying that ultimately we did so succeed. But we did not succeed as quickly as we had hoped to do. It was our belief at first that the demonstration of our intention to act vigorously, and to use force if necessary, would have sufficed to check what was going on. Well, it did not. Matters went further and further, and we were obliged to take further steps; and as we did so we came to the point at which, from a combination of circumstances, we did arrive at the result that had been contemplated. That was, at all events, our policy; but then, as we were absolutely unable to say at what point we might succeed, we could not say how far our expenditure might go. When I spoke of £1,000,000 or £1,500,000, as being the amount I thought we ought to spend, I said that which, from the information we then had, and from the opinions we then formed, I believed to be the true state of the case. My right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich actually went the length of saying that I ought not to use such slipshod language as even to talk of "£1,000,000 or £1,500,000," but that one ought to say £1,500,000 plump, and make provision for the highest possible expenditure. That raises rather a serious question. Are you, upon all occasions, to make provision to meet the highest possible expenditure? Because, if you do that, you will find that you are entering upon an extremely expensive course. If the largest possible expenditure should happily not be incurred, then you will have imposed taxes which are not required; and that certainly would produce an effect which was produced by right hon. Gentlemen opposite with very great applause on more than one occasion—they asked for a great deal of means, and at the end of the year came forward with a magnificent surplus. That is a course of policy which I do not approve of; and I do not think that hon. Gentlemen generally on this side of the House approve of it either. I admit it is very heroic and looks very well; but, on the other hand, I think it is inconvenient to the taxpayers and to the trade of the country that you should increase taxes more than is necessary. I think myself it is wiser and better that you should do something moderate in the way of spreading over one or two or three years an ascertained expenditure which is within moderate limits, and which can be extinguished and disposed of without causing inconvenient fluctuations of taxes. My right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich taunts me because he says that in 1860, when it was proposed by the Government of that day, of which he was a distinguished Member and Chancellor of the Exchequer, to raise a loan for fortifications and spread it over 25 years, I objected to the proposal, and urged that the thing would be done better and more properly by the addition of proper amounts to the Estimates within the year. I still think that, having regard to the long period of 25 years over which the expenditure was proposed to be spread, it was a reasonable contention on my part; but I was young at that time, and my right hon. Friend had had far greater experience, and, at any rate, the speech, which he is now good enough to call an excellent one, failed entirely to produce any effect upon him at the time. That, however, is a purely personal affair; but with regard to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract, I am ready to admit that in all those cases to which he has referred all charges were met by taxation, and by taxation imposed within the year. I do not deny it at all; and I am not now prepared to enter into a discussion about the circumstances of each and every one of these cases. I think there were some circumstances that might make them stronger, and others that might make them weaker; but I base this proposal, not, I am bound to say, on the precedent of cases of that kind, but upon what I believe to be the right and proper course to be taken for the good of the country. I think you must look at it in this way. This has been an exceptional transaction. It is one, if our view is right—and the House has been good enough to support us in that view—in which we have expended a considerable—but not by any means an enormous—sum of money in averting what might have been a most serious burden upon the country for generations to come. If we had gone into a war, there is no saying what the limit to that burden might have been. I think it is not unreasonable that we should endeavour to spread that charge over the short period of three years; and looking to the state of the country, and the present depressed condition of many classes amongst us, I think it is desirable that we should not worry them by increasing taxation which, according to the hypothesis, was after a few months to be taken off again. Of course, if we were told that we should have to raise the level of our taxation, that would be a very different thing; and in one of the cases mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract—the case of the year 1860—our military Expenditure was raised to a level, from which it did not fall for a good many years afterwards. I may instance one of the reasons which appears to me to justify our dividing this expenditure in the way we have done. What has been one of the largest items—perhaps, the very largest single item—that has been paid for out of this Vote? Why, the item for the purchase of ships. We have spent £1,500,000 in the purchase of ships, which it would have taken four years to build. There is surely nothing very unreasonable, under the circumstances, in spreading over three years expenditure from which I am sanguine enough to hope that this wise purchase affords us some prospect of relief. However, I will not say more upon that point, except that I do not wish it to be understood that, because I did not enter into any sanguine calculations as to the possibility of reductions in ordinary expenditure next year, I have, therefore, no hope that we may have such reductions. I feel sure it is the duty of the Government—and certainly it is the interest of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—to press most earnestly for such wise economy and reductions in the ordinary expenditure as may be attainable; and I can promise the Committee that that matter will not escape my attention. There is, I think, very little else of which I need take notice, except some observations that have been made with regard to the probable cost of Cyprus. I am not in a position at the present moment to enter into any detailed calculations on that subject, for it is an entire misconception to suppose that we have had this matter in our minds, or that there has been any plan of occupying or retaining Cyprus, for the length of time that has been supposed. It is only within a very recent period that our attention has been concentrated on that Island. As regards the military Expenditure, my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War will presently state what he believes to be the proper amount of forces; but it will be very far short, indeed, of anything that we have heard of in the course of this discussion. I should say that some 2,000 soldiers would be amply sufficient for the occupation of the Island; but I would rather not enter into a point of military detail. There will, of course, be some expenses of a moderate character for the administration of the Island in the first instance; but it must be remembered that we have to look to the revenues of the Island to support the charges; and though it may not be possible to make these revenues support all the charges in the first year, I have no doubt that we shall be able hereafter, by a proper administration, to make them bear their own charges. At all events, they ought to do so; and that is a matter to which our attention is directed. The distinguished gentleman who has gone out now as High Commissioner (Sir Garnet Wolseley) is charged with the duty of making a full Report on all these matters; and by the time the House re-assembles, I have no doubt we shall be in a position to give much fuller information than it is at present in my power to do. I do not know that there are any other points on which I need make any observations. I think, if I were to go into all the precedents of former years, I could show a good many cases in which Estimates have been made, and expenditure incurred, with reference not only to the finance of a single year, but with reference to the finance of the year following, and even of several years following. I think I could find cases in which my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich himself had incurred expenditure of that kind. I confess that my recollection, although I have not refreshed it very lately, leads me to think that the first idea of issuing Exchequer Bonds for a limited term of years originated with the proposals made in 1853, when these Bonds were to be issued and to run for seven years, in order to cover the process of the extinction of the Income Tax; and other cases I am certain could be found in which great financial operations were instituted to involve certain sacrifices of the Revenue for one year, and in which the Revenue of the next year was to be brought into account in order to provide for the whole charge. I remember that Sir Henry Willoughby used to be very critical at that time and denounced the practice, and that it was warmly defended by the right hon. Gentleman, who was then responsible for it. I do not say that these precedents can be regarded as entirely on all-fours. What I say is, that the doctrine which appears to be laid down—that every emergency is to be met by an addition to the Income Tax—is a very dangerous one, and that it is a bad principle to raise taxation to cover a maximum amount of estimated expenditure. I could not help being amused at a lively newspaper article, or extract from an article, which I saw the other day. The newspaper writer was denouncing the extravagance of the Tory Government, and comparing it with the economy of their Predecessors, and this expression was used which rather amused me. I am quoting from *The Manchester Examiner and Times* of a few days ago. The Revenue receipts, it was here said, were £2 8*s*. 2*d*. per head of the population in 1873-4, and fell to £2 7*s*. 8*d*. in the fourth year of Tory rule; while the proportion of the expenditure per head, which was reduced to £2 4*s*. 5*d*. in my right hon. Friend's (Mr. Gladstone's) last year of Office, is now £2 9*s*. 3*d*. It struck me that this was a very roundabout way of saying that the Tory Government took less out of the people and spent more for their benefit than its Predecessors.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK said, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had more than once in his last remarks spoken of spreading expenditure over three years; but the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had clearly shown that this was a mis-description of the Government proposals. The expenditure was already incurred, and it was its repayment that was to be spread over three years. The right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) seemed to be misleading himself by a false analogy. If the Government were going to erect buildings, to construct fortifications, or build ships, they might spread the expenditure over a period of years; but what was now proposed was obviously different. The country, he believed, would hear with considerable regret the large amount of Supplementary Estimates which they were called upon to meet, and the expenditure on the Kaffir War would be heard of with surprise. No one had the least idea they were incurring so heavy a liability in South Africa. He had not supported the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) in the strenuous opposition he offered last Session to the Government's South African policy; but he could not help feeling that the subsequent course of events had, to a certain extent, followed the course prophesied by the hon. Member. As our frontier in South Africa was pushed further North it became naturally more extended; and he would suggest to the Government that they should consider whether it would not be wise to take some steps to provide for future expenditure of this kind by arrangements with reference to the land by which we could repay ourselves. He felt that the expenditure which formed the bulk of the Supplementary Estimates had been, to a great extent, useless. In his opinion, it would have been more easy for Russia to have yielded to the wishes of this country if they had been expressed in a somewhat less warlike manner; and when he compared the Treaty of San Stefano with the Treaty of Berlin, and saw what the changes made in the arrangements of the former Treaty really were, he could not help thinking that the country had got very little for their money. In some respects he preferred the Treaty of San Stefano to that of Berlin; because he believed a strong Bulgaria was desirable in the interests of this country, and would have conduced to the happiness of the people in that region. As regarded Cyprus, no hon. Member who had yet spoken had expected that Her Majesty's Government would be able to give even an approximate estimate of what the cost of our occupation of that Island would be; but he thought they had a right to expect some idea of the policy of the Government in respect to that Island. Did the Government contemplate making large harbours there? Or did they intend to undertake any large public works? If the acquisition of Cyprus had been the result of such a sudden idea that the Government had not yet formed any deliberate intentions, it seemed to him that it was not wise on their part to take the Island with so little consideration. A much larger number of men than 2,000 would have to be placed in the Island if our occupation of it was intended to put us in a position of preventing the progress of Russia in Asia Minor. The Chancellor of the Exchequer used a dangerous expression in the course of his speech when he spoke of "exceptional expenditure." There was always exceptional expenditure, and it was hardly to be expected that it could be avoided next year or the year after. The China War afforded no precedent for the present financial proposals, since an indemnity was received from China which covered much of the deficit there might otherwise have been. Much had been lately heard about the Imperial policy of this country. Would it not have been more consistent with Imperial policy, and more likely to produce an effective impression abroad, if this expenditure had been met at once out of income. If less popular at home, it would have been more prudent. The course of postponing payment did not appear calculated to give foreign Governments a high opinion of our financial strength.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, the right hon. Members for Pontefract and Greenwich (Mr. Childers and Mr. Gladstone) had bestowed upon the propositions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer criticism most wide, searching, and retrospective, and certainly not flattering. He was utterly unprepared to follow them in their wide and discursive review, and would content himself with some remarks with reference to the present year. He was struck with the regard of the right hon. Gentlemen for precedents, and especially for precedents set by themselves. Precedent was not always to be implicitly followed. It must sometimes be regarded, not as an example, but as a warning; and this remark applied, in his opinion, to many of the precedents of the last 10 or 20 years. The right hon. Member for Pontefract said that the four months of the present financial year already indicated a deficiency of £400,000, and thence he argued that at the end of the financial year there would be a very large deficiency for which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made no provision. Admitting the right hon. Gentleman's premisses, he must demur to his conclusion. During the last few months, the industry and enterprize of the country had been paralyzed, partly by the apprehension of war, and partly by the action of the labouring classes, who chose to strike. What reason was there to apprehend that this state of things would last for the next eight months? He believed that, as after a storm came a lull, and after a lull a storm, so the period of inaction from which the country was now emerging would probably be one of great activity in trade, and a consequent increase in Exchequer receipts. It was, therefore, perfectly legitimate that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should anticipate that the financial year, 1878-9, would be, at least, as productive as its recent predecessors. He doubted the utility of making criticisms upon certain possible shortcomings in the Estimates of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, months before the events occurred, which alone could give reality and force to those criticisms. A Budget was necessarily a matter of opinion, and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer formed his conclusions upon grounds presented to him and advice given by those best able to help him, he had done his duty. No man could be responsible for circumstances which might afterwards entirely disturb his reckoning. The circumstances of the Congress could not have been foreseen by any Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he could not blame him for having now to make this second Statement. The question now to be considered was, not whether the Estimates ought to have been produced earlier, but how the charges now thrown upon the finances of the country were to be met? The right hon. Member for Pontefract based his criticisms mainly upon what had been done in 1859-60, when a deficiency of £5,000,000 was met by a proposal to increase the Income Tax by 4*d.* in the pound. Did his right hon. Friend propose that a similar course should be followed now? If not, he failed to see what he could censure in the present arrangement. He gathered that the right hon. Gentleman, and the right hon. Member for Greenwich, wished the Expenditure of the year to be provided for out of the Revenue of the year. What taxes were in that case to be resorted to in order to meet the additional outlay which had been incurred? To that outlay he confessed he entertained, in the first instance, the strongest possible objection. He did not believe that the demand for £6,000,000, to make a display before Powers, with whom we were negotiating, was a legitimate demand; and he had thought since, that other proceedings, of a more or less sensational character, were not such as were necessary to a country in a position like ours. But men of far greater experience, and larger political knowledge, than himself, in whose opinion he had great confidence, had expressed to him a contrary view, and had assured him, from their knowledge of Oriental Governments, that the exhibition of material force made by the English Government was calculated to have, and did have, a very important influence in bringing about a successful settlement of the question at issue. The charges had now to be met; and the question was, whether they were to be met by special taxation, or partly by taxation and partly by dividing the payment over a series of years? The Income Tax had already been raised from 3*d.* to 5*d.*, and he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done wisely in not increasing it. Looking, as he did, on the Income Tax, knowing its iniquity, its oppressive character, and the waste, both moral and material, accompanying its collection, he felt every increase of the tax as a sensible pain. He had not remarked that the right hon. Gentlemen opposite, in their contrast of the present and late Government, had adverted to the different measures taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the reduction of Debt. Eighteen or 20 years ago, no distinct preparations were made for the redemption of Debt, except in a limited way by Terminable Annuities. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer had insured the paying off of £5,000,000 by a very simple operation. In two years he would have paid off £10,000,000 of the National Debt—a sum equal to, if not exceeding, the amounts he might temporarily require on loan. If, then, the National Debt, instead of being greviously enlarged, was to be reduced, he saw no reason to censure the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; for he was sure that, except under pressure of urgent necessity, any alteration in the fiscal policy of the country was a disadvantage. For a great national purpose, the difficulties and disturbances of such an alteration might be submitted to; but, for example, to vary repeatedly the Income Tax was in itself an evil, apart from the objections he entertained towards it on account of the iniquitous mode in which it was levied. In what he had said he spoke with one reservation—Cyprus. Of the expenditure there the Committee had been told nothing; and, therefore, he would say nothing, except this—that he devoutly trusted the Government would not attempt to govern that Island, and raise the Queen's flag there, while the Sultan retained a Sovereignty over it, but would acquire the fee-simple of the property, if we were to undertake its management and rule. This was especially necessary when, as he saw, this country was already making industrial engagements there. He had heard of projected commercial operations of every kind in connection with the Island. The Government themselves, he believed, were already undertaking national works of considerable magnitude. He sincerely protested against English people's money being invested in the Island of Cyprus until the Island of Cyprus became the English people's property.

Mr. CHILDERS: Perhaps my right hon. Friend will allow me to remind him that I read the figures from the official Return, showing that we were paying, in 1859, on account of interest and reduction of Debt, £1,200,000 more than now. [Mr. J. G. Hubbard: Of that kind of Debt?] Yes.

Mr. RYLANDS: I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer has entirely failed to give any satisfactory reason whatever for having adopted a course so unprecedented in regard to the financial arrangements of this country. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I daresay, trusts to the very large majority he has at his back who are prepared to support the Government. No arguments would justify the extraordinary course in view of deficiencies not to impose additional taxes, but to incur additional obligations as to the future, in a manner that no one can speak positively as to how they are to be met. He has taken that course, because it is perfectly well understood by hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House that if the Government begin to lay on additional taxation at the present time, they would secure a large amount of public disapproval and disappointment. If the Government had exercised the thrift which was displayed by the Government of the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), they would have no need to come to the House for additional taxation, for they would have had no difficulty in meeting the increased Expenditure. Let hon. Gentlemen cast an eye over the Returns of Expenditure during the years in which the late Government administered the affairs of this country. He will find that during the time the present Government have been in Office, the Expenditure in the Army, the Navy, and the Civil Services, have been steadily increasing, and they are now spending, in their ordinary Expenditure, some £10,000,000 or £12,000,000 more than the Government of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich did. If the Conservative Government had exercised the same economy, they would have had no difficulty in meeting the increased charges, without coming down to the House with such proposals as had been laid on the Table. Is the country likely to be satisfied with an expenditure of £7,000,000 for objects which the Government cannot describe or justify? The right hon. Gentleman now acknowledges that the Government have not seriously considered what is to be done with Cyprus. I have listened with astonishment to the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—that he can give us no information about Cyprus, and that it had been for so short a time under the notice of the Government, that the Cabinet have not yet determined what they are to do with this possession. Instead of there being 10,000 troops stationed at Cyprus, there will be only 2,000; therefore it is said that the expense will not be so great. So far as I can judge from the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, so far from being useful for offensive purposes in Asia Minor, the possession of the Island is to be a sham and a pretence, yet it is hung out before the country as being a great stroke of policy. If we are to have docks suitable for the reception of large vessels of war, and if we are to have forts and barracks necessary for accommodating a large number of troops in Cyprus for offensive purposes in Asia Minor—although I do not believe that it would answer the end in view—that would be an intelligible policy. But what can 2,000 troops do in Cyprus when there is no harbour for vessels of war? It is altogether a sham. The Government say they have secured peace; and it is said that we have such an interest in peace that the expense incurred in maintaining it has been small as compared with that of war; and that we may, therefore, fairly leave the expenditure to be met by the taxpayers in the next two years. Well, I have no doubt whatever that the country is gratified that we have got peace; and that if we had entered into the wickedness and crime of war, we should have laid much heavier burdens on the country. But the danger to peace was the creation of the Government themselves. Peace was not menaced, except by the Government in disturbing the concert in Europe. The Chancellor of the Exchequer can give us no definite information as to the arrangements of the next two years, and he has only, in my judgment, taken the course he has always taken during the whole Session whenever the Government have come down to the House to make any demand upon the Public Exchequer. They have never given us sufficient information. I think I am justified in saying that the statements they have made have been misleading statements. When the Vote of £6,000,000 was asked for, we were told from the Government Bench that it was extremely probable that no portion of that Vote of Credit would be spent, or only a very small portion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer excuses the Government by saying that new circumstances have arisen which were not contemplated. How soon did they arise? As soon as the Government was granted the money they began to spend it, although the circumstances remained exactly the same. There is one reason that accounts very much for the fact that misleading statements are placed before us. This difficulty has arisen from the fact that the Government have only been in the same mind for a short time at once. For several months there was a kind of hysterical policy on the part of the Government. They seem to have been excited by one thing, and then by another, and they took steps which afterwards they were disposed to change, or in some manner to withdraw. We know now that great differences existed even in the Cabinet itself; so that it was almost impossible for Members of the Government in the House to give a clear statement as to the determination of the Government. There was an idea on the part of several Members of the Government that the £6,000,000 would not be wanted. I think there have been several occasions on which steps were taken on information which may have proved afterwards to be inaccurate, and which justified the Chancellor of the Exchequer in saying that he found it quite impossible to give the House full information. There was one notable case in which the Secretary of State for the Home Department had told us that the Cabinet were possessed of information of so serious a character that they could not disregard it, and it was afterwards found that that information was incorrect. I should like to ask the Government what that information was, and what were the steps taken by the Government in consequence of the information? The probability is that it had very much to do with the movement of the Indian troops. I fear it is utterly impossible to oppose the proposition of the Government. We believe that the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, although made in good faith, is made on calculations which will not prove to be correct, and that next year the Expenditure will be far more than he contemplates at present. Of course, we cannot carry our opposition to these propositions further than a protest; but whatever course is taken by the Government to put off the evil day, this expenditure, which has been so lavishly incurred, will have to be met sooner or later.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, there were one or two points of practical importance to which he would refer. Some of the remarks of the right hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not answered. He wanted very much to know if we had got to the end of the expenditure with regard to the Indian troops? It was thought they were to remain at Malta; but now they had been removed to Cyprus, which must raise the expense very considerably. From the beginning the expense of these troops was very large indeed. They had given pecuniary encouragement to the Sepoys in order to secure their loyalty. Those Indian troops—men and officers—were excessively highly paid, and were brigaded with European troops, who were less highly paid. Some weeks ago he made a Motion for a Committee to inquire into the matter. When he came down to the House he met the Secretary of State for War (Colonel Stanley), who said the Government were willing to accept that proposal in substance, and as soon as the troops were settled, that Committee would be granted. When they were settled in Malta he renewed his application from day to day for several weeks; but the matter was still delayed, though he was always told the Committee was to come off as soon as possible. He confessed that towards the end of July his patience got exhausted; but, at last, after many inquiries, he was pleased to learn that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was prepared to appoint a Committee. The Committee being appointed, he was in hopes that he would obtain information, which would be valuable, with regard to the actual cost of these troops. When the Committee met a very great surprise was in store for him. He found that instead of communicating with himself previous to the sitting of this Committee, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had placed himself in communication with the right hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), who was away in the country. When he came up the noble Lord (Lord Eustace Cecil) communicated with that right hon. Gentleman without any knowledge on his (Sir George Campbell's) part. When the Committee met and the noble Lord was voted into the Chair, he proposed that the Committee should do nothing at all, but should postpone operations until next year. He was quite convinced that valuable information would be obtained if only one witness from the Indian Office was examined, and perhaps one from the War Office. He was taken very much by surprise, and he did not think that he had been quite well treated in the matter. So much did this feeling prevail in the Committee, that although the official and ex-official elements had combined, on a division the numbers were 6 and 6, and the motion for adjournment was carried by the casting vote of the noble Lord as Chairman. The noble Lord said the Government wished to leave the matter in the hands of the Committee. That could hardly be so when six independent Members were in favour of going on, and the adjournment was only carried by the casting vote of the noble Lord himself. Next morning there were telegrams from Cyprus that the Indian troops were to be sent back to India. The real fact probably was that the Indian troops were excessively expensive, and, being in a difficulty, the Government were very anxious to send them back to India. That being so, it was not exactly convenient to the Government that the exact pay and allowances should be examined. He was quite sure, if the noble Lord had told him there was any difficulty, he should have been the last man to have pressed on any exposure contrary to the interests of the Public Service. He (Sir George Campbell) was not without suspicion now that these non-proceedings of the Committee were connected with the determination of the Government to get rid of these troops. As regarded Cyprus, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them fairly that it was quite impossible for the Government to estimate what would be the cost of the administration of Cyprus. But the sum put down in the Estimates for the expenses at Cyprus was not only not sufficient, but was quite absurd. What was that sum—£25,000? It might be that the Government would reduce the number of troops to 2,000 men. He was quite prepared to admit that 2,000 men were amply sufficient to maintain order in Cyprus. If, however, the objects of taking Cyprus were those set forth by the Government to assist in the defence of Asia Minor, then 2,000 men would not be sufficient for any purpose of that kind. That would not be enough for offensive purposes, nor for defensive purposes. We should not dare to leave Malta with 2,000 men. Cyprus, it seemed to him, was much less defensible. His own view was that it would be much better that we should not attempt to maintain a defensive position in Cyprus. Therefore he should be glad to learn that that was not proposed by the Government, whatever they intended to do. He must say still that, in his opinion, this estimate of £25,000 for the whole military expenses of Cyprus, in a year of which so many months had yet to run, was quite inadequate, and, in fact, ridiculous. Parliamentary Papers, issued only that morning, had shown how great the expense was likely to be. It was pretty clear that the whole of the property, including public buildings, which was up to the date of the Convention the property of the Sultan, was to remain in his own hands. Unless he was misinformed, Sir Garnet Wolseley, instead of having possession handed over to him of the Turkish buildings for the purpose of his Government, had been compelled to go about begging the Greeks to rent him houses, and the demands of the Greeks were so exorbitant that he had been compelled to go outside the town, which was, practically, the seat of his Government. This was not, to say the least of it, a very dignified position to be occupied by the Representative of Her Majesty, who had undertaken the defence of Asiatic Turkey, and the occupation of Cyprus as part of the arrangement. The expenses that would have to be undertaken would turn out to be very great indeed. The cost of the Governor General and his staff would certainly be very considerable, and large cost would be entailed by the maintenance of a sufficient Force in the Island to enable us to carry out the undertaking upon which we had entered. It had now become quite clear that Cyprus was an unhealthy Island, at any rate, at this season of the year. In this connection he wished to give a word of very serious warning to Her Majesty's Government, and he was sure that the hon. and gallant Gentleman below him (Sir George Balfour) would confirm him, that in a region and climate productive of autumnal agues and fevers, Native Indian troops would suffer much more severely than Europeans in circumstances where they were ill-protected against malarious influences. Experience of what had happened in India led him to believe that in a climate like that of Cyprus they would have whole battalions of Native troops going on the sick list, unless very large sums of money were expended in building suitable barracks in salubrious parts of the Island. Unless this was done, the only chance of saving the Native troops was to send them back at once to India. He was one of those who were extremely anxious that the experiment of employing Native Indian troops in Europe should be fairly tried; and, therefore, he should be extremely sorry if any ground were given for supposing that in either a financial or a sanitary point of view the bringing of Native troops from India to Europe had proved a failure. It would certainly not be a very glorious ending to this experiment to be compelled to take the troops back to India before sufficient opportunity had been given for testing their capabilities for service in Europe. But if the Island was unhealthy, and the Government was not prepared to spend more money than that which was contemplated by the Estimate, the best thing to be done would be to send the Native troops back to India as soon as the commissariat arrangements admitted of their transport. Such a course would certainly have the effect of bringing the experiment to an end before it had been really tried; but it would be better to do this than to have the troops decimated by sickness. The Estimate for the civil administration of Cyprus was even more ridiculous than that for the expense of the military services of the Island. The amount proposed to be taken was £8,000. He had had a good deal of experience in the administration of new territories taken over from indigenous Administrations; and he felt sure that, no matter how fertile and prosperous the community annexed might be, a great expense must be incurred in the first instance. How much greater, therefore, must be the cost of taking over this wretchedly misgoverned and harried Island from the Turks? One important point in connection with this question had been overlooked. It had been said that, in all probability, the Revenue would pay the expenditure; but it seemed to be forgotten that we had undertaken to pay over to the Turks a sum equalling the Revenue which they had hitherto derived from the Island, and that there was a vast difference between the English and Turkish modes of administration, particularly as far as the levying and collection of taxes was concerned. Up to the present, the Turkish expenditure in Cyprus had been almost infinitesimal, and the Turkish officials had been allowed by their Government, in accordance with Oriental custom, to live upon the people of the Island. England could not harry the Island as Turkey had done; she could not, therefore, raise a Revenue as large as that which had been raised by the Turks, and her expenditure would, of necessity, be much greater than it had been under Turkish rule. England would require much larger Government establishments, and would have to pay for them, instead of allowing the officials to pay themselves at the expense of the people as the Turks had done. It was also clear that they would have to pay on a large scale, judging from the demands which had already been made by the Greeks upon Sir Garnet Wolseley, since his arrival in Cyprus. He, therefore, thought this Estimate of £8,000 was utterly ridiculous and misleading, and in no degree representing a fair estimate of what the actual expense would be.

He wished, also, to say a word as to the expense of the Kaffir War. He came down to the House prepared to hear that the sum of £300,000, put down upon the Estimates as the probable cost of the War, would not be sufficient to meet it; and he was anxious to ask the Government whether he was not right in his conjecture? But the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had anticipated his objection by stating that another £400,000 would be necessary on account of this War. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) in thinking that the Government had not treated the House fairly in reference to this matter. He had himself hammered constantly at this question, because he had been anxious to know whether the money spent at the Cape was Colonial money, or whether it was drawn from the Imperial Exchequer; and he had been continually met with the statement that the expenditure would be but small. Now, however, the House was told that, in addition to the amount originally contemplated, over £400,000 would be necessary, making over £700,000 in all. He had always had a sort of uncomfortable suspicion in reference to this matter. He was, from the first, quite sure that there was no man in the Empire better fitted to deal with the administration of affairs at the Cape than Sir Bartle Frere, and subsequent events had shown that he was right in his opinion. But it struck him throughout that, eminent as were the qualities of Sir Bartle Frere, and great as were his merits, there was something almost superhuman in the task of reconciling the different parties at the Cape, and establishing a sort of happy family there with arrangements to carry on a war. It had occurred to him throughout that, added to his eminent qualities, Sir Bartle Frere had British money behind him; and it now appeared this was the case. The opposition at the Cape seemed to have disappeared; everything had the appearance of being perfectly amicable; but these circumstances were coupled with the fact that England was to pay £743,000 towards the expenses of the Kaffir War. He was afraid that the House of Commons had not been fairly dealt with; that, in fact, the opposing parties at the Cape had been, as it were, "squared" with British money, without the consent of Parliament, and that we had been paying them—and paying them very well indeed—for fighting their own battles. This could not be regarded as a satisfactory state of things. With regard to the future, it must be borne in mind that although the Kaffir War was practically at an end, or was speedily approaching it, owing to the very eminent qualities of Sir Bartle Frere, there was a threatened war in the Transvaal. He hoped the war would be averted; but as the whole civil administration of that part of Africa was on our hands, he feared that a moderate sum of money would be necessary for the purpose of conducting that administration in a peaceful manner, or a still larger demand in order to the carrying on of wars in that, at present, disturbed territory. On all these grounds, he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had, in the Statement he made in Committee of Ways and Means, underestimated the real character of the demands he would eventually find it necessary to make upon the Imperial Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman ought, in his opinion, to have met the whole matter more boldly, and to have called upon the country to pay, by means of an increased taxation, for what was called "a spirited foreign policy."

MR. E. JENKINS thought the somewhat surprising speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer called for some further explanations. The right hon. Gentleman had opened his Budget, and, apparently, had provided for the expenditure that would be necessary for the rest of the present year; but when he came to compare the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman with the undertakings into which the Government had entered, he found a very wide difference between the two sets of circumstances. He could not help feeling, apart from the very keen criticisms which had proceeded from the front Opposition Bench, that the first pin had been stuck into the bladder of Imperial policy, which had been so successfully blown up with Imperial gas by hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House. The point on which he wished to receive information from the front Ministerial Bench was this. The right hon. Gentleman had framed his Estimates, and, in so doing, had made what had been clearly shown to be a most imperfect provision for the sort of hybrid arrangement with regard to Cyprus which had been entered into. He wished the opposite Benches had been filled with hon. Members who supported this great Imperial policy, in order that he might have asked their assistance in obtaining information from the Government as to the Convention into which this country had or had not entered, and the responsibilities which Her Majesty's Government had or had not undertaken. The Government had made no proposals as so the contingencies likely to arise out of the existing state of things. The House knew how frequently the Chancellor of the Exchequer had come down to the House with undivulged secrets of Government policy locked up in his breast; and he, for one, should not be at all surprised if, in the course of a few days, the right hon. Gentleman came down and announced that a British Resident had been appointed to Constantinople with a salary of £6,000 a-year, and that Her Majesty had taken possession of the Island of Tenedos, or some other island in those seas. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War smiled at this criticism; but it was based, unhappily, upon facts which were too certain and accurate to be controverted by the Ministry. He would ask the attention of the House to this—either that the Government were deluding the country, by an empirical policy, into a supposition that they were really going to undertake that the administration of Turkey in Asia should be put into a thoroughly efficient condition, or they were not. If the last presumption was accurate, the Turkish Convention was a piece of waste paper; and he could understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer coming down to the House and making no mention of possible contingencies with regard to the responsibilities which the country had undertaken. One of the first things that would strike anyone considering the subject carefully would be that, with a view to minimizing the difficulties and dangers that might arise, there should be an increase in the number of Consuls, who should report to the Home Government as to the condition of the countries, or parts of countries, in which they were engaged; but he had heard of no such proposal; and, as far as the occupation of Cyprus by Indian troops was concerned, they had been told that it was not determined to occupy Cyprus until long after the Native troops had been moved from India to Malta. As far, in fact, as he could judge, the only reason for sending these troops to Cyprus was that some use should be made of them before they were sent back to India. What appeared on the face of these whole proceedings was that the Government had not, and never had, a policy on this point; or if they had a policy, that they had deceived the House, and kept from it any knowledge of what they intended to do, or of the amount of money which would be necessary to carry their policy into effect. The House was left to conclude that this was a mere delusion put forward for the purpose of keeping up a show of Imperial policy with which to go to the country, or that the Government had undertaken responsibilities so serious that they did not dare to ask the House for means to meet them. In these days of startling disclosures, he should not be surprised to find that either one or other of these states of things was an accurate description of the facts. So far as the financial question was concerned, Parliament was bound to take note not only of the state of things at home, but as to the position of affairs abroad. On Saturday last, the noble Earl the Prime Minister, speaking at the Mansion House, drew a pleasing picture of universal peace in Europe; but he forgot to mention that Austria, in carrying out her part of the Agreement, had let herself into a little war; that the Italians were uneasy; and that affairs, generally, were in so menacing a condition that it would not be safe to calculate upon the peace of Europe being maintained for a single year; and that, therefore, it would not be safe to postpone, even for a year, the financial responsibilities which ought to be met at once by the taxpayers of the country. Under the circumstances, he thought the House and the country had a right to ask for further information as to the policy of the Government in reference to this particular question.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR could not agree with the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) in thinking that the Native troops had been in any way bribed to come to Europe. As far as his knowledge enabled him to speak, the rate of pay and allowances given to them was the same as when others of the Indian Army had been called upon to go to Burmah, Abyssinia, the Persian Gulf, or any other of the places outside of British India, in which they had had to serve from time to time. He might also add that the payment in rupees, though large in appearance when converted into sterling, was, in reality, so economical to the Government, that it would be wise to apply the Indian system to the English military arrangements; because the money actually paid covered every item of charge which was now met by the Home Government for barracks, furniture, servants, rations, carriage of baggage, and tents, for all of which the Home Government contributed, and in a far higher ratio than that which was calculated to be with the Indian system. The officers received in rupees the full amount for every purpose. No perquisites, no back allowances, were permitted. Such additions would be a violation of agreements. He had also been pained to hear the language used by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy as to the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere at the Cape. He had long known the honest heart and truthful mind of the Governor of the Cape, and he could not think for a moment that he would descend to the practice of bribery in any shape or form.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he had not intended in any way to accuse Sir Bartle Frere of unworthy conduct—very much the contrary.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR at once accepted the disclaimer. With regard to the Native Indian troops in Cyprus, he was strongly of opinion that unless the Government was prepared for such an expenditure as would properly house them, the only safe course to take would be to send them back at once to India. Further, he thought it would not be possible, at the amount of money which was asked from Parliament to maintain the large Force at present on the Island, or to construct the works that would become necessary. Once let loose the Engineers upon the making of fortifications, allow the officers of Artillery to construct batteries at will, or empower the authorities to proceed with the building of barracks, and then it would not be £1,000,000, or perhaps £1,500,000, that would pay the bill. It would be impossible to house our soldiers in barracks under £250 a-head; and the making of harbours, breakwaters, jetties, and other improvements, would swallow up the rest of the money which, instead of being expended on a wretched little Island of 150,000 inhabitants, might, he thought, be much more profitably laid out at home. He admitted that £10,000,000 might turn the Island into a paradise; but where was that money to come from? Certainly not from the pockets of the people of England. He had intended to move that the £2,000,000 now proposed to be raised should be reduced by the sum of £1,080,000; but, on reflection, he had changed his mind. If he could not persuade the Government to do what was right, then on their heads would rest the responsibility of doing wrong—by withholding the Papers for which he had repeatedly applied, in order to show the state of the money claims between the Home and Indian Governments. He washed his hands of it. Now, with reference to the military charges made by the War Office against India, he had refrained, as the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer knew, from any hasty action. He had trusted in the Government to act fairly and justly towards India, and had refrained, from year to year, raising his voice against the exorbitant charges they threw upon the Indian Revenue, notwithstanding that he had had the means at his command to bring forward the question. But his request for Papers on the subject had never been acceded to. The Papers had been promised him again and again; but he had always been put off during the last three years. Now, of the £1,080,000 charged by the War Office against the Government of India, he believed that £300,000, or more, was in excess of the proper amount. A Petition was last night presented in "another place" from the people of India, complaining of the taxation imposed on them, and another Petition, as hon. Members were aware, had been presented in that House to the same effect by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett). Well, the sum of money which, as it seemed to him, was unjustly levied by the War Office upon India, was more than sufficient, he believed, to cover the extraordinary salt tax recently imposed upon the people of Madras.

THE CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. and gallant Member that he was wandering from the Question before the Committee, which was that a sum, not exceeding £2,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, his intention had been not to move the reduction of the Vote; but if his observations were narrowed in that way, he should feel obliged to do it. After what had been said, he trusted the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would endeavour to give him the Papers he asked for—in other words, details of the charge of £1,080,000 which was thrown upon the Revenues of India. He felt keenly on this matter, believing that the people of India were suffering an injustice. The least the Government could do was to show them that their complaints had been attended to, and to furnish them with information which would enable them to judge whether or not they were being unjustly dealt with. He wished the Government to take note that once again he refrained from taking extreme measures against them by moving the reduction of the Vote; and he trusted his appeal for information would not this time be disregarded. Passing from this subject, he would only say that he agreed, to a certain extent, with what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers). He thought it much to be regretted that the Government should incur debt on account of their policy and not pay it off out of the year's income. They would have done much better, in his opinion, to have resorted to a bold financial stroke, which would have shown the world that if they pursued a spirited foreign policy, they were not afraid to meet the cost of it. He valued peace beyond price, for nothing more terrible could happen to a country than being plunged into war; and, although he did not approve the mode in which peace had been maintained, still, as it had been maintained, he thought the people of this country ought willingly to put their hands in their pockets and pay for it at once. Looking over the Expenditure of the last two years, it would be found that if the Government had not raised the Income Tax, they would, at the present moment, have been £8,000,000 in debt; and he thought it would have been wiser on their part, both financially and politically, to have wiped off their deficiency in one year, instead of deferring payment of it till next year, or the next again.

General SHUTE expressed a hope that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would not be induced by the remarks of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Sir George Balfour) to show his hand with regard to Cyprus, as it would not, in his opinion, be to the advantage of this country to make it known whether the garrison was to be 10,000 men, or a couple of battalions which, with one or two batteries of Artillery, and our Fleet commanders in the Mediterranean, would probably be enough to occupy it.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR reminded the hon. and gallant Member that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had already stated the intentions of the Government in that respect.

General SHUTE said, his own idea with regard to Cyprus was this—it was simply a strategical position, in which we might, if necessary, concentrate our military power from all our Colonies and Dependencies, including India. At Malta they had not sufficient space to do that, and it was undesirable, for other reasons, to attempt it there. There could be little doubt that within two years Cyprus might be made to pay more than its own expenses.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK confessed to having listened to the remarks of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (General Shute) with considerable surprise. With all deference to the hon. and gallant Member's superior knowledge of the matter, he must be allowed to demur to his statement that Cyprus could be regarded as a strategical position. The great Imperial policy of the Government, of which they had heard so much, was now beginning to assume a definite bearing in the matter of pounds, shillings, and pence; and it seemed to him the more closely the people of England studied its details, the better they would see how complete and utter a failure it was, and how totally disproportionate to the result to be achieved was the gigantic expense involved. Now, as to the strategical position of Cyprus—[General Shute: I said it might be used for the concentration of troops.]—Quite so. The hon. and gallant Member proposed to use Cyprus for the concentration of troops from all our Colonies and Dependencies. Well, when they were concentrated there, what in the world did he propose to do with them? That was the question which, from a humble and narrow military point of view, he ventured to put to him, and also to the Government. They were told that this was a part of the great Imperial policy which was to write the awful words—"Thus far, and no farther"—on the crest of some mountains, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he believed, called the A B C mountains the other day, and to draw a magnificent line across the Continents of Asia and Europe, beyond which Russia was not to pass. For this, they had the certainty of having to pay £6,000,000 now, and every prospect of having to pay double or treble that sum in future. Now, he would ask right hon. Gentlemen opposite, who might be supposed to have formed some definite conception of the means by which they hoped to carry out their plans, how was the acquisition of Cyprus to aid them with their grand Imperial policy? The country was waiting for an answer to this question, and it was his firm conviction that in 20 years' time they would be waiting still. Everybody recognized that this country committed a great mistake in bolstering up Turkey in 1856. Yet, with 20 years, additional experience, the Government were proposing to do the same thing again, to the tune at present of £6,000,000, which they proposed to pay, not in the present year, but at some future date. [An hon. Member: Three years.] Well, he gathered from the speech of his right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) that no definite time could really be fixed for the carrying out of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's projects. The Government proposed to garrison Cyprus with 2,000 troops, instead of the 8,000 British and Indian troops now there. Well, what became of his hon. and gallant Friend's grand strategical scheme? If Cyprus was to be of any importance whatever as an extension of our military and naval basis eastward in the Mediterranean—and he would not by any means object to such an extension, if carried out in a proper way—it could only be by the formation there of a military depôt of the largest sort, by the creation of harbours where no harbours existed, and by the erection of barracks, arsenals, and forts on a large scale, to do which not £6,000,000 but £20,000,000 would be necessary. All this would be required to make Cyprus tenable under circumstances which could easily arise out of the foreign policy of this country—supposing, for instance, we found ourselves in military complications with other Powers beside Russia. Italy and France were Mediterranean Powers, and they, surely, had as great interests, and as great susceptibilities in the Mediterranean as ourselves? Well, had we improved our position with regard to them by this sudden, this underhand—he had almost said this surreptitious—acquisition of Cyprus, which, however, he confessed was better than the violent seizure of the Island originally contemplated? [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER dissented.] Well, he should be glad to hear him deny that the violent seizure of Cyprus was originally contemplated. It had been stated that it was, on very high authority in "another place"—he meant the authority of the Earl of Derby—and if the Earl of Derby's statement was inexact, he should be glad to know what the proposal actually was which had been cut short by that noble Earl's secession from the Cabinet? As it was, our acquisition of Cyprus was absurd; it had not been reasoned out, and could lead to no logical conclusion whatever. At the same time, as he had said, he was glad to say it was only a faint and inferior copy of a project for seizing the Island by means of an expedition which the Earl of Derby had termed piratical.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The hon. and gallant Gentleman must excuse me, but he is entirely mistaken on that subject. No such plan was ever agreed upon by the Government.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK accepted the explanation, such as it was, though it only left matters in greater doubt and obscurity than before. It would have come with greater force if the right hon. Gentleman had stated what the proposition entertained by the Government at one time in regard to Cyprus actually was. To come back to Cyprus itself—and, if he was not mistaken, they would come back to Cyprus very often within the next few years—if it was to be used for the concentration of troops from all parts of our Dominions, where were those troops to be landed, and for what purpose? He maintained, and always would maintain, that if the object of the Government was to lengthen the chain of their Mediterranean positions, so as to strengthen themselves in the Levant, in view of certain military contingencies which might arise, a more generous and more liberal way of attaining it, and one more in accordance with the policy of this country during the past 20 years, would have been to have used their influence in the Congress at Berlin to obtain the transfer of the Island of Crete to Greece, to which it properly belonged, and to which it must eventually go—

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out to the hon. and gallant Member that he was speaking somewhat wide of the Question, which was that a sum not exceeding £2,000,000 be granted to Her Majesty.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK: Quite so. It was to that Question that he was addressing himself. If, he repeated, the object of the Government had been to obtain some equivalent for the expenditure now incurred—if their object had been to strengthen themselves in the Mediterranean, they might have secured, by negotiation or purchase, or other legitimate means, a position in the Peninsula of Suda, in the Northern part of the Island of Crete, and also possession of some point further east on the Syrian coast, or elsewhere. They would thus have established themselves east and west in the Mediterranean on a line of unassailable and self-supporting fortresses, without any of the responsibilities attaching to Cyprus. Now, he yielded to no man in that House or the country—and he thought he might say so without egotism, and without being called upon to produce proofs of it—in his desire to uphold, in its strongest and most developed form, the honour and integrity of our Empire, militarily and politically; but he maintained that the Government had not only committed a great blunder in the policy they had pursued, but that they had done what was calculated to frustrate their own views in every possible manner.

ADMIRAL SIR WILLIAM EDMONSTONE rose to Order. He submitted that the hon. and gallant Member was travelling beyond the Question.

The CHAIRMAN said, he had more than once pointed out to the hon. and gallant Member that his observations were of a somewhat discursive character, and not immediately connected with the Question before the Committee, which was that of raising Supply.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, that was exactly the Question he proposed to discuss, and he was not to be deterred from dealing with it by observations from the hon. and gallant Member opposite, of which, he must say, he did not see the point. He was not surprised that the hon. and gallant Gentleman disagreed with him. He was not aware the hon. and gallant Gentleman had ever shown that he had given the subject much study or thought. The mode by which the Government proposed to obtain an equivalent for this money was not only the question now, but would be the question for years and years to come, and he maintained that that mode was a futile one, and of all modes the least calculated to secure the object they had in view. For what had they done? They had imposed, as they believed, a check upon the advance of Russia in Asia Minor. But the effect of that was merely to warn Russia off a line on which, by no possible combination of circumstances, could she do us the slightest harm, and to make her concentrate her attention on two other lines to India still open to her—lines from which we were entirely shut out. Hence his contention that the offensive challenge thrown out by the Government to Russia would only tend to frustrate the policy they wished to carry out. And this was to be the outcome of an expenditure which, great at present, would be immeasurable in the future. Very different would have been the results if they had taken the course indicated by himself and others, in the first instance, in respect to Turkey. They would have placed the British Empire relatively in a much stronger financial position than it now occupied, and they would have gained the support of a united country. That was what the Government might have done in the month of December, 1876, and again in the month of January of the following year; and when hon. Gentlemen opposite had had time to reflect upon the consequences, financial and otherwise, which they had entailed upon the country by having departed from their policy; when the sound of this flourish of trumpets had died away; and when they had to go, day by day, and week by week, and month by month, through the painful process of paying the bill, he trusted that it might teach them a little moderation, and that they would not be so ready to cast imputations upon those who happened to differ from themselves in political opinion, but that they would have the generosity to acknowledge that they also had been actuated by a spirit of equal political wisdom and patriotism with themselves.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the said Commissioners may raise such sum by Exchequer Bonds, Exchequer Bills, or Treasury Bills, or by either, or by all of such modes."

Resolution *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the principal of all Exchequer Bonds which may be so issued shall be paid off at par, at the expiration of any period not exceeding three years from the date of such Bonds."

Mr. E. JENKINS called attention to the fact that his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock) had risen to address the Committee, when he was stopped. He (Mr. Jenkins) wished to get some information from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and as he was not in his place, he begged to move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. E. Jenkins.*)

The CHAIRMAN desired to point out that no hon. Member rose to address the Committee, and he therefore put the Question.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK remarked, that though he was prepared to bow to the decision of the Chair, he certainly conceived that he was in possession of the House; and he could not but think that the proceeding by which he had been cut short was not entirely in accordance with usage.

The CHAIRMAN said, the hon. and gallant Baronet had entirely misconceived the circumstances. He called upon another hon. Member to continue the debate; and that hon. Member subsequently not rising, and there being no one in possession of the House, it was his duty to put the Resolution, which he did.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK begged to point out that he had not concluded his observations, nor had he any intention of doing so.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON rose to Order. This was an attack by the hon. and gallant Member on a decision of the Chair. The Chair had decided that the hon. and gallant Member had concluded his remarks, and the Chairman had stated that he called on another hon. Member to continue the discussion. In the circumstances, he must appeal to the Committee to support the Chairman against the direct attack which the hon. and gallant Member had made upon the Chair.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK thought it must be entirely a matter of opinion as to whether he had concluded his remarks or not. Surely, on that point, he was himself the best judge?

Mr. GREGORY said, he was sitting next to the hon. and gallant Member for Hereford (Colonel Arbuthnot). The Chairman certainly called on that hon. and gallant Gentleman, and then left the Chair. The hon. and gallant Member for Hereford was in possession of the House, and clearly he could not have been called upon unless the hon. and gallant Member had sat down. He might add that he distinctly saw the hon. and gallant Member for Sunderland resume his seat.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he was listening with great attention to the remarks of the hon. and gallant Member (Sir Henry Havelock), and he must say that he was under the impression that he had finished his observations; but he wished to point out to his hon. and gallant Friend that he was by no means precluded from making any observation he thought fit at a subsequent stage, or indeed on the Resolution now before the Committee.

Colonel ARBUTHNOT said, he should not have attempted to rise had he not been under the conviction that the hon. and gallant Member had concluded his remarks. The remarks which he had himself intended to offer would have been of so short and comparatively so unimportant a character, that he did not think it worth while to trouble the Committee with them.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, he had no intention of sitting down when the Chairman went out. He had only turned round to look for his notes. He would postpone his further remarks until another stage.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That the interest of all such Exchequer Bonds shall be paid half-yearly, and shall be charged upon and issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof."

Mr. E. JENKINS said, he did not think that these Resolutions ought to be allowed to pass until some answer had been given to the question which had been put on his side of the House, and which had been treated with perfect silence by Gentlemen on the front Bench opposite. That question was, whether the Anglo-Turkish Convention was a real Convention or a sham? From what had taken place that night, it would appear to be a sham. He thought it must be plain, from the manner in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had brought forward the Supplementary Budget, that it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to do anything real in relation to that Convention. They were entitled to ask whether that was so or not? As the Budget stood, they had every reason to hope that they were not going to do anything. There was no proposal to increase the means of information respecting the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey; they were to have no more Consuls. If that was the case, surely hon. Gentlemen opposite would have their eyes opened to the true nature of the transaction which had been entered into secretly by the Government, and which had cost the country some £6,000,000 odd?

Mr. GREGORY thought it was very unreasonable on the part of the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) to expect the Government to bring in a Supplementary Budget for the administration of Asiatic Turkey. What the Government had done was to enter into a Convention with Turkey, in which the latter guaranteed that she would introduce certain reforms into Asia Minor, and it was only fair to wait to see whether those reforms were executed. It was not necessary for this purpose that the Government should inaugurate a system of espionage throughout the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey. All they had to do was to lay down a certain scheme of reforms for the Turkish Government, and to see that it, or something like it, was put into execution within a reasonable period.

Mr. J. COWEN said, his hon. Friend the Member for Dundee was somewhat difficult to please. He complained of this Convention with Turkey, the ground of his argument being that it was an objectionable instrument, which would lead this country to a great expense.

Mr. E. JENKINS wished to explain that his hon. Friend had misunderstood him. What he pointed out was that the Convention was either a sham or it was not. If it were a sham, the Government would not do anything under it; and if it were not a sham, the Government ought to have brought forward some proposals for carrying it into effect.

Mr. J. COWEN said, that if the Convention did not incur any responsibility it ought to be a source of satisfaction to his hon. Friend. If it did incur expense, it would a source of dissatisfaction to him. As he (Mr. J. Cowen) understood it, the proposition of Her Majesty's Government was that certain reforms were to be instituted in Asia Minor. Those reforms could not be carried into effect in a month, nor even in a year. Information must be obtained, and upon that information action must be taken. The Convention had not been very long concluded, and it was unreasonable to expect that any Government should be in a position to come to the House at that time and put on the Table an elaborate scheme for the reform of the Turkish Provinces in Asia. A proposal had been submitted for defraying the expense of the proceedings which the Government had already undertaken, and when the scheme for the complete reformation of Turkey was before the House, he had no doubt that they would have from the Government an exposition that would meet the requirement of his hon. Friend. Meanwhile, it was unreasonable to find fault with any Administration, because it was not able at once to submit complete proposals.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am sorry to say I was not in the House at the time when the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) was speaking; but I suppose I am rightly informed as to what he said by the observations of the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen). I understand him to say — "Either this is a real Convention or a sham; but if real, that it ought to be immediately followed up by some considerable proposals on the part of the Government." I venture to say, in the first place, that the Convention is a very real Convention, and that it was adopted with the substantial intention of Her Majesty's Government to give, in a serious and solemn manner, effect, as far as they can do so, to the proposals of that Convention. No doubt we have taken a very serious liability by undertaking that we shall defend Turkey against the invasion of Russia. In order to enable us to perform that, we require to be put in a position which may give us advantages in the event of our being called upon to act in a military manner. Although I cannot give any opinion of my own, we have been advised that the Island of Cyprus will afford very considerable advantages for concentrating and massing troops if necessary, and for retaining a position which will be of strategical value in the event of going to war. But we have other objects, and to me those objects are even of greater importance than the strategical value of Cyprus. We have agreed that the Sultan shall undertake to introduce into his Asiatic Provinces reforms which shall be agreed upon between him and ourselves, and we have, as we think, a considerable vantage ground in the possession, or rather in the occupation, of Cyprus, for seeing that such reforms as may be agreed upon shall be carried out. And I may also point out that this position gives us great advantages in illustrating the reforms that we ourselves shall wish to see effected. You may go into a country like Turkey, and say such and such reforms shall be made; but if you are able to point to territory in your own occupation where you are actually carrying out those same reforms, no doubt they would be more readily adopted in view of the improved condition of the country in which they had been introduced. The hon. Member said — "If these are your views, why don't you come forward with some large scheme to give effect to them?" We cannot evolve these schemes from our internal consciousness. The first thing we have to do is to satisfy ourselves with the actual requirements of Cyprus itself, and the expenses necessary to be incurred. All that will take time. And hon. Gentlemen will see at once that it is not a matter that one can settle by sitting down and considering it alone. You must have proper inquiry made. That is what we are making; and the small sum of £8,000 which we are asking on account for Cyprus will be applicable to charges of that sort. With regard to the Military Service, the Secretary of State for War has made what he considers to be a sufficient provision for the occupation of the Island. It is not thought necessary to retain anything like a large Force in the Island; and as soon as it is convenient and proper to do so, the bulk of the Indian troops will be sent back to India, and but a comparatively small Force will garrison the Island, except when there may be occasion to retain a larger Force for operations which are not now contemplated. We believe we have made an adequate provision for the remainder of the year, and, indeed, doubt very much whether it will be possible to spend as much as the £8,000 in the particular objects we have in view. As far as the future is concerned, we shall be in possession of further information before we ask for another grant, by which time, I have no doubt, we shall be able to come forward with some reasonable proposal. To put down on paper something evolved from our own internal consciousness would, at the present moment, only have the effect of deluding the House. We certainly possess a good deal of information concerning Cyprus; but we have not that information in a shape which enables us to put it into the form of an exact Estimate.

MR. WHITWELL said, the right hon. Gentleman was beginning to vote money on account of this new acquisition of Cyprus. He (Mr. Whitwell) thought fresh and important questions were raised by the Vote. In the first place, it was decidedly a scandalous thing that we should enter into a Convention with Turkey, undertaking to defend her against attack. But Cyprus had been conceded to us, and we might look upon it as a *quid pro quo* for the services we had undertaken to perform. ["No, no!"] They had, at any rate, acquired Cyprus, and were going to spend money upon it; and it was perfectly clear that something had been given to us in exchange for something to be done, which constituted exactly a *quid pro quo* in his view. The right hon. Gentleman had told them most plainly that in obtaining that place they had obtained it without any knowledge of its character, inasmuch as they had now undertaken to inquire into its resources, character, conditions, and details. He trusted that the £8,000 about to be voted would be sufficient for that purpose. But he ventured to ask whether it was really the case that we had already appointed a Governor, with a salary of £5,000 a-year? Every morning they saw in the newspapers reports of gentlemen being appointed to become Superintendents in the Island, and have the control of certain Departments—one being appointed to the Customs, another to a different branch of the Service. He thought he was right in saying that the system of government about to be established in Cyprus was a joint system of government by three Departments of the State. If he was wrong, it was only through want of information; and if the Foreign Office, the War Office, and the Colonial Office had nothing to do with it, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be kind enough to inform the Committee under what Department the Island was to be placed? The right hon. Gentleman spoke of it as a strategical point of occupation. He (Mr. Whitwell) asked him, in that case, whether the establishment of military depôts and fortifications were not absolutely necessary as a consequence of our adopting a strategical point of occupation? Surely, the Surveyor General of the Ordnance or War Department would have something to do in the mounting of guns in the Island? The garrison might be only 2,000 men; but the Island would be visited by ships of war that must be communicated with, and already £6,000 was put down for the establishment of telegraphic communication. It was, therefore, perfectly clear that £8,000 was a very small sum to be voted before the end of the financial year for the administration of Cyprus. If he, and hon. Members who were of the same opinion as himself, were wrong, it was entirely owing to the want of information. He was obliged to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, when they came to the voting of money, it should be for some impalpable object? The British taxpayer had a right to have a real statement of the grounds upon which he was called upon to pay money. He quite admitted the great importance of the second point referred to by the right hon. Gentleman —namely, the influence of this Empire upon the Turkish nation. But he very much regretted that we had been the first to exact territory from the Turks in their Asiatic Provinces. He thought that a most important question. The noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon) had told them, in a manner which was poetical and charming, his prospects and hopes of the great benefits which would follow our interference in the Asiatic territories of the Porte. But he ventured to doubt that our advice would be influential, notwithstanding our position in the neighbourhood of Asia Minor. Did the right hon. Gentleman expect to change the state of things existing in Turkey in Asia by the mere circumstance of having a Settlement near the coast? He did not see how the categorical question of his hon. Friend below him (Mr. E. Jenkins) could be answered; but, before going back to their constituents, hon. Members should be provided with some further information, which he trusted would be supplied before the discussion terminated.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, we had certainly assumed an onerous responsibility in undertaking to guarantee the Turkish Dominion in Asia against Russia, and for that purpose it was necessary that we should have some position in that portion of the Mediterranean nearest to Turkish territory. He had always regretted that we had given up the Ionian Islands, for in doing so he believed we had made a great mistake. As it was necessary to have some such position, they had fixed upon Cyprus as the best for the purpose of carrying out the Guarantee to Turkey. We had, therefore, occupied the Island, which would now become a good model for the Turks in the administration of their own affairs. We might, as he believed, in a short time, by good management, make Cyprus a rich and happy country, as well as a model country for that part of the world. We should have the right to say to the Turks—"See what we have done in Cyprus; do the same in your Dominions." It had been assumed that we had undertaken to govern the Eastern Possessions of Turkey; but we had undertaken nothing of the sort. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had complained that Her Majesty's Government had not laid before the House a full plan for the reforms to be made in the government of the Turkish Dominions in Asia. It was impossible for Her Majesty's Government or the Opposition either to do anything of the sort. We had not undertaken to prepare a plan; but we had told the Porte that it must govern those Provinces in such a manner as to insure their improvement. That was all they had undertaken. He had had a conversation a few days ago with Hobart Pasha, an old friend of his, who had told him that "the Turks were people who can be led, but could not be driven; and that if you tried to force them you could do nothing with them." He said, moreover, that "they were very reasonable people, and that the Sultan was not a sensualist, as was often supposed, nor a bigot; but a sensible man, who sees the necessities of the times." From all he could learn, he (Sir George Bowyer) believed the Sultan to be a very intelligent man.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. and learned Member for Wexford is travelling a little beyond the Question before the Committee.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER stood corrected; although, at the same time, he thought that what he had said had a fair application to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman opposite, which he was not called upon to withdraw. He said we were undertaking to govern without producing a plan for the government of the Turkish Provinces.

Mr. E. JENKINS had said nothing of the kind.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER had certainly understood the hon. Gentleman to speak in that sense, and in answer thereto, he had said that we had not undertaken to govern those Provinces; that they were to be governed by the

Porte; but we had every reason to believe that the Porte would govern them in accordance with the undertaking which the British Government had given. He believed that we had only undertaken to prescribe what ought to be done in a general way, leaving to the Porte to carry out the system which might be found to be necessary; and that the experiment would prove to be thoroughly successful.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK said, that, for his part, he regarded the explanation which they had succeeded in obtaining from the Chancellor of the Exchequer as throwing considerable light upon the question. For instance, they had been told that great advantages were anticipated from the good example we should set the Turks, by our mode of governing the Island of Cyprus. He would like the Chancellor of the Exchequer to tell him what would be the difference between the example of good government which we had established for so many years in Malta, and that proposed to be set up in the Island of Cyprus? The position of Malta was totally different in every way from that of Cyprus; and, for that reason, he differed from the policy which Her Majesty's Government had adopted. Malta was a strategical point; Cyprus was not a strategical point. Malta was self-contained, and when it had been provisioned and garrisoned it could be left to itself for six months; but Cyprus was in no such position. It was an Island of about 140 miles in length, and 60 in breadth; and it was not at all improbable that in the event of competition between England and Russia, or any Mediterranean Power, which was quite possible, their whole military and naval efforts would have to be directed to the safety of Cyprus alone; for which reason it was totally valueless, and not to be compared with a point on the Asiatic coast, which might be made a complete fortress in itself. He had gathered a great deal of comfort from what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been kind enough to express. What the English people desired to know was what was the nature of that great policy of reform in Asia? Did it mean anything or nothing? If we were to carry it on in opposition to the objections that might be raised to it, we should be unnecessarily straining our relations with the Porte, or else the policy was a mere sham, for no money had been taken for the purposes that were to be carried out. He believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer had himself told them that the three points on which it was intended that the reforms in Turkey should turn were the administration of police, the purification of justice, and the rectification of the revenue. If these matters were left to the Turks they would end in failure; if we attended to them ourselves they would entail great expense. Her Majesty's Government had told them that they were going to undertake the reform of Turkey, and he yielded to no man in the desire that Turkey should be thoroughly reformed. But he gathered from the explanation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that they did not propose either then, next year, or at any future time, that the policy which had been adopted without, at all events, asking leave of the English people, should not become a charge upon them. He should be very glad to hold the Government to the promise that this great policy was not to be carried out at the expense of the ratepayers. That promise had been given definitely, and he was perfectly satisfied.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he quite understood the considerations which had induced Her Majesty's Government to enter into the Convention of Constantinople, whereby the occupation of Cyprus had been ceded to this country. He did not conceal from himself the weight of the liabilities that Convention might entail on this country; but two considerations had principally decided the vote he gave on Friday against the Resolutions proposed by the noble Lord the Member for the Radnor Boroughs. He considered the occupation of Cyprus desirable—first, because the Russian Armies had not yet been withdrawn from the vicinity of Constantinople; and, secondly, on account of the fact that the Port of Batoum had been acquired by Russia, not by conquest, but by cession on the part of the Turkish Government. The possession of the Port of Batoum by Russia might, and probably would, enable her to command, under certain circumstances, the Eastern outlet of the Straits—the mouth of the Bosphorus in the Black Sea. He therefore thought it of great importance to the interests and influence of this country to have some station nearer the Dardanelles than Malta, for he had always considered the wholesale abandonment of the Ionian Islands by this country a very questionable measure, so far as it affected her influence and interests in the East; and he felt this without the slightest jealousy of the Kingdom of Greece, at the establishment of which he rejoiced; but, so far as the interests of England were concerned, he was distinctly of opinion that the cession of Batoum to Russia, and the command Russia thereby obtained of the Eastern outlet from the Bosphorus, rendered it highly important that England should have some naval station within easy distance of the entrance to the Dardanelles, without incurring the inconveniences that had always attended our naval occupation of the Sea of Marmora.

Mr. MUNTZ agreed, in one respect, with his hon. Friend, and that was as to the expediency of giving up the Island of Corfu. He had come late into the House, and did not understand the object of that discussion. He thought they had had it all last week, and he had had enough of it, although he had no opportunity of expressing his views. The House had talked the matter out, and ought to be satisfied without going any further. He understood the discussion now touched on the Island of Cyprus, and the money to be expended upon it. He thought that had been disposed of by last week's discussion. The House had determined, by an immense majority, in favour of the Asiatic policy of the Government. The House had decided it, and he did not see any use in opening the question again. The Government had undertaken great responsibility, and it was for them to carry out that responsibility. It was for them to carry out their undertaking, both as to the Asiatic Convention and the acquisition of the Island of Cyprus. He could not agree with the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Newdegate), that the Island of Cyprus was a good position for the defence of the Straits. It might be of great service to point out to the inhabitants of Cyprus and the Asiatic Continent how a nation could benefit by being well governed. [Major O'Gorman: By England?] No place had benefited more by the good government of England than the place the hon. and gallant Gentleman came from. [Major O'Gorman: It is not true.] The Government had undertaken to regenerate, not only Asia Minor, but Syria. He had had great pleasure in listening to the romantic remarks of the noble Lord the Member for Liverpool (Viscount Sandon), when he spoke of the regeneration of Asia Minor. But these were dreams. It would be for the Government to press what influence they had upon Turkey, if it was possible to have any influence on a body of men who were accustomed to be governed in a particular way. It would be almost impossible to get good government, unless they took the French course of landing troops and hanging a tyrannical Pasha. That would be expensive; but it would be the only way to regenerate Turkey. It came to this—that you would have to resuscitate a corpse. You might galvanize it, and give it a living expression for a moment; but the instant the battery was taken away, your corpse would return to its original position. He did not think it was possible to reform Turkey without re-organizing it altogether, and that was a task so gigantic that he could not imagine any man should wish it to be carried out, or any Government dare to attempt it. As, however, the House had endorsed the Treaty of Constantinople, the responsibility rested with the Government, and it would be for them during the Recess to show their hands as to the practicability of the promised reforms.

Mr. E. JENKINS could only point out to the hon. Member, that if he had been in the House he would have understood what the question was. He must ask what the Government were going to give the people of this country for their money? The occupation of Cyprus was all they got for their £6,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had satisfied them thus far. The Government had come down and asked for a Supplementary Budget, and yet no provision whatever was made for any serious action in Asiatic Turkey. The right hon. Gentleman virtually said that the Government intended to do nothing in Asiatic Turkey except to exert a moral influence on the subjects of the Sultan. If he did not say that, he must mean that the Government were going to undertake something more. They must have an organization in view. If that was the case, they had not treated the House fairly, by not giving an idea of the organization. They had not informed the House of anything that would be necessary for carrying that organization out. He, therefore, accepted the right hon. Gentleman's assurance that all this was simply a Convention on the part of the Sultan which we did not mean to enforce, and that would have no result. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I entirely disclaim that interpretation.] Then this discussion was justified. Let them know what the Government was going to do. They had asked the House to postpone inquiry till next year. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had, however, shown that they meant to spend the money. Surely, the House ought to know for what purpose it was wanted, or they ought not to have voted the money.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he had taken part in the great debate, and he should not now pursue a discussion on a subject which he thought received sufficient consideration last week. In the quarter of an hour he then occupied he ventured to express not only his own dissatisfaction, but that of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who were mute as if they were at a funeral. The question they were now discussing was a question of money. When the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) was addressing the House——

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I must rise to Order. I do not think it is in Order to refer to a previous debate.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he would accept the intervention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and would confine himself to the question. He would suggest to the Government that they should appeal to the country before the humbug of this Cyprus business became appreciated, and before the glamour of the last fortnight should be dissipated.

MR. HOPWOOD would not only support the proposed inquiry, but would press for further inquiry as regarded the intentions of the Government in Cyprus. Of course, the Government had some idea of what was to be done in Cyprus besides sending troops. Looking at the terms of the Convention, he found it was contemplated that land might be purchased compulsorily at a fair price. Did the Government mean to purchase land? It appeared that Sir Garnet Wolseley had some difficulty in finding a house. Did the Government mean to purchase a considerable estate for the purpose of Government buildings for providing the Staff, and so on? Then, he understood the sanitary condition of the Island was very bad. Surely, the first course the Government would take would be in the direction of preserving the health of the troops? A great deal more than £30,000 or £40,000 would be required for these purposes. Did the Government mean to say that they were not going to apply themselves to this matter? Surely the Government could give reasonable information, and might tell the House whether they were in a position to tell the probable cost of these things, and the extent to which they wished to go?

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that two or three hours ago he had said the same thing as the hon. Members had just said in a better manner. He was astonished to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that they should not be able to spend the sum taken in the Estimates for Cyprus in the coming year. He trusted, when the matter was further considered, there would be fuller information given as to the course to be taken in regard to the administration of Cyprus.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

## SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

## ARMY—ALLOWANCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE RESERVES.

### RESOLUTION.

MAJOR NOLAN, in rising to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the present allowance of 6*d*. per diem for each wife and 2*d*. for each child of the Reserve men should be increased in those cases in which the calling out of the Reserve men has left their families with inadequate means of support;"

said, he would acknowledge that the question had lost much of its interest for the House and the country, the Reserves having now been disembodied. But we had now placed ourselves in competition with the other great military Powers of Europe, and we must do as other military Powers did—we must look to our Reserves—we must see to their sufficiency in point of numbers, to their efficiency when called upon, and that they should be available when needed. He did not say that our Reserves must be better in hand, because they had done well—they had answered the call made upon them with rapidity, which was the first requisite in regard to such a Force. But, under our system of voluntary enlistment, it would be impossible to increase their number unless the men were fairly treated. The allowance made to the families of the Reserve men when the Force was called out was 6*d.* a-day for the wife and 2*d.* for each child—an amount which was totally insufficient. The wife and family of the soldier in India received as much money as was now given to the Reserve men's wives and families at home, and they obtained rations and quarters in addition. When a Reserve man joined the colours was not the time when he could save money for his wife and children. He then came in contact with his comrades; he had expenses to meet in connection with his clothing and other matters; and, as a rule, he could not be expected to send much money home to his family. The former Secretary of State for War had stated that the Reserve man would be able to save money from his pay, when called out on service, which would be sufficient, in addition to the regular allowance, for the support of his family. But he (Major Nolan) maintained that the utmost he could save from his pay was 3*d.* a-day—which, added to the 6*d.*, made 9*d.* a-day—to which was to be added the 2*d.* for each child, a sum that was totally inadequate for the maintenance of the families of the men. As for the men, they all corroborated him in that view. Soldiers who married with leave were always sufficiently supported, and that ought to be the case with the men of the Reserves, who might be said to be in a precisely similar position. He would call attention to the subject next Session, and hoped, in the meanwhile, that it would receive the attention of the Government.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the present allowance of 6*d.* per diem for each wife and 2*d.* for each child of the Reserve men should be increased in those cases in which the calling out of the Reserve men has left their families with inadequate means of support,"—(*Major Nolan*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

### PARLIAMENT — ORDER — DISORDERLY CONDUCT OF A MEMBER.

Colonel STANLEY, who on rising was interrupted by Major O'Gorman with a loud cry of "Hear, hear!" said, it would hardly be necessary for him to take up the time of the House with any long statement, for, as a matter of fact, the Reserve Forces had been sent home, and their allowances were things of the past. [Major O'Gorman: Hear, hear! *and cries of* "Order!"] The question was one which must be dealt with not as a matter of kindly feeling towards the wives and families of the Reserve men, but as a matter of duty, and in accordance with the actual facts as they stood. [Major O'Gorman: Hear, hear!] The Government were bound to exercise their functions as ministers of the fund placed at their disposal by Parliament; and, however agreeable it might be to place the families of the men of the Reserves in a position of affluence, that was not the object with which they ought to approach the subject.

Major O'GORMAN again exclaimed "Hear, hear!" in a loud tone.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! order!

Major O'GORMAN: Hear, hear!

Colonel STANLEY proceeded. They had to consider the absolute requirements of the case. In the first place, he need scarcely point out that when the men entered into their engagements they knew perfectly well what their liabilities and emoluments were to be, and in the next place, as far as he could judge, the amount of actual destitution had been comparatively small, and had been, in most cases, traceable to causes for which the Government were not altogether responsible. His right hon. Friend had been good enough to desire a circular to be addressed to the local authorities inquiring what cases of destitution had been heard of in each neighbourhood; and till the facts of the case were proved, he could not admit the reality of the alleged widespread destitution. [Major O'GORMAN: Hear, hear!] With very few exceptions, the letters that had been addressed to him contained no complaints of the insufficiency of the allowances. He might remind the House that in addition to the allowances made the Government had thought themselves at liberty to interpret the regulations in respect of school fees so as to place the children of Reserve men on the same footing as the children of men actually serving with the colours—that was to say, the school fees were paid for them. This was a great assistance to the family. He did not deny that there might be cases of hardship——

MAJOR O'GORMAN (in a loud tone): Hear, hear! ["Order, order!" "Chair, chair!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War is addressing the House, and is entitled to proceed without interruption. I must call upon the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford to desist from these interruptions.

MAJOR O'GORMAN: I am not interrupting; I insist I am not interrupting. I am entitled to call "Hear, hear!" [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Chair!"] I have not interrupted; I insist I have not. I am entitled to call "Hear, hear!"

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: It is impossible that interruptions of this kind can be allowed. It is quite impossible that this House can submit to hear the ruling of the Speaker from the Chair disregarded. The hon. and gallant Member has been twice called to Order, and, instead of preserving Order, he repeats the expressions which drew Mr. Speaker's interference. The House cannot submit to hear Mr. Speaker challenged. The hon. and gallant Member, no doubt, had no intention to do anything disorderly; but he must feel it his duty to desist.

MAJOR O'GORMAN: I am not disorderly. I deny it. I have a right to call "Hear, hear!" whenever and as often as I please.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The hon. and gallant Gentleman, I am willing to believe, has no intention of doing anything that would not be in Order; but Mr. Speaker having been appealed to, and having called upon the hon. and gallant Gentleman to desist from interrupting——

MAJOR O'GORMAN: I am not out of Order. I deny it. I am not interrupting. I have a right to call "Hear, hear!" after every sentence, after every comma, after every semi-colon, if I think proper, and I mean to exercise it.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The House cannot submit to have the ruling of the Speaker set at defiance by interruptions of this kind. The hon. and gallant Gentleman probably has no intention of doing anything disorderly; but he must feel that, having been called to Order, he cannot be permitted to continue these interruptions.

MAJOR O'GORMAN: I am not interrupting. I deny it. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Chair!"]

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN: I am sure, Sir, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman never meant to dispute your ruling. It is only a matter of not understanding what your ruling was. He was under the impression that he was quite in Order in doing as he did; but, as I gather from your decision, Sir, he was not in Order, I am sure he will feel that he ought not to continue in that course.

MAJOR O'GORMAN (in a loud and excited tone): I have a right to cheer, and I intend to do it. ["Order!"]

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: This is a state of things which the House cannot permit to continue. [*Cheers.*] I am not quite sure what is the precedent that we ought to follow—[Major O'GORMAN: Hear!]—for, happily, such conduct is not of a character very common; but I apprehend that it will be necessary, unless the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Waterford apologizes to the Chair for disputing your ruling, that the House should proceed to pass some Resolution on his conduct. I think, Sir, I am in Order in suggesting that you, Sir, should call upon the hon. and gallant Member to apologize and to submit himself to the ruling of the Chair; and if that be not done I shall feel it my duty to submit a Motion to the House upon his conduct.

MAJOR O'GORMAN: I will not apologize.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put it to the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford, that he owes it to the House to make some apology for the interruption he has persisted in carrying on. I must call upon him at once to make such apology as is due to the House.

Major O'GORMAN: I refuse to do it. I have done nothing but what is perfectly usual in this House. I have a right to cheer, if I think proper, or to cry "Oh, oh!" at every comma, at every colon, at every semi-colon—spoken in the language in this House. I am entitled to do that by every rule of the House, by every precedent of the House. I have done nothing wrong. If I did do anything wrong, I am an Irish gentleman, and know how to apologize for it; but I have done nothing wrong, and will not apologize.

Mr. BULWER: I do not think the hon. and gallant Gentleman quite appreciates the position. No Member of the House would object to the hon. and gallant Member cheering in accordance with the rules and customs of the House; but I would point out to the hon. and gallant Member that that is not the question. You, Sir, have called upon the hon. and gallant Member to desist from pursuing a certain line of conduct; and the hon. and gallant Member refuses to desist. The point is that he has been called to Order by the Speaker. Although the hon. and gallant Member may think that he is not exceeding his privilege, yet now that his attention has been directed to the matter from the Chair, I am sure the hon. and gallant Member is too good a soldier to refuse to submit to discipline.

Major O'GORMAN: The Speaker has not called me to Order. He has done nothing of the sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: After what has passed I have no other alternative left to me but to name the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford for the line of conduct he has pursued this evening; and I now name you, Major O'Gorman, for having interrupted the proceedings of this House by disorderly conduct, and for having refused, when called upon by the Chair, to submit yourself to the judgment of the House.

Major O'GORMAN: Hear, hear!

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: As you, Sir, have felt it necessary to exercise what is always held to be a solemn duty—[Major O'Gorman: Pshaw!]—by naming the hon. and gallant Member, I feel it my duty to move that the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford, for his disorderly interruption and disrespectful conduct to yourself, be directed to withdraw.

Mr. LOWE: I second the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Major O'Gorman for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair be directed to withdraw."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER: I have not the advantage of knowing all the circumstances which have given rise to this painful incident. I understand the circumstances partially, but not the whole of the circumstances, which have made it the painful duty of the Leader of the House to move the Resolution just read from the Chair; but, so far as I understand the circumstances, there was no other course open to the right hon. Gentleman than the one he has adopted. But, before a Motion of the kind proposed is put, one is naturally anxious to know to what it is likely to lead. I would like to know what further step is likely to result from this proceeding before I give my assent to the Motion? I do not make this remark in any hypercritical spirit. I think it would be of assistance to hon. Members in deciding what course they should take if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would indicate what he intends to do supposing he carries his Motion?

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN: Sir, within my memory there is one Member of this House whom I can recall as being named—Mr. Charles Gavan Duffy, the Member for New Ross—and he was named by Mr. John Ball. But upon his being named there was no possible mistake as to the reasons for such nomination. May I venture to say that there seems to me to be a misapprehension in this case? I believe my hon. and gallant Friend is under a gross misapprehension. He is under an impression which is neither justified by the Rules of the House or of any deliberative Assembly; but he has a strange idea that he has a right to use certain phrases to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman when he was addressing the House. [Major O'Gorman: No, no!]

As it occurs to me, the hon. and gallant Member is grossly in error. The mistake he has committed is this—that after he has been called to Order by you, Sir, who preside over this House, he has not felt it his duty—no matter what may be his own private views—to submit to you as the person empowered to guide and influence the House. I am certain, however, that if the Speaker will permit the hon. and gallant Member now to apologize, the Chancellor of the Exchequer will withdraw the Motion, which it must have been a great pain to him to propose to the House.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) asks what is the course I propose next to take? I believe that on an occasion of this sort the proper course would be, the hon. and gallant Member having withdrawn, for the House to consider what course should be taken. That is a matter entirely for the judgment of the House. Probably some expression of opinion on the part of the House would be asked for upon the conduct of the hon. and gallant Gentleman; and, of course, it would not be right that should be done in the presence of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. I am quite certain that the House, even now, if the hon. and gallant Gentleman is willing to say that he apologizes to the House, and expresses his regret that he was out of Order, will permit this painful scene to come to a conclusion. But unless that is done, it is really necessary that the hon. and gallant Gentleman should withdraw in order that we should consider the course we should take.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK was understood to suggest that the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford was labouring under violent excitement arising from a personal matter, and that that offered some palliation though not excuse for his conduct.

[Major O'GORMAN had now left the House.]

DR. O'LEARY: I rise with a feeling of great embarrassment; but I know that the hon. and gallant Member is, and has been for the last three hours, labouring under deep excitement caused by the reception of communications of a personal nature, the character of which has very greatly excited him. If I were professionally asked the question, I should say that, under the present circumstances, he is not really accountable for his actions.

MR. STACPOOLE: I am sure the hon. and gallant Member, if he thinks carefully over this matter, will be the first person to offer an apology and explanation. Perhaps he is rather heated, and the House is perhaps a little excited by the occurrence. It is a very unusual thing that a Member should be "named," and a Speaker of this House once said, when he was asked what would be the consequence of such an event, "The Lord only knows." I would ask the House to consider the matter quietly and candidly, and therefore to let the question be adjourned till to-morrow. When he is a little more calm and collected, the hon. and gallant Member will see his position—and I beg, therefore, to move the adjournment of the debate.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL: As one who was present at the time when this unhappy occurrence arose, I may say, Sir, that the principal object in the mind of everyone is that your position should be sustained. The hon. and gallant Member seems to have done that which it would put the House to some difficulty to induce him to do—namely, to withdraw; and I hope that after the opinions that have been expressed, it will be held that the authority of the Chair and the dignity of the House have been sufficiently maintained. I therefore think that if the hon. and gallant Member is prepared to make a full and sufficient apology, it might be accepted, and he might be exempted from further consequences.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL thought that they might now be permitted to proceed with Business.

COLONEL STANLEY: As I happened to be the one who was speaking when you, Sir, called the hon. and gallant Member to Order, I should like to add a few words. I need hardly assure the House, or the Friends of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, that no one can regard his interruptions with a kinder feeling than I do. It is at any time a pleasure to receive a cheer from the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and whether in the precise nature of a cheer of approbation or not, I do not inquire. But you, Sir, saw in the interests of the

House that these cheers exceeded those which it is the ordinary function of a Member of this House to utter. I only venture now to make the humble suggestion that if the House be of opinion that its dignity and that of the Chair has been sufficiently vindicated, and if the hon. and gallant Member, on the Motion that he be ordered to withdraw, should submit himself to your ruling and apologize to the House for his conduct, this painful incident may be allowed to pass aside.

Mr. C. BECKETT-DENISON said, there was a distinct Motion before the House, which he apprehended would be carried *nemine contradicente.* But he would add one suggestion to what had fallen from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, and that was, that if there be any communication to be made to the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford, it should not be made to-night, after the explanations that have been given of his conduct, but that to-morrow should be given him as a *locus penitentiæ* wherein he may make a full submission to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER was about to put the Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when——

Mr. STACPOOLE reminded Mr. Speaker that he had moved the adjournment of the debate:—As that Motion had not been formally proposed——

Mr. SHEIL now moved that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. MELDON seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sheil.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I do not see how the House can, consistently with its own dignity, adjourn the debate on such a question. The Motion before the House is that the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford do withdraw; and I apprehend that that is a question which does not admit of adjournment. As soon as a decision has been arrived at on the latter question, it will then become the duty of someone—I shall take this duty upon myself—to make a proposal to the House. I do not wish to be out of Order by saying what I am going to do, but I think there is great force in the suggestion of the two hon. Members that this matter should not be proceeded with hastily to-night, but that opportunity should be given to the House to consider what course shall be taken; but the Motion before the House is one that ought to be decided at once.

Major NOLAN: All the Irish Members are anxious to sustain the authority of the Chair, and regret that it should have been disregarded by the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford. But I think the use of the words "disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour" makes the matter more serious than is absolutely necessary. It will be quite sufficient if the hon. and gallant Member is ordered to withdraw. If the Motion for the adjournment of the debate were withdrawn, I will move the omission of those words.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: How is it possible we can adjourn till to-morrow the Question whether the hon. and gallant Member be directed to withdraw? It is not common sense. The object of the House is to vindicate the authority of the Chair. Nobody wishes that the hon. and gallant Member should be hastily dealt with—the consideration of how he shall be dealt with is another matter. The only matter before the Committee at the moment is whether we shall vindicate the authority of the Chair, which has been called in question, and that we cannot adjourn till to-morrow.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: If what has been stated with respect to the condition of the hon. and gallant Member be the fact, it is clearly not only the best course for the House itself that this Motion should be adopted, but it is the most considerate course towards the hon. and gallant Member himself; for this will give him to-night to reflect upon what has occurred, and that, I trust, will produce a proper apology to you, Sir, to-morrow.

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH: I hope Irish Members will not persevere in the proposal to omit the words "disorderly and disrespectful." Hon. Members for Ireland have themselves admitted—as hon. Members who heard what took place cannot but admit—that by distinctly contradicting you, Sir, by disputing your ruling, and by refusing to apologize to the House, the conduct of the hon. and gallant Member was disrespectful and disorderly. It would be idle to pass any Resolution of this kind without taking distinct notice of why it is passed.

Mr. O'CLERY trusted that the word "disrespectful" would be omitted, for he was sure his hon. and gallant Friend was quite incapable of intentional disrespect to the Chair.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that as allusion had been made to the excitement under which his hon. and gallant Friend laboured, he wished to explain that that excitement was produced by a consideration, as he conceived it, of professional wrong. It was right that that should be known, lest it should be attributed to any other cause.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed,

"That Major O'Gorman for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair be directed to withdraw."

Major NOLAN: I now beg to propose, as an Amendment, to leave out the words "for disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour to the Chair," and to add at the end, "for disregarding the authority of the Chair." [An hon. Member: Is that disorderly or not?] I will not go into that now. I am very sorry for his conduct; but I should be sorry indeed if a record was entered on the Journals of this House against the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford for his whole lifetime; and I think, taking the explanation of my hon. Friend (Dr. O'Leary) into account, these words should be left out.

Dr. WARD seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out the words "for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair," and, at the end of the Question, to add the words "for disregarding the authority of the Chair."—(*Major Nolan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am quite sure the House always desires to act in a kindly spirit towards all its Members, and there is no Member of the House towards whom more kindly feelings are entertained than towards the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford. At the same time, I am bound to say—I do not wish to use strong language—but I think that the conduct of the hon. and gallant Member towards you, Sir—however it may be accounted for—was such that the House cannot possibly overlook. It is essential—it is our first duty—in cases of this kind, to support the authority of the Chair. That authority—and I appeal to all who were present at the time—was not exerted until after a considerable time had elapsed, and it was then exerted in the most considerate form. The hon. and gallant Member most distinctly, and with considerable emphasis, several times declared his intention of not submitting to the authority of the Chair, and his conduct was such that it is impossible to abstain from marking it with our disapprobation. Nobody can mistake the character of the interruption or of the vote which I propose shall be passed. I am quite sure, however, that the kindly feelings we all entertain towards the hon. and gallant Member will prevent us doing anything unnecessary or which would needlessly cause him pain; but it is a case in which I must ask the House to support me.

Mr. LOWE: It is not, Sir, with a view to cause pain to the hon. and gallant Member we are asked to vote for this Motion, but because it is absolutely necessary to carry on our Business with a due regard to order, and to maintain—what is most necessary to that end—the deference which is due, and which we are most happy to pay, to your ruling. As the matter stands, if the Amendment were carried, it would really amount to a ruling by this House that a refusal to obey an order of the Chair is not disrespectful. To the Amendment I hope the House will not agree. I think we shall take a moderate and wise course if we do that which is absolutely necessary to vindicate your authority, in which we are all as much interested as you, Sir, are yourself. If we do that, we can then suspend proceedings, and the hon. and gallant Member will then have an opportunity of making his submission to the House and to the Chair, and save us from the painful necessity of going further.

Lord ELCHO considered it essential that the Resolution should be carried unanimously. The question really amounted to this—whether the House was to remain an orderly Assembly, or to become a disorderly one? No one could doubt that the conduct of the hon. and gallant Member who had withdrawn was disorderly, and it had been so ruled. They could not, therefore, accept an Amendment which disputed that fact. There were two questions to be considered; one was how the hon. and gallant Member should be dealt with, the other was as to the character of the House itself. As to the latter, it appeared to him that the adoption of the Resolution of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was the only way in which they could deal with the conduct of the hon. and gallant Member consistently with the dignity of this House; but, after maintaining that dignity, they were prepared to accept his apology to-morrow. He hoped, therefore, that hon. Members for Ireland who were anxious to save their Friend, would withdraw their Amendment.

Mr. STACPOOLE: I hope my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Galway (Major Nolan) will withdraw his Amendment, and allow the House to come to an unanimous decision; and then I hope, to-morrow, my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Waterford will come down to the House and express regret for the course he has pursued.

Mr. MELDON: I should have been delighted if my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Waterford had been in a position to withdraw the expressions he made use of. I think your authority, and the dignity of the House, would have been vindicated if he had withdrawn them at the time. But I believe, from the excited state he has been in all this evening, that it is scarcely possible for him to consider the matter reasonably. I could have wished, therefore, that there should have been an adjournment of the debate, in order to give him an opportunity for reflection. That course, however, has not been adopted, and we now come to the Amendment of my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Galway. I would urge him not to press that Amendment in the interest of the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford himself, and I will tell him why. It is perfectly well known that the hon. and gallant Member is not responsible for the conduct he has pursued to-night. I hope the House will not now come to a deliberate opinion upon the conduct of the hon. and gallant Member, but will afford him the opportunity of an explanation, which I am fully persuaded will be perfectly satisfactory. The passing of a Resolution under these circumstances would be a more serious matter than merely passing a Resolution which would give a *locus penitentiæ* of which the hon. and gallant Member could avail himself.

Mr. A. MOORE: I certainly shall not deprecate any course of action which the Government or the House may think fit to adopt; but, knowing the excitable character of my hon. and gallant Friend, and knowing that when, on a previous occasion, he found himself in the wrong, he was anxious and willing to make an apology, I think the authority of the Chair would be amply vindicated if he were simply ordered to withdraw. I have seen the hon. and gallant Member a few minutes since, and he is so excited that he cannot bring calm reflection to bear on the question. I can hardly believe, Sir, that he could have intended to be disrespectful to you, so respectful is the usual tone of his mind. I, therefore, support the Amendment. I hope that the words branding him with ungentlemanlike conduct will be withdrawn.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: I do not think that the hon. and gallant Member for Galway has considered that the addition of the words he proposes will convey a stronger condemnation of the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford than the original Motion; and, therefore, in the interest of the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford himself, I hope that the hon. and gallant Member for Galway will not persevere with his Amendment.

Mr. P. J. SMYTH: I have just conferred with my hon. and gallant Friend outside the House, and he assures me he meant no disrespect to you, Sir. He assures me of that positively. Other Members have gone out to confer with him, and I hope the House will defer its decision. ["No, no!"] I do not think there is any Member of this House less capable of any act of disrespect towards this House or the Chair than my hon. and gallant Friend. I was not here at the time the words were spoken; but, whatever he may have said in a moment of excitement, I am sure he did not mean any disrespect to your authority. I do hope there will be no objection to allow him to come in and personally make his apology. ["No, no!"]

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put.

*Ordered,* That Major O'Gorman, for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair, be directed to withdraw.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I now desire to move that the conduct of Major O'Gorman towards the Chair be taken into consideration to-morrow, and that he be ordered to attend in his place to-morrow. I feel sure, as well from the character of the hon. and gallant Gentleman as from what has been said of him by his Friends, that when to-morrow comes, having had time to think over what has passed, he will give such an explanation or make such statement as shall entirely put an end to the matter.

Motion *agreed to.*

*Ordered,* That the conduct of Major O'Gorman towards the Chair be taken into consideration To-morrow.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*Ordered,* That Major O'Gorman do attend in his place To-morrow.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

The Entry of this discussion upon the Votes is as follows:—

Major O'Gorman, Member for Waterford, having frequently in a disorderly manner interrupted the Secretary of State for War, who was speaking in Debate, was called to order by Mr. Speaker, and having declined to submit to the authority of the Chair—

Mr. Speaker called on Major O'Gorman by his name:—

Whereupon, Major O'Gorman having persisted in his disorderly behaviour,

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Major O'Gorman for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair be directed to withdraw."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Debate arising;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sheil.*)

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed,

"That Major O'Gorman for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair be directed to withdraw."

Amendment proposed,

To leave out the words "for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair," and, at the end of the Question, to add the words "for disregarding the authority of the Chair."—(*Major Nolan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put.

*Ordered,* That Major O'Gorman, for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair, be directed to withdraw.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*Ordered,* That the conduct of Major O'Gorman towards the Chair be taken into consideration To-morrow.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*Ordered,* That Major O'Gorman do attend in his place To-morrow.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## SUPPLY.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

COLONEL STANLEY, resuming, said, he had already pointed out how the matter stood with regard to the Reserve men. Undoubtedly, it was hard for the wife of a Reserve man who had a good situation, as a policeman, or on a railway, to find herself reduced to an income far below that to which she was ordinarily accustomed; but the State could not take account of social differences, and it was bound to consider all Army Reserve men as being on an equal footing. It was not possible, in dealing with their families, to consider the situation they held in civil employment. He had pointed out the relief they had endeavoured to give, and very few complaints had been received from the women themselves. One such complaint came from the mother of a Reserve man taking care of his children, who thought she was entitled to the same allowance as the wife would have been. If, on full investigation, he found it necessary, he would bring the matter under the notice of the House; but he did not anticipate that that would be the case, and at present he had no proposal to make.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

## ARMY — THE AUXILIARY FORCES — YEOMANRY ADJUTANTS.

### RESOLUTION.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE called attention to the system of seconding Officers in Cavalry Regiments on appointment to Adjutancies of Yeomanry, and to move—

> "That the present system of seconding Officers in Cavalry Regiments requires amendment, as it is calculated to give undue advantages in promotion and retirement under the Royal Warrant of the 30th day of August 1877 to Officers holding such appointments."

MR. O'CONNOR POWER seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the present system of seconding Officers in Cavalry Regiments requires amendment, as it is calculated to give undue advantages in promotion and retirement under the Royal Warrant of the 13th day of August 1877 to Officers holding such appointments,"—(*Major O'Beirne,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

COLONEL LOYD LINDSAY said, he thought it would be very inconvenient to carry out the proposal of the hon. and gallant Member. The Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the question of the Yeomanry had made certain recommendations, one of which was that the Yeomanry should have the advantage of the assistance of officers—Captains serving in Cavalry regiments. Previous to that, Yeomanry officers were drawn from the ranks, and it was an advantage to the Yeomanry regiments that officers should be appointed. He could not conceive anything more unjust than that they should have their promotion stopped, for while they were acting as Adjutants, their pay was less than when they were acting with their regiments. He, therefore, thought it would be quite unreasonable to carry out any such proposal as that of the hon. and gallant Member. If any undue promotion should occur, the Commander-in-Chief would see the matter right.

*Colonel Stanley*

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

## HOUSE OF COMMONS—SALARIES OF OFFICIALS.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. O'CLERY called attention to the inadequacy of the salaries paid to the under officials of the House of Commons in regard to the amount of work done in comparison with the salaries enjoyed by the officials holding corresponding positions in the House of Lords. On looking at the Estimates, he found that there were men employed as fire-lighters at £58 a-year, and it was unreasonable to suppose that they could do their duty to the House and maintain wives and families on about £1 2*s.* 6*d.* a-week. Such salaries ought to be given to these people as would prevent them from having to seek employment from people while Parliament was not in Session. He trusted that the Treasury would take into account the increased cost of living, and consider whether larger salaries ought not be given.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the object of the hon. Member was that the case of the officials who attended that House in minor capacities should be taken into consideration, with a view to the increase of their salaries. This House had no control over the other House of Parliament with regard to the services and salaries of the officials employed there; and it was, therefore, hardly possible to make any comparison between the two Houses in that respect. The question was simply whether the amount of salary of the subordinate officers in the House of Commons was equivalent to the work done. As far as he was aware, there had been no resignations by the subordinate officials of the House, who, it might be inferred, did not wish to leave the Service. One reason why the places were sought for was, that those officials were employed only during a certain portion of the year, and, therefore, the best of their time was available for any other employment which they might obtain elsewhere. In 1874, there was a general rise in wages of some of the officials in that House, to bring them up to the standard of the same class of officials employed in other Government Departments, and they were in receipt of those salaries now. After considering the advantages which those officials possessed over others, in having a considerable portion of the year to themselves which they could devote to their own uses, and in view of the fact that there was no want of applicants, and that there were no complaints among the men themselves—those who had the real regulation and management of affairs of the House saw no reason why any alteration should be made, and he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) did not, therefore, think it necessary for the House to consider the question in the way suggested by the hon. Member.

## ARMY—PHYSICAL EXAMINATION OF OFFICERS—REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. HAYTER said, he desired to call attention to the Report of the Joint Committee of the War Office and of the Civil Service Commissioners appointed to consider the question whether the present literary examinations for the Army should be supplemented by physical competition. The question had already been twice discussed by noble Lords in "another place;" and as it was a very important one, in the opinion of all those who took an interest in matters relating to the efficiency of the officers of the Army, he trusted that some expression would be given to the views entertained by the Secretary of State for War upon the advisability of giving the number of 1,200 marks to candidates for competition in physical tests. The Commission which had made the recommendation consisted of three civilian and three military Members, whose names, of course, carried with them very great weight. But, at the same time, it was to be observed that this was a very peculiar innovation. The upshot of the Report was, that to those who showed efficiency in three of the following six subjects:—namely, Riding, Walking, Running, Jumping, Swimming, and Gymnastics—should be given 1,200 marks additional, the consequence of which would be that an examination supplementary to the ordinary Army Examination would have to be held. It was important that the opinions should be known of such men as General Sir John Adye, the Rev. Dr. Ridding, Head Master at Winchester; the Rev. Dr. Perceval, Head Master at Clifton; and the Rev. Dr. Faber, Head Master at Malvern College; all of whom had written, in reply to a general Circular sent to them, more or less in the sense that there was a danger that the intellectual studies of youths would be neglected for the physical subjects for proficiency in which they were to receive the 1,200 additional marks. He asked the House to consider the particular exercise of riding. How unjust would it be to some candidates, whose parents were not rich enough to afford to keep horses, that the sons of more wealthy persons should receive marks for an acquirement which was beyond their reach? Again, it was very frequently the case that officers were many years in the Army without having to ride at all, from which it would be seen that competition in this exercise would be to them, at any rate, superfluous. When it was considered that swimming was now taught in all public schools, and that cricket matches and boat races were increasing year by year, he considered it proved that there was no want of physical activity amongst the young men of the present generation. There was, however, in intellectual acquirements great danger in the competition between the officers of the English and officers of foreign Armies. It was to be remembered that the Germans, in their struggle with France, had a very marked superiority in the intelligence of their officers. It was the desire, therefore, of Lord Cardwell—and he trusted it was also the desire of the present Secretary of State for War—to raise, by every means, the intellectual standard of our officers. The officers now had an opportunity of studying all branches of their profession, while he would remind the House incidentally that every candidate for the staff had to pass an examination, to prove his efficiency in riding. Upon these general grounds, therefore, he maintained that there was no necessity for the additional stimulus recommended for acquiring excellence in physical competitions, which, in his opinion, would operate prejudicially against the necessary progress in intellectual studies of candidates for the Army. In conclusion, he would remind the House, in proof of the ample supply of candidates for the Army, that at the last examination, out of 180 candidates, no less than 70 had been already rejected.

COLONEL ARBUTHNOT thought the opinions quoted by his hon. and gallant Friend had hardly been a fair sample of those contained in the letters included in the Report of the Committee. That Report pointed to two objects which it was desirable to gain—in the first place, the exclusion from the Army of mere bookworms; and, secondly, to prevent the loss to the Army of the services of those who might be good scholars, and who had the advantage over the whole or a large number of those who got their commissions. The opinions of the schoolmasters which had been quoted were two-fold; some were in favour of a certain number of marks being given for efficiency; others thought it should be a *sine quâ non* that a certain amount of efficiency should exist. In his opinion, a combination of these two plans would work well—that was to say, a certain test examination as to physical power should be introduced, with a moderate number of marks as a *sine quâ non*, and those who excelled should be able to gain a limited number of marks with a view to making up a number that would turn the balance in their favour over some others who were no better than themselves.

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN expressed his entire concurrence with the remarks of his hon. and gallant Friend (Mr. Hayter), and trusted that the Government would pause before accepting the recommendation of the Committee. He was no fanatical devotee to competitive examination; but, whatever might be thought of the subject, it was the fairest mode they could have of entering the Public Service; and the defects originally found in it had been gradually eliminated by the care of the Examiners. The great error which underlay the Report of the Committee was the opinion that, in the competitive examination of young men, those who took the highest place were necessarily bookworms, and that the rest were fine gallant fellows who were a great loss to the Public Service. Was it not notoriously the case that the best men in the schools were often distinguished in the cricket-field or on the river? On the other hand, it might very well be that a youth stood very low in the list, and yet would not be made an efficient officer by any such proposal as that contained in the Report. Hon. Members opposite talked of numbers being lost to the Army through the system of examination. Now, the standard of examination was not so very terrible, and if candidates applied themselves to study they ought to be able to pass. The proposal of the Committee would, if carried out, enable some stupid youth to leap over the heads of his more successful competitors, simply because he might have the knack of leaping high and running fast. He admitted that it was desirable for an officer in the Army to be up to a certain standard of physical endurance; that his stamina should be good. One of the officers examined before the Committee pointed out that, after a long and hard march, an officer should be able to look after the comfort of his men. It was admitted that he should be a man of endurance; but as to the question of jumping, running, and walking, everyone knew it was a sort of knack. He would rather see candidates from cricketing elevens, or from the eights on the river, which would supply youths possessed of the happy qualities of judgment, patience, and temper, so necessary to the officer in the Army. As for the artificial way of putting them through gymnastic exercises, in order to discover who could run and walk fast, it seemed to him an extraordinary proposal to proceed from the Civil Service Commissioners. He did not want to make any strong observations about schoolmasters; but if he wanted an opinion upon the subject under consideration, he should certainly not go to them. He urged his right hon. and gallant Friend to consider fully, before adopting the Report of the Commissioners.

COLONEL STANLEY would endeavour to confine his observations to as short a space of time as possible. He did not intend to follow his hon. and gallant Friend opposite into the various opinions of schoolmasters and others who gave the results of their experience to the

Commission. Owing to the circumstances of the year, there had been neither time nor opportunity for properly considering the very interesting question raised. It had been his duty, and the duty of others, to read the Report carefully; and, as a result of that, he was bound to say that, in his opinion, the *onus probandi* rested with the Commissioners, and that there were points to be attended to before their suggestions could be carried out. Two questions, very much to the point, were—first, were the young men who were now candidates for the Army, physically of a lower standard than those who presented themselves before competitive examination became the rule? So far from that being the case, a finer set of young men, take them all round, could not be found. His hon. and gallant Friend near him informed him that the distinguished General who commanded at Aldershot had expressed an opinion that "the officers of the present day are the finest we have had." The second question was, could we institute such a course of study without injury. It was obvious that this consideration underlay the recommendation of the Commissioners. They seemed to admit riding and swimming—probably two of the most valuable qualities which a man as an officer could possess—while they excluded putting the shot as, in the first place, useless, and liable to strain young men. If it were proved that the officers of the Army were subject to diseases which could only be the result of over study, he thought the question would merit more prompt and close attention. He was only expressing his individual opinion, and that without hesitation. The obvious bias in the minds of all schoolmasters was that if you really give marks for muscular exercises an injurious effect would be produced on the mental training of the candidate. It should be borne in mind that these young men were very like young horses, and that if they trained them too much they were very likely to end by losing all, and it was necessary to be very careful not to damage their constitutions. No doubt, *cæteris paribus*, the physically best men were preferable; but while he did not wish to disparage the Commissioners, he was bound to express his personal opinion that the burden of proof lay with them.

## ARMY—CASE OF SURGEON-MAJOR CLARKE.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. MELDON was very averse to troubling the House with anything like a grievance; but, from the facts connected with the case he was about to mention, he thought it would be of opinion that there were certain special and public grounds which justified him in calling attention to the matter. He wished to draw attention to the case of Surgeon-Major Clarke, who was passed over for promotion under very extraordinary circumstances. In 1876, when his promotion was stopped, Surgeon-Major Clarke had been in the Service 28 years and four months, of which period 17 years and five months had been passed in foreign service. He was engaged in Dublin, in connection with the Recruiting Department, and in August, 1876, when his turn for promotion came, he found that two officers, much his juniors, were promoted over his head. The testimonials of Surgeon-Major Clarke, laid before the Secretary of State for War and the Commander-in-Chief, showed that from the day he entered the Service up to the present moment his conduct had been exceedingly good, and every commanding officer under whom he had served, except one, had given him the highest praise. When he found that he had been passed over, Surgeon-Major Clarke put himself in communication with the Director General of the Army Medical Department, and, subsequently, with the Commander-in-Chief. After a long correspondence, he succeeded in inducing His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief to tell the Director General to state the grounds on which his promotion was stopped. It was a very unusual thing for the Director General, who had the power of selecting from among a number of officers, to state the grounds on which any particular officers were passed over; but, in this particular case, His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief thought it right that the grounds on which Surgeon-Major Clarke had been passed over should be stated. On 26th September, 1876, a letter was written by an official, on the part of the Director General, stating the reasons in question. Several grounds were alleged by the Director General; but before he read them, he (Mr. Meldon) wished to say that he did not seek to justify the position that an officer who had been passed over had any right to know the reason, or to complain to Parliament, merely because the discretion rested in the Director General of the Medical Department had been exercised. But, in the present case, the grounds had been disclosed, and enabled Surgeon-Major Clarke to complain of the manner in which he had been treated, and made it proper to bring the matter before the notice of the House. The first ground stated by the Director General of the Medical Department was that Surgeon-Major Clarke had been charged with insubordination; and, secondly, that recently, Surgeon-Major Clarke had been guilty of carelessness in the examination of recruits in his district. With respect to the first ground stated, the facts were that in 1853, while Surgeon-Major Clarke was on duty in India with the 90th Regiment, to which he was attached, some dispute arose between him and his commanding officer as to the way in which the sick should be treated. Surgeon-Major Clarke thought the commanding officer was inferior to himself in the matter of knowledge, and wished to take his own course. Surgeon-Major Clarke was eventually reprimanded, and removed from the 90th Regiment, in consequence of this dispute. Subsequently, he returned to this country, and demanded an inquiry into the reason for his removal from the 90th Regiment. The Military Secretary wrote to the Director General with reference to his case, and on a reply being received, Surgeon-Major Clarke was informed that His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, having considered the matter, thought there was nothing in the circumstances connected with his retirement from the 90th Regiment to prejudice his reputation or interfere with his future promotion in the Service. Thereupon, Surgeon-Major Clarke withdrew his application for an inquiry. Thus, they had the Commander-in-Chief, on the one hand, saying that his future promotion in the Service was not to be interfered with, and the Director General alleging the incident in India as a ground for passing him over. If his promotion were refused upon that ground, Surgeon-Major Clarke was most unjustly and most unfairly dealt with, and the Director General of the Medical Department had no right to refuse promotion by reason of a charge which the Commander-in-Chief had declared to be unfounded. Moreover, that incident occurred in 1853, and it was not until 1876 that Surgeon-Major Clarke was informed by the Director General that it was a reason for passing him over. If the matter remained there, no sufficient ground for passing over Surgeon-Major Clarke was shown, and in justice to him he ought to have been promoted. But another reason was stated. The Director General stated—

> "It appears, further, that you have recently been removed from the recruiting district in which you have been stationed, owing to your carelessness in the examination of recruits."

The fact was that Surgeon-Major Clarke was not removed from the recruiting district at Dublin for some weeks after his promotion was passed over. Therefore, there must have been some error in asserting that as a reason for supersession. He would now read to the House one or two of the testimonials that Surgeon-Major Clarke had received. On the 29th of August, 1876, the Assistant Adjutant General for Recruiting wrote to him—

> "My dear Clarke,—In reply to your note, it gives me very great pleasure to state my approbation of the way in which you have performed your duties. You have at all times shown your anxiety to give me every assistance and to promote the welfare of the Service."

Another letter, from Surgeon-Major Clarke's commanding officer during 1873 and 1874, said—

> "I have very great pleasure in acknowledging the assistance you have given me. It has relieved me from very much responsibility in approving recruits, and the ability and judgment you have displayed enable me to bear my hearty testimony to your professional knowledge and to your zeal for the Service."

Yet, in the face of these letters, Surgeon-Major Clarke was passed over, because he did not discharge his duties, with reference to the passing of recruits, in a satisfactory manner. The supersession took place long before Surgeon-Major Clarke's position in the recruiting department had ceased; and yet he was told that his promotion had been stopped in consequence of the occurrence of 1853, and of his removal from the recruiting department. With reference to the charges of insubordination laid against him by the Director General, Surgeon-Major Clarke could show testimonials of the highest character from all the commanding officers under whom he had served, with one exception. But, besides having been passed over when his turn for promotion came, the result of the interference of hon. Members in his case had been that Surgeon-Major Clarke had been removed from Dublin, and sent to India, and had, further, been subjected to a great many petty annoyances. Under these circumstances, and taking into account what he had stated to the House with reference to the assurance of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, that Surgeon-Major Clarke's promotion was not to be interfered with by reason of what occurred in 1853, he (Mr. Meldon) hoped that the present Secretary of State for War would give his consideration to the case, and that this very meritorious officer would get the promotion he most justly deserved.

Colonel STANLEY said, that the hon. and learned Member had clearly spoken under a misapprehension of the facts of this case. He had argued as if this were a case of supersession, and the hon. and learned Member had spoken several times of Surgeon-Major Clarke's having had his promotion stopped. The truth was that there were certain officers in the Medical Department—a very small number—who were administrative officers. When an officer had attained the highest rank in the executive branch in the Medical Department, he had a probability of succeeding to the administrative branch of the Service. The number of officers in the administrative branch was very few, and they were not appointed by seniority, but were chosen by selection. Without saying anything unduly in disparagement of Surgeon-Major Clarke, yet he might observe that there were officers who, by reason of their professional acquirements and their zeal in the Service, were more fit for the post in question than Surgeon-Major Clarke. He did not want to give any reason, and he did not think it was necessary that they should go into any of the charges that had been made against Surgeon-Major Clarke. As he understood, they had been condoned by His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief; but as this was a case of selection, Surgeon-Major Clarke could not complain if other officers were thought more fit for the post than he. His Predecessor in Office had left a Minute that this was a case of selection, and not of supersession. The matter had been most carefully gone into; and, for his part, he could see no reason for altering the decision that had been arrived at, and he must, therefore, decline to re-open the case.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, that as the appointments in the administrative branch of the Medical Service were made by selection under the regulations recently issued, and however much he might regret to see a good officer suspended, yet it must be recognized that Surgeon-Major Clarke had no reason to complain of the authorities for adhering to the Orders of the Service. He was, however, of opinion, that it would have been better if no reasons had been stated by the Director General for not appointing Surgeon-Major Clarke. This reticence would have prevented the pain which the words used must have given to a good officer.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

## SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £386,800, Charge for Commissariat, Transport, &c.

Colonel ARBUTHNOT took that opportunity of asking the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, whether he would undertake that the undoubted grievance of the Artificers in the Artillery should be removed? He would like to know whether it could, by any possibility, be removed in the present financial year? The Returns showed the great injustice to which the Artificers in the Royal Artillery were now subjected. The Artificers in the Royal Artillery could not draw more than 1*s.* 10*d.* a-day, whereas the Cavalry drew 3*s.* 7*d.*, Royal Engineers 3*s.* 7*d.*, and the Army Service Corps 4*s.* 9*d.* He was surprised that this inequality should have remained so long.

Colonel STANLEY observed, that there would be no opportunity this year of altering the matter. He would, at the same time, assure the hon. and gallant Member that the matter would have his very careful consideration.

Major NOLAN said, that the Secretary of State for War would find that a very great grievance would grow up in the Royal Artillery unless this injustice were remedied. Under the system of short enlistment, there would be a difficulty in obtaining Artificers for the Royal Artillery, if the inequality complained of was not removed.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £3,185,000, Provisions, Forage, &c.

(3.) £806,000, Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies.

Major NOLAN said, the system of clothing garrison batteries of Artillery had been completely changed during the past year and a-half. These batteries were commanded by a major, and it was perfectly impossible for him to do the details of the clothing. This troublesome work had to be done by a sergeant, who was very fully employed. He got no extra pay whatever, a fact which was quite unusual in the Army. In every other branch, if a man had to do extra work—such as managing the clothing department—he always got extra pay. But in the case of garrison batteries the commandant, knowing that unless the sergeant got extra pay he would not do the work, paid him out of his own pocket 1*s.* or 9*d.* a-day extra. The system of managing the clothing department of field batteries was the same; but there the sergeant in charge was made a quarter-master sergeant, and had that position and pay. He, therefore, asked the Secretary of State for War, in the case of garrison batteries, to put the sergeant in charge of the clothing in a better position. By attending to this point, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would be looking into a serious grievance.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK complained that when the Reserve men were called out they had no second suits of uniform; and, after a long field day in the rain, the men had the alternative of going naked or stand about wet to the skin. He could not help thinking that this was false economy, and the deficiency in clothing required the most serious attention of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. Then, when the Reserve men were called out, they were supposed to bring their own boots, instead of being supplied by the Government. A Committee, on which he had the honour to serve some two years ago, went into the matter very closely, and recommended that a sufficient stock of boots should be kept in store to meet all requirements. The experiment of calling out the Reserves had been an important one, especially as showing the precise number of men England could put into the field at any time; and he thought in the future there should not be such mistakes found as had been discovered on this recent occasion. The Government ought always to be in a position to at once put two Army Corps into the field.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL said, the subject had engaged the attention of the Secretary of State for War and himself, and Reports had been asked for, which were under consideration. The hon. and gallant Baronet would, no doubt, recollect that there was no store of reserve clothing until provision was made for it a year or two since by the late Secretary of State for War. All must admit that there had been a great strain upon the Departments recently; but he might safely say that had there been any necessity for a second Army Corps to take the field, one might have been equipped and ready in a month or six weeks.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, it seemed to him that the Government had only contemplated the equipment of one Army Corps. England could not send less than two Army Corps into the field simultaneously; and if ever any other idea was carried out, it would be found that a fatal mistake had been made. He should not regard any preparation as complete unless they contemplated such a proceeding.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked what was the result of the experiment made by the late Secretary of State for War of voting money to lay in a reserve stock of cloth? Had the War Office kept faith with the House, which specially voted £200,000 for this express purpose, and had the War Office laid in the stock of cloth which they spoke of, and kept up that reserve for extraordinary demands?

Colonel ARBUTHNOT did not for a moment believe that every Reserve man expected to find his kit complete when he was called up. The question now was one of the future, and he had no doubt many valuable suggestions had been made.

COLONEL STANLEY said, in answer to his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir George Balfour) as to whether the stock of reserve clothing had been kept up, he must say unquestionably not. As to the complaint about a non-supply of a second suit of clothes, he admitted there was some grounds for that. But it must be remembered that it had only been contemplated that one Army Corps would have to be provided. At the present moment a Committee was sitting on the subject, and he hoped arrangements would be made which would lead to an improvement.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, the boots supplied to the men of the Army were the cause of constant complaint. Nothing could be worse than to have bad boots. The Infantry could not march in them; and, of course, they were worth nothing if they could not march. There was no reason at all why good boots should not be supplied.

LORD ELCHO said, there was another cause of complaint, and that was the kind of leggings served out to the Infantry.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, the question of boots cropped up last year, and in consequence of complaints a thorough inquiry was made into the matter. Not only had he called for Reports on the subject, but he bought a pair of boots of the character supplied for himself, and he never wished to walk in any which were more easy or more comfortable. That certainly was his experience. If his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) would give him particulars of any complaints, he would look into the matter. In the case of the leggings, he could give no information; but if the nature of the complaints were laid before him, there should be an inquiry into them.

MAJOR NOLAN was bound to say, from his experience of the boots of the Artillery—and he had had a good opportunity of judging—they were excellent, and they were very much praised.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £1,330,000, Warlike Stores.

MR. WHITWELL asked if the small arm manufactory was engaged in making Martini-Henry rifles only; and whether experiments had been made regarding the new military arms which were being used in other parts of the world?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, at the present moment nothing but Martini-Henry rifles and carbines were being manufactured. The value of these weapons was proved in the late war, when the Turks, who were not celebrated for keeping their arms in good condition, made such an extraordinary use of them. Therefore, he thought the House and the country might be satisfied with the manufacture of those arms.

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN said, the Martini-Henry rifle, if not the best, was one of the very best of weapons, and he saw no advantage to be derived from changing it.

LORD ELCHO said, the recent results of shooting with the Martini-Henry had shown it to be the superior to any foreign weapon. He should like to hear from his noble Friend what was the number of those rifles in store—he meant not at present in the hands of the troops.

MR. WHITWELL said, what he desired to know was, whether great advantages were likely to be derived from the use of the Martini-Henry rifle?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, that a Departmental Committee was now sitting for the purpose of inquiring into this question. Respecting the inquiry of the hon. Member, he might state that 2,000 Martini-Henry rifles were this year issued for the use of Volunteers at Wimbledon. The gift had been received with a very good spirit, and had been much appreciated. He believed that some little difficulty had been experienced with regard to the sighting; but, at the same time, the Martini-Henry had acquitted itself as, in his opinion, it always would do—exceedingly well. With regard to the number of rifles in store, the reserve, in round numbers, was 400,000. There were also some 18,000 carbines in store. The question of carbines was discussed last year by the Committee, and the carbine now adopted was approved of by most Cavalry officers, and was considered by them as a good weapon for that branch of the Service.

LORD ELCHO asked, whether his noble Friend had read the account of the discussion at the United Service Institution on this subject?

MAJOR NOLAN hoped that the Government would provide some magazine-loaders; for, in the opinion of competent American officers, there was a tendency towards the greater use of those weapons. This Vote was for big guns. Some breech-loading Armstrongs were doing very well. He believed the Surveyor General of the Ordnance was in the wrong in some statements he had made; he had the authority of Sir William Armstrong to that effect. With respect to breech-loaders generally, he thought the country was hardly pushing its experiments as far as it ought. The War Office, he believed, had now only two descriptions of guns with which they were experimenting.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL would assure his hon. and gallant Friend that the War Office was not shutting its eyes to what was going on in regard to the question of breech-loading ordnance. The War Office was aware that breech-loaders might be very effective under certain circumstances; but whatever was done in the way of change must be done gradually. It was quite possible that more breech-loaders would be designed, and the hon. and gallant Member might rest assured that, if useful, they would be adopted. With regard to the alleged contradiction of the Surveyor General by Sir William Armstrong, he would not say one word against the statement of the hon. and gallant Member; but only repeat that what he (Lord Eustace Cecil) had stated was on very good authority.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK wished to make one or two observations on the very important points that had been touched upon. As respected the Martini-Henry, it might be taken that it was a rifle which, if not the very best that could be made, yet was as near perfection as it could well be in the present state of scientific knowledge. He had recently had an opportunity of seeing in use, by the Turks, a rifle very similar to the Martini-Henry—he meant the Martini-Peabody. Its results were so satisfactory that he was glad to think that the whole of the British Army was armed with a weapon almost identical. With respect to the Martini-Henry carbine, it differed from the rifle only in being shorter; but, with that difference, was altogether as good a weapon. Some mention had been made of magazine repeating rifles, which were not in use in the English Army. In some situations, as in the late war, during the defence of Plevna, a rifle from which some 16 or 18 shots could be fired without reloading, was found in those peculiar circumstances to be of great utility. Owing to the smallness of the British Army, it was certain that it would be nearly always upon the defensive, and the advantage from rifles of that sort should not be lost sight of. The question was a very important one, as to whether an Army occupied in field works should not be supplied with magazine repeating rifles. At the right time and place, no doubt very extraordinary results could be obtained from such rifles. In the experiments conducted at Shoeburyness, it had been shown that in field works suddenly thrown up such rifles would aid materially in holding them against attacks. He might say that he was greatly disappointed to see the very inferior performance of the Gatling gun at Shoeburyness. From what he observed, he supposed the defect was not so much in the gun as in the mode of loading it. He was sure that, under certain circumstances, the greatest possible advantage could be reaped from the proper use of the Gatling gun.

MR. WHITWELL would like to know whether the Government was now in a position to manufacture all the torpedoes required for the use of the country, or whether, and to what extent, dependence was placed in their supply by outside manufacturers?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, they had hitherto been able to supply all that were required. In a few years, he hoped that even in war time the Government would be able to manufacture all that were wanted.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £854,300, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879."

Mr. E. JENKINS wished to make an inquiry with respect to the Vote for buildings in South Africa. They had received £9,000 from the Cape Government on this account. But there was a sum of £12,000 sanctioned by the Treasury for providing accommodation to the troops in Natal and the Transvaal. He would like to know whether there was any chance of that money being reimbursed out of the Colonial funds; and, further, whether Her Majesty's Government considered it good policy to continue to supply the Colonies with these buildings?

Colonel STANLEY said, it would be extremely inconvenient if the buildings were not supplied when necessary. The chief consideration was the safety of the Colony, and the Government could not always hold its hand with respect to expenditure of this character. Sometimes the Colony in which the works were executed paid its share; but he was not able to give a definite answer in the present case.

Lord ELCHO thought one of the greatest dangers to the country in case of war would have arisen from the coaling stations being undefended. He would like to know whether any steps had been taken to protect the coaling stations?

Colonel STANLEY did not know whether he could give details on this subject, or, indeed, whether it would be advisable to publish such information. A Defence Committee, he might say, had been assembled, which considered very carefully the best measures to be taken for the safety of the coaling stations. At all the large coaling stations, earth batteries were improvised and armed. As a rule, they had been erected as temporary batteries only, but, with the aid of heavy guns, would be a very sufficient protection against iron-clad Fleets.

General SHUTE moved the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £3,000, in respect of the construction of the new hospital for the two regiments of Household Cavalry at the Regent's Park Barracks. He felt somewhat strongly on this subject, although it was a small matter, and one of detail, that would hardly come under the consideration of his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War, yet its decision was one of serious importance to the three regiments of Household Cavalry. On this matter depended their efficient medical treatment, and he might almost say their death-rate; and he was satisfied that when he had stated the case all military men in the House, and all hon. Members who took an interest in the medical treatment of soldiers, and all who were interested in sanitary science, would agree with him in objecting to this hospital. He must first explain to the Committee that, with a view to carrying out the new departmental system, the old regimental system for the medical treatment of troops had been gradually abolished. In towns where there were two, three, or more regiments quartered, measures had been gradually taken to concentrate the sick from each regiment into one hospital. No doubt there were objections to the plan; but he was aware that it had its advantages; that it was more applicable to service in the field; and that it would tend to improve the Army School of Surgery and Medicine, which had been at a somewhat low standard. But as regarded Cavalry on home service, there was no doubt that the regimental system was the best; as respected the Household Cavalry, in particular, he saw no sort of advantage in the adoption of the system of concentrating their sick in London in one hospital; for they had their own regimental surgeons and their assistant surgeons, and were to continue to be so organized, which was not the case with the Cavalry of the Line. He objected to the Vote for two reasons—first, he objected to the hospital for the reception of the sick from two regiments of Household Cavalry being placed in what he might call the worst possible and most unhealthy site; and, secondly, he objected to the distance—about three miles—that the sick and injured of the regiment quartered in Knightsbridge would have to be carried through the streets of London to reach the hospital. First, as to the sanitary part of the question, the new hospital was placed on the same site as the old hospital in the Regent's Park Barracks. It was close to the outer wall at one angle of the Barracks; immediately on one side there were some very objectionable mews, not under military control, and which had been complained of by the medical officer of the regiment quartered there. But, infinitely worse, on another side, the hospital was within 20 or 25 yards of the notoriously objectionable Regent's Park Canal, a receptacle for dead dogs, cats, and all descriptions of filth. The last time that he saw the canal, there was over its surface that tell-tale scum peculiar to stagnant and putrid water. So near the wall of the proposed hospital was the canal, that it had been necessary to drive 30 piles to prevent the foundations of the hospital inclining gradually towards the canal. In one of the walls of the Barracks near the hospital there were some very large fissures, the result of the ground gradually giving way towards the canal, and a magazine, to be pulled down to make room for the new building, was quite out of the perpendicular from the same cause. But this was not the worst. The Canal Company had some land close by the hospital, and separated from it only by some railings, and on this it was proposed, at some future time, to form a "lay-by" for barges; and if that were done the wall of the hospital would be actually washed by the waters of the canal. The men in the Regent's Park Barracks had, as a rule, been more healthy than in the old Knightsbridge Barracks recently pulled down. The explanation of that was that the Regent's Park Barracks were comparatively new, and had been constructed on a better plan and without the defects of the old Knightsbridge Barracks, and because the men's quarters were as far from the canal as the barrack property would admit of. But there had always been a large proportion of deaths at Regent's Park, and that had been attributed to the extremely bad site of the hospital in which the sick men were lodged. He had visited the children's school, some time since, in those Barracks, which was close to the canal, and was shown articles which had become mildewed from having been kept only 10 days there. The officers' quarters being close to the canal, the mess stores of biscuits, and so on, soon became good for nothing, if not kept in tin boxes, from the extreme damp. He thought he had now shown the Committee pretty clearly that this was not a desirable place upon which to build a hospital for two regiments. He believed he was right in saying that, in the opinion of the commanding officers and surgeon majors of all the three regiments, the site of the hospital was very objectionable, and that they had officially stated their objections. He would add a little more with regard to Cavalry hospitals in particular. There was no doubt that Cavalry were much better off with hospitals of their own. He had had 80 or 90 four-year-olds being broke in by his own soldiers; and, of course, a great number of casualties must occur in head-quarters of Cavalry regiments. It was naturally to be expected that old soldiers breaking wild Irish four-year-olds, and young soldiers being taught to ride, would be occasionally liable to fractures and other serious injuries. He remembered once boasting that for months no such casualties had occurred in his regiment. The next morning one man was killed, and another had his leg fractured, and a third seriously injured. How would it be if all these men had had to be removed three miles to the hospital? The result of the departmental hospital system was shown by what was told him the other day by an officer in Dublin, where the system of the concentration of sick was being carried out. A case of fracture was removed three miles to the hospital to be treated. Owing to the removal, a simple became a compound fracture, and the man was likely to be lame for life, or, perhaps, lose his leg. He had this from the colonel of the Cavalry regiment in which the man was serving. He mentioned these matters with special regard to Cavalry hospitals. Although he did not object, as a rule, to the departmental system of hospitals for Infantry, still, nothing contributed so much to the bond between men and officers as the latter making it a practice to visit their sick men. The men, moreover, objected to being taken from their barracks, regarding the regiment as their home. In the case of the Household Regiments, if they had not their own hospitals, all casualties, however trivial, would have to be removed to the Regent's Park Barracks, through about three miles of streets. It might be argued that the same thing was being carried out at Berlin; but how was it being carried out? The authorities there had built a magnificent hospital, on part of the manœuvre ground —the most healthy site—and had laid down a line of railway from the various barracks to the hospital. The large roomy conveyances contained beds, hammocks, and every comfort and convenience, and the sick were conveyed to the hospital without being shaken or injured. Carried out in that way, the policy of having a hospital away from a barrack was quite another affair. The only objection to building a hospital at Knightsbridge was one of space. But he believed that had been overcome, and that the hon. Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. J. R. Yorke) received a positive promise that some houses between the Duke of Wellington's Riding School and Knightbridge Barracks should be purchased; and, in that case, there would be ample room for hospital accommodation. A most influentially signed Petition had been sent to the Chief Commissioner of Works upon the subject; and he believed that if the right hon. Gentleman, in conjunction with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Secretary of State for War, would put their heads together, they could manage the alteration, making a great Metropolitan improvement, and give a handsome and commodious foot entrance into the Park. The present passage into Hyde Park was most objectionable. Two houses stood there, which were a great nuisance to the troops and the neighbourhood, and there were other houses, which he would not describe, in the same locality. It had been reported by one Engineer officer that the space to be thus acquired would not be sufficient, while another reported that it would be. He had visited the locality himself, and he unhesitatingly said there was room. What was still better, they would be able to have the hospital at the extreme west end of the Barrack-ground, if they wished it. Many people objected to have an hospital in their midst; but that for a regiment of 300 and odd fine healthy men was a different thing to an ordinary hospital. The average illness of the Barracks was from 9 to 12 men—that was about 3 per 100—so that too large a building need not be constructed. Then, another advantage would be derived, which was, it seemed, not thought of. At present, the Veterinary Surgeon's establishment was at one end of the Barracks, and the forge at another; whereas, if the ground in question was acquired, it would enable them to be associated, and this was a most important arrangement, as the shoeing of a regiment should be closely superintended by the veterinary surgeon. In conclusion, he expressed a belief that he had shown that Knightsbridge Barracks wanted a hospital; that if the War Office chose, a site could be found for such a building; and he had also shown the importance of placing the veterinary establishment and the forge together. He hoped, therefore, that his right hon. and gallant Friend would give way, and give Knightsbridge Barracks a hospital, and also thereby effect a great Metropolitan improvement.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £851,300, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879."—(*General Shute.*)

Major O'BEIRNE thought it was perfectly absurd to have a hospital three miles away, especially when they remembered the numerous accidents which occurred in Cavalry regiments. It certainly could not conduce to the recovery of a man to convey him three miles over a rough road. There was another objection which had not been mentioned. Supposing a contagious disease broke out. It certainly would not be desirable to take a man infected with small-pox through the streets of London to a hospital. He should, therefore, support the hon. and gallant Member for Brighton (General Shute) if he went to a division.

Colonel STANLEY hoped his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Brighton would not put the Committee to the inconvenience of dividing upon the question, which was no new one. It had been the cause of repeated discussions in the House; plans and estimates had been ordered, from time to time, and approved; but it had never been thought desirable to erect the hospital. There was a hospital at Regent's Park sufficient for all purposes; whereas, if they built another at Knightsbridge, they would not only have two buildings near each other, but have to acquire the second at a cost of £25,000, independent of the cost of maintaining the two establishments. As to moving the men in waggons to the hospital, he might say the conveyances were admirably contrived for the purpose; and all the best surgeons, he believed, would prefer treating cases in a good hospital, where all the means and appliances for so doing existed, than dealing with them on the spot. He had endeavoured to find out the average number of casualties in a Cavalry regiment, and he believed a regiment 300 strong had an average of nine men sick per 100. That certainly was not a very serious number; and he believed the Committee would pause before they involved the country in an expenditure of £30,000 or £40,000 next year, in addition to the Supplementary Estimates of the Government.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR hoped the hon. and gallant Member for Brighton (General Shute) would not divide the Committee, as he was sure to be beaten. He was sure, after the remarks which had been made, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would further consider the matter.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(6.) £162,400, Military Education.

(7.) £33,300, Miscellaneous Effective Services.

Mr. E. JENKINS asked to be informed as to the number of military *attachés*, and where they were engaged?

Colonel STANLEY said, there were military *attachés* employed at Paris, Vienna, Berlin, St. Petersburgh, and Constantinople. During the late war other officers had been doing similar duties, but only for the time.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR desired to know if any Reports of the slightest value had ever been received from the military *attachés*, and whether they were of any use, either to the War Office or to the public?

Colonel STANLEY said, the War Office received Reports of the greatest value from the military *attachés.*

Vote *agreed to.*

(8.) £251,500, Administration of Army.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, year by year there was an increased charge for the Intelligence Department; whereas the information which that Department publicly rendered was of no value, because none was made public. They could give no information as to Cyprus when it was annexed; and, therefore, he asked what was the use of such a costly Office?

Colonel STANLEY said, since Viscount Cardwell had instituted the Intelligence Department, it had done all the work it was intended to execute, and had proved itself very useful. To his knowledge the Department had done very excellent work, and it furnished information not only to the War Office but to other Departments of the State if they needed it. It was impossible in a few years to obtain all the information which the Government would like; but still, much had been done, and he was sure the Office would prove of great value to the country.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR complained that the salaries of all the military clerks in the War Office had been reduced by £450, while those of the officers in that Department had been increased to the same extent. This was a mean thing. If officers ought to have more pay, let them have it; but surely they should not be rewarded at the expense of the subordinates? He detested such conduct; and he hoped the present Secretary of State would put an end to such a state of things.

Colonel STANLEY did not think the observations of the hon. and gallant Member were correct; and, therefore, he could not answer him.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, the decrease in the clerks' salaries was apparent, as was also the increase in those of the officers. He regretted to see the Secretary of State lending himself to such an arrangement. ["Oh, oh!" "Divide!"] If he heard those remarks again, he would move to report Progress. One Member of that House had been dealt with that night for interfering with a speaker, and why should he (Sir George Balfour) be interrupted? It was discreditable to the Party which had turned out the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Major O'Gorman)—["Order, order!"]—now to try to interrupt him. ["Order, order!"] It was all very well to call out "Order!" but hon. Members had no right to interfere with him, and he would not have it. He supported the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he very rightly moved a Resolution affecting the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Major O'Gorman) for interruptions; and that being so, it was only right that he should be protected. He must again add that he thought it was unfair to reduce the clerks' salaries for the advantage of the officers; and hence he asked the Secretary of State for War to look into the matter as soon as possible.

Vote *agreed to.*

(9.) £33,300, Rewards for Distinguished Services.

(10.) £92,000, Pay of General Officers.

(11.) £870,300, Retired Full Pay, Half Pay, &c.

(12.) £121,000, Widows' Pensions, &c.

(13.) £16,900, Pensions for Wounds.

(14.) £35,600, Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions).

(15.) £1,025,000, Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (Out-Pensions).

(16.) £164,600, Superannuation Allowances.

(17.) £40,200, Militia, Yeomanry Cavalry, Volunteer Corps.

(18.) £1,080,000, in aid of Army Estimates for Home Charges for Regular Forces in India.

Major NOLAN asked where the Vote was to be found in the Estimates?

Colonel STANLEY said, it would be found on page 31 of the Estimates; it was for the sum voted in aid of the Home Charges for the Regular Forces serving in India. It was voted for the first time last year, according to the Forms of the House, in aid of the Indian charges. The Vote was a mere form, because the Indian Government met the charges; but, owing to an arrangement between the India Office and the Treasury—but which would come to an end next year—it had been found necessary to include the charges in the Army Estimates.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN presumed that the arrangement as to the alteration would not come before the House next Session. He would, therefore, take that opportunity of asking whether, if the matter were discussed next Session, it would not be absolutely necessary to have the documents before them?

Colonel STANLEY promised to look into the matter, in order to see what should be produced.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that as the matter then stood, they had the information before them in the shape of a Treasury Minute, in which 12 or 13 different documents were referred to. The matter could not be understood unless they were produced.

Colonel STANLEY could not promise to lay those documents on the Table; but they were open to the inspection of hon. Members at the War Office.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN observed, that there was nothing to conceal in the accounts, for his hon. Friend who was Chairman of the Accounts Committee had offered to show them to him.

Mr. WHITWELL thought that the object of this Vote was something entirely different from the Army Estimates, and objected to its being taken at that time.

The CHAIRMAN said, there was nothing to prevent this Vote being taken amongst the Army Estimates. It was perfectly in Order to propose the Vote at that time.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR observed, that the money for this purpose was formerly voted in the Army Estimates, and if there was no irregularity in the Motion, he saw no reason why the Vote should not be taken in the old way, instead of in the exceptional mode now followed.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, the Motion might be technically regular; but his impression was that last year it was put down on the Paper as a separate Motion, and was not placed with the Army Estimates.

Colonel STANLEY said, that he had already pointed out that the Vote was a mere form, and that it was included in the Army Estimates only as a transfer. With that explanation, as the Chairman had ruled that it was in Order, he trusted the Committee would pass the Vote.

Mr. WHITWELL remarked, that whatever his own opinion might be, after the ruling of the Chairman, he withdrew his objection to the Vote.

Vote *agreed to.*

### CIVIL SERVICES.

### CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(19.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £88,245, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Whitwell.*)

**LORD EUSTACE CECIL** hoped the Motion would not be pressed, and that the Committee would proceed with the Votes. It was impossible for Business to be carried through unless the Committee proceeded.

**MR. WHITWELL** would not press his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(20.) £6,262, to complete the sum for Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland.

(21.) £15,050, to complete the sum for Edinburgh University Buildings.

(22.) £137,057, to complete the sum for Public Buildings, Ireland.

### CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £22,435, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office for Public Works, Ireland."

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

### CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(23.) £817,652, to complete the sum for the Constabulary, Ireland.

(24.) £61,158, to complete the sum for Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Ireland.

(25.) £4,786, to complete the sum for Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Ireland.

(26.) 49,133, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

## CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 286.]

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

### CONSIDERATION, AS AMENDED.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on the Amendment [5th August] proposed (on Consideration of the Bill, as amended) to the proposed Amendment in page 29, line 5, after the word "suspected," to insert, as a new paragraph, the following words:—

"(2.) And on a second conviction within a period of twelve months of an offence against any one of the sub-sections of this section, he shall be liable, in the discretion of the court of summary jurisdiction before which he is convicted, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding one month, with or without hard labour, in lieu of the pecuniary penalty to which he is liable under this Act."—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

And which Amendment to the proposed Amendment was, to leave out the words "with or."—(*Major Nolan.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'with or' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Debate *resumed.*

Amendment to the proposed Amendment; and proposed Amendment, *withdrawn.*

Other Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

---

## BANKERS' BOOKS (EVIDENCE) BILL.

On Motion of Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bill to amend the Law of Evidence with respect to Bankers' Books, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Mr. HERSCHELL, Sir CHARLES MILLS, and Mr. RODWELL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 293.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Wednesday, 7th August, 1878.*

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—ARMY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, Class I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS: Class II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS; Class III.—LAW AND JUSTICE; Class IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART; Class V.—DIPLOMATIC SERVICES—POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE—ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION.

*Resolutions* [August 6] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—*Resolutions* [August 6] *reported.*

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, *re-committed* and *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Leave*—Expiring Laws Continuance *, *debate adjourned.*

*Ordered—First Reading*—Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) * [295].

*Committee — Report* — Statute Law Revision * [263]; Metropolitan Commons * [287].

*Third Reading*—Contagious Diseases (Animals) * [286], and *passed.*

## *PRIVATE BUSINESS.*

## CHRIST CHURCH, NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, TITHES COMMUTATION BILL—[*Lords*]—(*by Order.*)

### THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

SIR **HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON** said, he was sorry to interpose between the House and the third reading of this Bill; but he felt obliged to ask the House to re-commit the Bill for the purpose of introducing a new clause. The circumstances, as they had been brought to his knowledge, were these. The Bill would apply to certain Crown property in the possession of the Post Office. In the Bill as it stood originally when it went before the Select Committee, there was a clause protecting that property, and saving the Act of 1865, under which the property was acquired. That clause was struck out by the Select Committee, and for some time it was thought that the Act of 1865 would not be interfered with; that the Committee had taken a proper view of the case, and that the rights of the Crown property would not be affected. But, upon further investigation, it was believed that the Bill, in the shape in which it now appeared before the House, would override the provisions of the Act 28 & 29 *Vict.*; and, under these circumstances, he asked the House to re-commit the Bill for the purpose of enabling him to introduce a clause which would leave the 12th section of the Post Office Extension Act of 1865 untouched. He was extremely sorry to be obliged to interfere at so late a stage with the promoters of a Private Bill, and he only did so in the interests of the State, as there had been doubts thrown upon the action of the Bill in regard to the Crown property. He found himself obliged to ask the House to consent to the introduction of a clause, and for that purpose it would be necessary to re-commit the Bill. He should, however, be willing, if the House consented to insert the clause, to move that the Bill be re-instated in its present position, and read the third time. At the same time, he considered, late as the period of the Session was, that he was bound to propose the re-committal of the Bill for the purpose of moving the clause he had indicated.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of a new Clause,—(Saving rights of the General Post Office,)"—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson,*)—instead thereof.

SIR **CHARLES FORSTER** said, he was instructed to represent the views of the promoters of the Bill in regard to the proposed clause.

MR. **SPEAKER**: It is necessary, before the hon. Member for Walsall (Sir Charles Forster) addresses the House, that I should put the Question. The original Question was that the Bill be now read the third time, since which an Amendment has been moved to leave out the words "be now read the third time," in order to insert the words "re-committed in respect of a new Clause." The question I have to submit is that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir CHARLES FORSTER said, he was instructed by the promoters of the Bill to express their readiness to adopt the suggestion of the Secretary to the Treasury, and to insert the proposed clause.

Mr. T. CAVE, who had given Notice of opposition to the third reading of the Bill, said, he might state at once, in reference to the Motion of the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury, that as far as he (Mr. T. Cave) was concerned, if the House permitted the third reading of the Bill at all, he should offer no objection to the clause which the hon. Gentleman now proposed to introduce. The clause, as it originally stood when the Bill came down from the House of Lords, appeared to the Committee upstairs, of which he (Mr. T. Cave) was a Member, to give additional privileges to the Post Office. They were not disposed to interfere in any way with the privileges the Post Office already enjoyed; but, at the same time, they were indisposed to confer upon them any additional privileges. It was on that account that the Committee struck out the 12th clause. He thought, however, the Members of the Committee would agree with him that the clause, as it was now proposed to amend it by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury, made it negative instead of positive, and he should offer no objection to the replacing of it in its present form in the Bill. He felt bound to make some apology for trespassing upon the patience and time of the House at so late a period of the Session, and upon a Private Bill of this nature. It was with reluctance that he did so; but he thought the House would agree with him, when he explained the motives which induced him to oppose the measure, that he had no other course open to him. On Friday last, on the Consideration of the Report of the Committee upon the Bill, an objection was taken to the further progress of the measure. He had promised the opponents of the Bill to be present in order to explain their views upon the matter. He made the promise in perfect good faith, and the opponents, accepting his promise, were not prepared with another Member to lay their views before the House. Unfortunately, the discharge of other duties prevented him from fulfilling his engagement, and therefore it was that some of the thoughts and views of the opponents of the Bill were not placed before the House. He proposed to lay them before the House now, with the indulgence of the House, and in a very few words. In the year 1545—it was necessary that he should recite in a few short sentences the history of this Bill, and the legislation which it proposed to carry out, so that it might be understood by hon. Members on both sides of the House. The Bill, as it stood, would materially affect the position of real property, and would deal with it in a way in which it had never been dealt with before by any Act passed by Parliament. He, therefore, sincerely trusted that hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House would give him a short but attentive consideration. In the year 1545, St. Bartholomew's Hospital became the lay impropriators of the tithes of Christ Church, Newgate, and in that position they were empowered to levy tithes to the extent of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound. But, in consideration of their doing so, they were bound to repair the parish church, and they did repair the parish church until the Great Fire of London. In that great fire the church was burned down, and from that time to this St. Bartholomew's Hospital had failed in its duty, and had not repaired or, as far as he was advised, had not paid a single shilling in respect of the repair of that parish church. For the last 200 years, and since the Great Fire of London, St. Bartholomew's Hospital had accepted from the authorities of Christ Church, Newgate, an annual payment of about £200. This had been going on for two entire centuries.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand from the hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave) that he has no objection to the Bill being re-committed with the view of inserting the clause proposed by the hon. Member the Secretary to the Treasury. That being so, the more convenient course would be to allow that clause to be introduced, and upon a future occasion, when the Bill has to be considered as amended, or upon the third reading, he will have the opportunity of making the Motion of which he has given Notice.

Mr. T. CAVE said, he was disposed to bow entirely to the suggestion of the Speaker. It would probably be the most convenient course to reserve his observations until the Bill, as amended, came on for consideration. At the same time, he might be allowed to point out that a considerable number of Members had come down to the House expressly for the purpose of considering and discussing the Bill, and he hoped they would not be inconvenienced by his acting in accordance with the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair.

Mr. RAIKES: As I understand the course about to be taken, I must confess that it appears to me to be a somewhat embarrassing one. I understand that my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury proposes, in the event of the House accepting his Motion, to re-commit the Bill, in order that the clause which he proposes to insert may be introduced in Committee of the Whole House now, and after that is done, he further proposes to ask leave of the House to re-instate the Bill in the position in which it now is. That being so, I presume that the hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave) will be in a position to offer the observations he wishes to make later on, and I propose to reserve anything I desire to say in regard to the merits of the Bill until that stage is reached. At the same time, I feel that I am bound to point out to the House the extraordinary inconvenience of the unusual course which has been taken by the Post Office authorities in this matter. It is really almost playing with the Forms of Parliament when a Public Department before which a Bill of this sort has been throughout the whole of its career, only deems it necessary to object to the measure at the very last, or almost the very last, stage in its progress—namely, when it is proposed to read it the third time. The Bill has already passed through the other House of Parliament; it was brought down here, read a second time, committed and debated on the Motion for considering the Report of the Select Committee, and yet the Post Office authorities never thought proper to move in the matter until the Bill comes before us for third reading. I know it will be said that they inserted a clause in the Bill in its passage through the House of Lords, and that that clause has since been struck out by the Committee of the House of Commons. But the hon. Member for Barnstaple has told us that the Committee struck it out because they thought that it unduly enlarged the powers of the Post Office. Anyone who is familiar with the course taken by the Post Office in regard to Private Bill legislation will confirm that remark of the hon. Member. The House will remember that in the course of last year, in no less than 30 or 40 Bills, it was proposed to introduce unusual and extraordinary powers affecting the Post Office, and the powers of the Postmaster General; because the Government, at great expense to suitors to this House, thought it necessary to insert clauses in Private Bills instead of dealing with the matter in a general public measure. I agree, therefore, with the hon. Member for Barnstaple and the Committee upstairs that it was not necessary, in this Bill, to give increased and undue powers to the Post Office. I think the House should be careful as to allowing particular Departments of the Executive Government to override the general legislation. I have not the slightest wish on this occasion to oppose the Motion of my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury, and I do not, for one moment, wish to impute to him that he is in any way concerned in the matter. I believe it was only in the course of this morning that the matter was brought under his notice, and he has taken the earliest opportunity of calling attention to it. But I do think the House would do well to note the course which is taken on the part of the Post Office; and although I do not oppose the Motion of the Secretary to the Treasury, and see no objection to this clause being introduced in the Bill if the House thinks proper to do so, yet I have considered it my duty, as guardian in some degree of the interests of suitors to this House, to make these observations.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY thought the remarks which had been made in regard to the Post Office should not be passed by without notice. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government that, as on repeated occasions, Select Committees of that House had investigated the condition of most of the Public Departments—the Admiralty, the War Office, and other Departments—there was no Department that would be so much benefited by a thorough overhauling as the Post Office. He would, therefore, ask the Government whether, during the Recess, they would not consider the question of appointing a Special Committee, or a Royal Commission, to inquire into the whole management and condition of the Post Office administration? If that was done, he was sure the House would be astonished at the things done by the Post Office, and the public would be greatly benefited in the way of economy by a thorough overhauling of that Department.

Mr. J. COWEN said, the clause it was proposed to insert in the Bill might or might not be judicious or desirable. With this he had nothing to do. All he had to say was that hon. Members who had not had the advantage of being Members of the Committee—and were not, therefore, so familiar with the advantages of the Bill as the hon. Member for Barnstaple—knew nothing of the nature of the clause, or how it would affect the measure. He thought that the clause, or a draft of it, ought to be submitted to the House before they proceeded further. To ask them to recommit the Bill without having the clause before them would be decidedly wrong.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: If the House will give me its indulgence for a moment, I should like to say a word or two after what has been said by my hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means (Mr. Raikes). I think I am bound to enter a protest on the part of the Post Office against the remarks which have fallen from him, and in defence of their conduct in the matter, I may say that the Post Office did take every possible precaution, in order to carry out what I am asking the House to carry out now—namely, to protect the rights conferred upon them by the 28 & 29 *Vict.* In order to prevent the risk of this Act being set aside, they introduced a clause in the Bill when it was before the Committee in "another place." That clause was struck out by a Committee of this House; and, as I have stated already to the House, the Post Office have endeavoured, if possible, to meet the views expressed by the Committee. They were disposed, if it were possible, to assent to the omission of the clause altogether; but, on further consideration of the case, it was held by the legal advisers of the Post Office, consulting with the Legal Advisers of the Crown, that it would be necessary to retain the 12th section of the Act 28 & 29 *Vict.*, which confers certain privileges upon the Post Office. I believe I stated what the effect of this section was when the hon. Member for Newcastle was not in the House. The object of the clause now proposed is to provide and make certain that nothing in the Act shall interfere with the Post Office Extension Act of 1865—the 28 & 29 *Vict.*—in regard to the imposition of tithes rates as well as poor and other rates. That section gives certain powers and certain exemptions to the Post Office, and all I ask is that those powers and those exemptions shall be retained, notwithstanding the passing of this Bill. This being the object of the clause, it was found necessary that the re-committal of the Bill should be moved before it could be inserted. I confess that I have made the proposition with very great regret at so late a stage of the Bill; but my attention was only called to the matter late last night, and I endeavoured at once to meet the difficulty as far as I could. In the interests of the Post Office it is absolutely necessary to make this proposal, and I believe there is no objection on the part of the promoters to assent to it. I may add that the Post Office authorities have done all they could in "another place," and in all the stages of the Bill to guard the interests of the Crown property.

Mr. E. JENKINS suggested that the best course would be to re-commit the Bill and print the clause before proceeding further with the measure.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of a new Clause."

Mr. E. JENKINS begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: I hope the hon. Member for Dundee will not adopt that course. I have endeavoured, as clearly as I can, to explain to the House the object of this clause, and I have pointed out to the House what is the object of the action which the Government have been forced to take. I feel bound, in the interest of the Post Office, and in order to prevent inconvenience, to ask the House to allow this clause to take the course I have suggested. The words of the clause are—

> "Nothing in this Act shall repeal or alter any of the provisions of the Post Office Extension Act of 1865, and Section 12 of that Act shall be read as if the words 'tithes rates' had been inserted in that section."

The words used in the section are "poor or any other rates," and my proposition is that tithes rates should be included.

MR. W. E. FORSTER asked whether this new clause would in any way affect the general question of the opposition to the Bill? It must be borne in mind that, only a few nights ago, opposition was raised to the measure by his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll). He was not aware that the re-committal of the Bill would re-open the question raised on a previous occasion, and therefore he asked for information, because he did not think that the decision they came to the other day should be altered by a clause which they had had no time to consider.

MR. T. CAVE remarked, that while the House was entitled to look carefully at a clause of this importance, especially after attention had specially been drawn to it by the Chairman of Ways and Means, still he was bound to say he thought the clause was not unsatisfactory as it was now introduced by the hon. Member the Secretary to the Treasury. The Post Office had distinctly abandoned the claim for new powers which was put forward in the clause as originally proposed. Having, therefore, abandoned the ground which the Committee thought they improperly took up by trying, *sub rosa*, to get powers which they did not enjoy under the 28 & 29 *Vict.*, he saw no objection to the insertion of the clause which it was now proposed to substitute.

MR. SPEAKER: Did I understand that the hon. Member for Dundee moved the adjournment of the debate?

MR. E. JENKINS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Member second this Motion?

MR. PLIMSOLL: I beg to second it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

MR. RAIKES: I hope the hon. Member for Dundee will not persist in the course he has now proposed. The clause proposed on behalf of the Treasury is, in reality, only a Government clause, and it is not open to the same objection that applied to the clause which has been struck out by the Committee upon the Bill. That being so, I think it would be inconvenient, at this period of the Session, and at this stage of the Bill, to protract unnecessarily the consideration of the measure. I think the best course would be to re-commit the Bill, and insert the clause; and then, if the hon. Member for Derby, or any other hon. Member who takes an interest in the question, thinks it desirable to adjourn the stage of the third reading, that would be a very proper course to take. It will be a very difficult matter to resume the debate if an adjournment takes place as proposed by the hon. Member for Dundee. I hope, therefore, the hon. Member will not press the Motion he has made; but when the next stage is taken, if no objection is made to proceeding further with the Bill now, I think the House of Commons would agree, under the circumstances, with the propriety of postponing it.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, he was about to say very much of what had been said by his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means—namely, that it would be undesirable at that particular moment to adjourn the debate, especially as there were other stages of the Bill upon which a discussion might be raised. He quite agreed with the remark that had been made, that it was a very bad precedent to have new clauses sprung upon the House upon the third reading of the Bill. The hon. Member for Barnstaple opposed the Bill upon other grounds, and the grounds of his opposition might be discussed on the third reading, by which time the Bill would have been reprinted, and the clause would be before the House. At present, they knew nothing about it. He would suggest that his hon. Friend the Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) should allow the clause to be added to the Bill; but on the proposition for reading the Bill the third time, there should be a reasonable delay, in accordance with the Forms of the House.

MR. DILLWYN thought there was a great deal of force in the arguments which had been brought forward by his hon. Friend the Chairman of Committees against the course pursued by the Post Office. The matter was one of very great importance, and had great weight in his mind, so much so that he could scarcely follow the hon. Gentleman in his proposal to permit the Post Office to revise that clause. He entirely demurred to the establishment of a precedent that they should allow clauses of great importance like this to be sprung upon them without any notice at all. The clause was of very great importance indeed. This was plain, although they had barely an opportunity of seeing it. It appeared to him that it involved the principle of exempting the Post Office from the payment of rates, and it would be a most dangerous precedent, and might involve them in extreme difficulty in the future, if they allowed, without contest, new clauses to be sprung upon them in this way without ample time to consider their effect. He could not, therefore, agree with the proposition that they should at once re-commit the Bill, and insert the clause. He thought they ought to have time carefully to consider the clause before they passed it.

Sir SYDNEY WATERLOW trusted the House would not allow the progress of the Bill to be stopped. The clause proposed to them by the Government was a very simple one, and one to which neither the promoters themselves, nor those who opposed the Bill, could possibly object. What did it amount to? It amounted to this—that nothing in the Bill should in any way repeal the powers already given to the Post Office under a certain Act of Parliament which the Secretary to the Treasury quoted. It could not be supposed for a moment that the House would desire or attempt to interfere with the rights and powers of the Post Office. He believed that the power affected by the Bill as it stood was that conferred upon the Post Office with regard to rates generally, the right being given to not being assessed at a greater amount than the amount at which it was assessed before the new building was erected. He believed it was intended by the promoters of the Bill that the Post Office should not be so assessed, and, therefore, the promoters would not object to the insertion of this clause, and he could not suppose that the opponents of the Bill would. He ventured to think that the House would agree with him that they ought not, at this period of the Session, to obstruct the progress of a Private Bill, but that they would permit it now to make some progress. The merits of the Bill were fully debated the other day.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that if the clause were merely to provide that the Bill should not interfere with the general Statute affecting the Post Office, no Member in that House would feel inclined to oppose it in any way; but, as well as he could gather from the Secretary to the Treasury, the end of this clause contained other matter than a mere Government clause. If his ears did not deceive him, the end of the clause contained matter quite different from an exemption of the Post Office from the operation of the Bill. He thought there was something about church rates towards the end of the clause, as it was read by the hon. Member the Secretary to the Treasury.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *re-committed* in respect of a new Clause.

On Question, "That the Clause be read a second time?"

Mr. MUNTZ protested against the mode in which it was attempted, without Notice, to introduce the clause. He thought it was establishing a very bad precedent. There might be many Members who were opposed to the clause, but who would have had no opportunity of knowing that it was to come on.

Clause read a second time, and *added* to the Bill.

Sir CHARLES FORSTER wished to state, on behalf of the promoters, that he acquiesced in the suggestion that the third reading of the Bill should be taken to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to point out to the House that the next stage of the Bill is the consideration of it as amended, and after that there will be the third reading. Upon both of these stages the pleasure of the House can be taken, and therefore the hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave) will have two opportunities of bringing forward his Resolution.

Bill *reported,* with a further Amendment; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

## *QUESTIONS.*

### PRISONS ACT, 1877—THE NEW RULES.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether, under the new prison rules, persons in prison for the non-payment of fines or of breaches of municipal regulations, equally with graver offenders, are compelled to strip off all clothing except their shirts, and to put their clothes outside the cell, and then to lie on a deal board as a bed for the night, covered only with the prison blanket and rug; whether women and children are also subjected to this treatment; whether the Government has received remonstrances upon the subject from persons called upon to administer justice in Ireland; and, especially, whether the Chief Baron has not absolutely refused to send women to prison, except under extreme circumstances, while such regulations exist; and, whether the Government will forthwith revert to the use of beds and hammocks in Irish prisons?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Sir, no remonstrances upon this subject have been addressed to the Government; but my attention has been called to the remarks recently made by the Lord Chief Baron and Baron Dowse. As to children, I find that they have never been subjected to the operation of the rule respecting plank-beds. With regard to women, some modification of the application of this rule in now under consideration, and I may mention that a suggestion made the other day by the hon. Member himself with reference to an alteration in the arrangement of the plank will not be lost sight of. [Mr. Mitchell Henry: What suggestion?] I refer to a suggestion thrown out by the hon. Gentleman in this House when asking a Question a few days ago, to the effect that an indentation might be made in the plank, which will be considered before a decision is come to upon the subject. In all cases the utmost attention is paid to medical grounds for exemption. It is not the case that prisoners are compelled to strip off their clothes and put them outside their cells. An adequate supply of bed clothing is, as I stated the other day, invariably supplied.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to say, whether prisoners are stripped to their shirts and compelled to sleep on the bare boards? That is a Question to which I have failed to obtain a direct reply from the Treasury Bench.

Mr. J. LOWTHER: I say it is not the case. They are not compelled to strip off their clothes and leave them outside their cells. There is a night shirt and a pillow, and an adequate supply of bed-clothes served out to every prisoner.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY gave Notice that early next Session he would move for a Select Committee to inquire into the effect of the new Prison Rules, which appeared to have increased the harshness of our prison discipline.

### CHINA—THE CHEFOO TREATY.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHITWELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can inform the House before the Recess that Her Majesty's Government will secure the confirmation of the Chefoo Treaty?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, the Chefoo Treaty, as the House is aware, has been for some time before both the India Office and the Foreign Office, and considerable negotiations have been going on between the Foreign Office and the Government of India. I am not in a position, nor is the Secretary of State in a position, to state whether it will be possible to ratify the Treaty before the termination of the Session; but the matter has received the attention of both Secretaries of State, and there will be no unnecessary delay in the ratification of the Treaty.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### PARLIAMENT—ORDER—DISORDERLY CONDUCT OF A MEMBER.

The Order for Consideration of Major O'Gorman's conduct towards the Chair having been read,

Mr. O'SULLIVAN rose and said: Before this Order of the Day is proceeded with, I beg leave to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments with regard to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Waterford. I beg leave to ask that he may be allowed to come before the House for the purpose of explaining his conduct of last evening. I can assure you, Sir, that there is no hon. Member of this House who would be less desirous than my hon. and gallant Friend to show disrespect to this House, or to disobey the ruling of the Chair. I will not do more than ask the House to allow my hon. and gallant Friend to come before it, and explain his conduct.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am sure that the course proposed by the hon. Member for Limerick is one that the House will gladly agree to; and if, as I gather from the remarks of the hon. Member, it is possible that the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford will make a statement that will be satisfactory to the House, I am sure that the House will be very glad to hear him.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford be called in? [*Loud cries of* "Hear, hear!"]

The Serjeant-at-Arms was accordingly directed by Mr. Speaker to acquaint Major O'Gorman, That he had permission to return to his place. Who, having returned to the House, and taken his seat, being called upon by Mr. Speaker, rose and said: Mr. Speaker, Sir—I beg leave to submit myself to you and to this honourable House, and to express my deep regret at the occurrence which took place last night, and I hope that you and this honourable House will accept my apology. I trust that I may be allowed to add, Sir, that I acted under the influence of the greatest possible exasperation. That, however, is not now the question, and all that I have to do is to offer to you and this honourable House the expression of my deepest regret for what took place last night.

MR. SPEAKER: The House has now heard the statement and apology of the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford. If it should be the wish of the House to proceed no further in the matter, it would be an agreeable duty on my part to declare the will of the House in favour of indulgence. The House may be assured that, while jealous for the character of this House, and determined so far as lies in my power to maintain order in debate, it is with great reluctance that I have put in force the authority of the Chair, as I felt bound to do upon this occasion.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, the House will, I am convinced, upon all occasions be ready to support the authority of its Speaker, and I am quite sure I shall carry with me the sentiments of every hon. Member of this House when I say that we feel that you, Sir, always exercise the authority reposed in you with the greatest possible consideration towards hon. Members. I gather from what has fallen from you, Sir, that you take the view which I own I myself take—and which, I believe, is shared by the House—that the expression of regret which has been so frankly tendered by the hon. and gallant Member towards yourself and towards the House is of a satisfactory character, and will enable us to dispense with any further proceedings — which must necessarily have been most unpleasant to us all. I therefore beg, with your permission and that of the House, to move that this Order of the Day and the next be discharged.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I will not add anything to what has been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, beyond saying that nothing, in my opinion, could be more frank, more satisfactory, and more ample than the apology which has been tendered to you, Sir, and to the House, by the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford. Every hon. Member in this House will, I am sure, feel great pleasure in agreeing to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman.

Then, the House consenting that the said Order of the Day should be discharged, it was——

*Ordered*, That the said Order be discharged.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*Ordered*, That the Order for the attendance of Major O'Gorman in his place be read and discharged.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

The entry of this discussion upon the Votes is as follows:—

Major O'Gorman,—The Order for Consideration of his conduct towards the Chair having been read;

The honourable Member for Limerick County rose, and said that he had been requested by Major O'Gorman to ask leave of the House that he might be allowed to submit a statement and apology for his conduct to the House;

Leave being given, the Serjeant was directed by Mr. Speaker to acquaint Major O'Gorman, That he had permission to return to his place:—Then Major O'Gorman returned to his place, and offered to the House and to the Chair the expression of his deepest regret for what took place last night, and submitted himself to the favourable judgment of the House:—

Whereupon Mr. Speaker addressed the House as follows:—

"The House has now heard the statement and apology of Major O'Gorman.

If it should be the wish of the House to proceed no further in the matter, it would be an agreeable duty on my part to declare the will of the House in favour of indulgence.

The House may be assured that, while jealous for the character of this House, and determined so far as lies in my power to maintain order in debate, it is with great reluctance that I have put in force the authority of the Chair as I felt bound to do upon this occasion."

Then the House after considering the apology of Major O'Gorman, and, in consequence of what Mr. Speaker had said, consented that the said Order of the Day should be discharged.

*Ordered*, That the said Order be discharged.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*Ordered*, That the Order for the attendance of Major O'Gorman in his place be read and discharged.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

## CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

### RESOLUTION.

MR. DILLWYN, in rising to move—

"That, in order to facilitate the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates, it is desirable that a Select Committee should be appointed at the commencement of each Session of Parliament to go through the details of such Estimates, and report generally upon those particulars which may appear most to demand the attention of the House,"

said, that year by year the House was finding its grasp upon the public purse becoming more feeble, whilst the Public Expenditure was assuming very large proportions, and was constantly and alarmingly on the increase. In 1857-8 the Army and Navy Expenditure amounted to £22,546,000, while this year, it was no less than £26,586,000. The increase in the Civil Service Expenditure was still more startling. In 1857 it was £14,340,000, and this year it had increased to £23,400,000. The total increase in the expenditure of the country during this period amounted to £13,100,000. Under the present system of conducting the Business of the House, the opportunities of discussing the Estimates were rapidly becoming fewer, and the control of expenditure more and more in the hands of the Government and not of the House. It was not creditable to the House of Commons, composed as it was of so many men of business, that they did not make better provision for inquiring into the details of the expenditure of the country. He had no doubt that the Estimates were all right; but it was the duty of the House of Commons not to take that for granted. The Estimates did not receive that full consideration which they ought to have, and he had noticed as recently as that morning that, during the small hours, a number of items which it had not been expected would come forward so soon had been "hustled" through Committee. He was much interested in some of those items; but though he had returned to town specially to take part in discussing them, he was too late to do so. He was told that the House would be prorogued on Saturday week next, and there was still a great deal of Business to be done. The consequence would be that Business of an important character would be hurried through without any discussion. The hon. Gentleman was about to refer to the Resolutions which had been passed by the Select Committee on Public Business, when——

MR. SPEAKER ruled that as those Resolutions were not at present before the House, the hon. Member would not be in Order in discussing them in connection with the Resolution which he had moved.

MR. DILLWYN said, he would bow to the opinion of the Chair, and merely say that he hoped the House would agree with him as to the evil which existed and the remedy which ought to be applied. The Committee he would propose must not be a Government or a Political Committee in any sense, but on the Committee there should be a Representative of the Treasury Bench and a Representative of the front Opposition Bench. The other Members should be selected from both sides of the House, regard being had to the qualifications of hon. Gentlemen for dealing with the important financial questions which would be involved. He did not think the Report of the Committee should be a very voluminous one, but he thought no class of Votes should be taken in the Committee of the House until the Report on that class had been before the House for several days. He never remembered any year in which there had been so much difficulty in obtaining explanations as to the Votes as this year. He knew the difficulties the Government had had to contend with, and, therefore, did not blame them on that score; but he thought it demonstrated how great an assistance such a Committee as he proposed would be to the Government and the House.

MR. RYLANDS, in seconding the Motion, said: It is not my intention to occupy much time in supporting the views of my hon. Friend, as he has laid them fully before us; but I am bound to say that as the Session approaches its close, the manner in which the Estimates are taken is such as to produce an absolute public scandal. I do not want to express myself in unreasonable terms in reference to the course the Government have taken; but I do feel humiliated as a Member of this House, and representing a large number of electors deeply interested in the Public Expenditure, when I consider that under the condition in which the Estimates have been laid on the Table for consideration, I am utterly powerless to criticize, to check, or control the expenditure, however unnecessary and wasteful, in my judgment, it may be. Between 1 and 3 o'clock this morning several millions of money—I believe I am correct when I say between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000 came before the House—and I venture to assert that the way in which the House dealt with these heavy items of expenditure was an utter farce. Not the slightest practical consideration was given to them; and so far as the House of Commons is concerned, the Government might as well be intrusted with the utmost control over the expenditure, for they would then have had that responsibility which is always urged against any such proposal as we have now before us, and we in the House would be free. I am bound to say, after what has been said, that the Government were entirely justified in proceeding this morning. I quite understood—and I think it was generally understood—that the Government intended to bring on the Civil Service Estimates last night. I am bound to admit that at 1 o'clock I had the honour of a conversation with the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury upon the Business to be brought forward, and it was understood from his statement that, while the Supplementary Army Estimate would be postponed until to-day, the ordinary Army Estimates, and as many of the Civil Service Estimates as could possibly be taken, would be proceeded with, though the House was sitting late. It is only right to say this in justification of the course taken, and I daresay if any of us had shown any opposition to that course, the Secretary to the Treasury would not have pressed it. But it is impossible at this time of the Session to stand in the way of the Estimates by claiming from the Government sufficient time for the consideration of them. Already a great many hon. Members of the House have left London, and those who remain are wishing to get away as soon as possible—so that those who prolong discussion on the Estimates are considered very disagreeable characters indeed. In seconding this Motion, I must guard myself thus far—that I am not quite sure whether the terms of the Motion offer the best arrangement under which the preliminary examination of the Estimates could be advantageously conducted; but I must call the attention of the Government to this fact—that we are, perhaps, the only Legislature in the world where a Committee is not appointed for bringing under consideration the proposals for expenditure introduced by the Government. You have such a Committee in the Assemblies of France, Italy, Belgium; and in all parts of the world you will find that the Representatives of the people do retain in their hands the means of controlling the expenditure, and do exercise it by means of a Select Committee. I am quite aware that the Government will say that we shall diminish the responsibility of the Government in regard to the Estimates; but you must make your choice between two courses—either you must diminish the responsibility of the Government, or you must remove responsibility from the Representatives of the nation. Of course, the House of Commons is responsible for the expenditure, and, therefore, it ought to have effectual means of controlling expenditure; but it has no such control at the present moment. We do not, in proposing to give this means of control, wish to lessen the responsibility of the Government; but we wish to strengthen their hands in resisting the constant pressure brought to bear upon them by the permanent officials of the Crown. The House and country should know that it is not the political servants of the Crown, who occupy the front Bench opposite, who have the greatest control over the expenditure of the country; but it is that large permanent class of officials who are always in office, no matter whether this or that political Party commands the majority in the House, who, in every Department of the State, remain in office, and being fully informed upon all details, are relied upon by the temporary officials for a large amount of guidance and instruction. You have this great permanent class of officials, with interests directly opposed to other classes—with an interest to promote the spending of the public money by the increase of appointments, rapid promotion, and increased amounts of superannuation, so that they may have the full advantage of the position they occupy as servants of the Crown. I venture to say it is this influence of the spending servants of the Crown that puts pressure upon the heads of Departments to extend the operation of Departments, and to enlarge Government administration. It is to this important class that we, I believe, far more than to any political Party, on one side or the other, are indebted for the increase in the burden of taxation and expenditure continually going on. I know the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and every Gentleman who has had experience in the Treasury, must be acquainted with the fact that one of the greatest duties of the Treasury is to keep down the claims of the different official heads of Departments. I know that it was so in the last Government. I cannot say that I was intimately connected with that Government, but I was associated with many Members of the late Government, and I had abundant opportunity of knowing the persistent pressure put on the Government, with the view of increasing this or that branch of expenditure, and I think the present Secretary to the Treasury will assent, when I say that pressure is still going on under the present Government. I know perfectly well it is a disagreeable thing to resist that pressure. Perhaps there is some permanent official who is a very clever, very useful, and most agreeable fellow, having at his command a great amount of information, and he goes to his political Chief and presses upon him some extension or alteration in the administration of the Department. The political Head, influenced by the ability and agreeable manners of the permanent servant of the Crown, very likely thinks the proposal submitted is one calculated to promote the Public Service. He then goes to the Treasury to ask their consent to the change proposed, and we know what hard work it is for the Treasury to resist this constant pressure in all directions. We are not by any means bound to the words of this Motion; but I do venture to urge on the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he should seriously consider whether he cannot adopt some scheme of the kind in practice among other nations, by which, while by no means releasing the Government from its responsibility, we should, at all events, have the advantage of placing the Estimates under such sifting supervision that it would enable the Treasury to rest, to some extent, on that criticism by the House, as an additional reason for resisting the pressure of Departments for increasing expenditure. In pressing the matter, I have no political considerations; for I know perfectly well, whichever Party is in power, there is always this tendency to increased expenditure, and I am perfectly alive to the fact that every year these permanent officials get more and more influence over the political officials. Anyone can see what I can see, with my short Parliamentary experience, what is the consequent effect on the expenditure of the country. Administrative questions, formerly referred to Select Committees, are now referred to Departmental Committees, and as these are mainly composed of men occupying important permanent posts under the Crown, the tendency is to shut out Parliamentary control, and keep the House in ignorance of administrative matters, giving to these officials an opportunity of recommending changes which do not promote the interests of any but those recommending them, and add to the weight of taxation continually being piled on our shoulders. I venture to say that this constantly increasing expenditure is to the Government of the country a serious political danger. I believe that in the course the Government are taking in enlarging official administration, now in one direction, now in another, under the influence of those permanent officials, who believe they can control local administration better than the people concerned, that the disposition of the Government to enlarge the control of Departments will add to the great sum total of the national expenditure; and, unless some serious step is taken to keep down that expenditure, and to get rid of scandals known to exist from the fact that large sums of public money are paid to men whose public services do not entitle them to it, and unless something is done to deal with the superannuations which every year are becoming more monstrous in extent, I believe the time will come when, under some great public pressure —some state of public distress and dissatisfaction—strong and serious dangers will arise from the scale of expenditure in this country going on from year to year, increasing apparently without check, and with every addition to that expenditure casting an additional burden upon the shoulders of the people of this country.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in order to facilitate the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates, it is desirable that a Select Committee should be appointed at the commencement of each Session of Parliament, to go through the details of such Estimates, and report generally upon those particulars which may appear most to demand the attention of the House,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the proposal which the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) had made was, no doubt, one of considerable importance. In one form or another, it had been brought under the attention of the House from time to time. He quite admitted that the Motion was worthy of consideration, though he did not think that the House would do well to adopt it. Two wholly different questions had been raised—first, how best to facilitate the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates; and, secondly, how best to prevent obstruction, and enable the House to get through its Business. With regard to the first point, he doubted whether the appointment of a Select Committee of this sort would be advantageous. It would to some extent diminish the responsibility of the Government, by throwing upon the Committee the unpleasant burden of criticizing, objecting to, and keeping down the proposals of the different Departments. He thought a permanent Department of the Government, having the advantages which the Treasury possessed of Executive experience and knowledge, was better qualified really to deal on system with the proposals of the other Departments than any Committee which could be appointed for the purpose. What was to be the function of that Committee? Was it to supersede, or to be in addition to, the work of the House? He thought there would be great jealousy of 20 or 30 Members of a Committee sitting upstairs, deciding that there was no necessity to raise questions upon nine-tenths of the Votes, and that only one-tenth of them need be discussed. On the other hand, if the Committee was not to supersede, or to be in addition to, the labours of the House, he very much doubted whether they would gain much in point of time. The points to which the Committee would draw attention would raise discussions. Under all the circumstances, having given a good deal of consideration to the subject, he did not think that it would be the best plan of dealing with these Estimates to refer them to a Committee upstairs. What he did think was that it was desirable that the Committee of the Whole House should deal with the Estimates more thoroughly and fully than they were able to do sometimes under the present arrangements. There had been every desire on the part of successive Governments to give the House full information on the matters that were submitted to it, and, at the same time, to do all in their power to arrange the Business so as to obtain a fair discussion; but they had been met with a variety of obstacles. Indeed, it really became a matter in which they had to make a choice of difficulties. If the principle was to be maintained of having discussion on all occasions before the Speaker left the Chair, in order to go into Committee on the Estimates, it was very difficult indeed to secure that the Estimates should be fairly and properly discussed. Nobody wished for a moment to restrain or fetter the exercise of that right, which was one of the fundamental and cardinal rights and principles of the House, of bringing forward questions of grievance; but, at the same time, a great deal of inconvenience arose from the attempt which was sometimes made to combine two things which were incompatible. An instance was furnished by the position in which the House was placed at that moment, when Members, having come down to discuss important Supplementary Estimates, found a list of some 20 Notices of Amendments on the Motion for going into Committee of Supply without knowing which, if any, of them would be proceeded with. In that way it often became necessary to put off discussion, or to prevent full and fair discussion of the Estimates. As to obstruction, he might alter and apply to the hon. Member (Mr. Dillwyn) a well-known quotation, and say that he—

> "Vowing men should ne'er obstruct, obstructed;"

for he delivered a long and somewhat rambling speech upon a great number of topics, which, if now properly considered, would fill up a great part of the afternoon, and either render it necessary to put off the discussion of the Estimates, or prevent their full and fair consideration. He had never himself taken any very strong line with regard to obstruction. What he complained of much more than he did of obstruction was digression—digression not indulged in for the sake of obstruction, but really producing the effect which it was desired to avoid. As to the proceedings of this Session, it was certainly true that a good many of the Estimates had remained till a very late period. In consequence of the appointment of the Committee on Public Business, the Government did not this year ask for one clear day in the week for going into the Estimates, though this would have materially facilitated Supply. If, however, he went into all the reasons which made it difficult to get on earlier with Supply, he would be guilty of the same sin as he was protesting against. With regard to the Motion, he did not think that the strength of feeling in the House was such as to enable it to come to a decision upon it, and he therefore invited hon. Members to abstain from further discussion on the present occasion, and to go into Committee of Supply.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR was sorry that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not taken into his favourable consideration the proposal of the hon. Member for Swansea, which had been long on the Notice Paper. A Committee such as that suggested would be of great advantage. Under the French system, the Estimates were reduced to a form which we might with great benefit take as a model, and these Estimates were submitted to a Standing Committee for investigation, and for report to the full Chamber. So far from impeding or extending business, the Committee's inquiry actually lessened the discussions. The reason was obvious to all who examined the French Estimates—these were fully as extensive and varied in kinds of expenditure as were our own Estimates. But by looking into the arrangements and details, the facts became clear that the greater portion of the charges in the Estimates were legal and could not be challenged, unless the broad policy for which money was needed was also challenged. The result was that a few charges were alone left for objection, and thus the attention of the full Chamber was given to the items so objected to, leaving the vast mass of the items in the Estimates to be passed without challenge. The marked contrast between the English and French practice was that every item in our Estimates was liable to be challenged. The experienced Members could easily detect the useless challenges, and could see that by occupying the attention of the House the objectionable charges were left unnoticed. The foundation of all correct accounting rested on thoroughly good Estimates, and the hon. Member's proposal of a Committee was well calculated to insure good Estimates.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that he thoroughly sympathized with the object of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). The growth of the Civil Service Estimates was continuous, and alarming in more senses than as manifesting the mere growth of expenditure. Should the Motion now before the House be rejected, as he feared it might be, then the hon. Member for Swansea would do well to remember that it had been by independent action, and by means of an organization extraneous to the House, that the late Mr. Hume obtained a position in this House whereby he succeeded in largely controlling the Public Expenditure. Except by a laborious process of analysis, no one could compass the real position of the expenditure presented to the House in the form of the Civil Service Estimates. Mr. Hume established an office of his own; he employed several clerks, and so ably did he control this private establishment, that, by use of the information he thus obtained, he gained, after a time, such a weight in the House, as enabled him for many years largely to control the Public Expenditure. There was no reason that such an agency as Mr. Hume's should not be again established outside that House. The hon. Member for Swansea should look deeper into this matter, if he wished to arrive at the causes of this continual and exaggerated increase of the Civil Service Estimates. It was idle to expect that economical control could be effectively exercised over this increasing expenditure by Her Majesty's Ministers, who were either the temporary Chiefs, or subordinately connected for the time, during their tenure of Office, with the great Departments of the State. Her Majesty's Ministers were practically dependent upon these Departments for the information which they produced in that House, and upon which they acted. Under such circumstances, it was idle to expect those who had but a fleeting tenure of Office to exercise an efficient economical control over Departments, which consisted in the main of permanent officials, a body of public servants whose influence was continually growing. The House itself was largely accountable for the exaggerated expenditure included under the Civil Service Estimates. Session by Session, the House, largely by its legislation, contributed to the exaggeration of the Civil Service Estimates. The Session before last the House passed the Prisons Act, whereby it handed over the whole of the gaols to the Home Department, depriving, for this purpose, the local authorities of an enormous amount in the aggregate of patronage, and providing for a large addition to the Civil Service Expenditure. Again, this Session, the Bill for the Prevention of the Spread of Cattle Disease was sent to that House from the House of Lords in such form, that the slaughter of cattle at the ports would have been regulated directly by law. The House could not rest satisfied with that arrangement; it swept the whole of it away, and, in lieu of it, vested the Privy Council with very extensive discretionary powers, which were to be made dependent upon Reports to be obtained from agents abroad, and upon information to be continually supplied as to the condition of all the cattle landed at the outports of this country. This system entailed the employment of many additional agents, and, in consequence, must entail a large addition, as in the case of the Prisons Act, to the Civil Service Expenditure and Estimates. Thus largely and continuously down to the present day, the House went on providing by its legislation for the exaggerated increase of the Civil Service Estimates. High authorities—authorities whom he (Mr. Newdegate) highly respected—held that government by Commissions, which must be or become virtually irresponsible, was a bad form of government. The great Departments of the State, and especially the Civil Departments, were, each of them, under the action of the recent legislation to which he had referred, assuming the character of gigantic Commissions, and it appeared to him (Mr.

Newdegate) that unless that House adopted some means to concentrate its power for financial and economical purposes, such as the hon. Member for Swansea proposed, it would find itself virtually impotent to control the growth, increase, and application of the expenditure, to which the Civil Service Estimates were intended to provide an index; and that some such action on the part of the House as the hon. Member for Swansea now proposed, was more and more essential to the discharge of that primary economical duty, which the House, by its very constitution, owed to the country.

Mr. M'LAREN complained of the late period of the Session, and the late hours at which Estimates were taken. He would give an instance of how adversely this operated on national interests. On Monday last, nearly all the Scotch Estimates were taken at a very late hour. He remained there until between 1 and 2 o'clock, and counted the Scotch Members who were present at several periods during the evening, and found there were only seven present, out of the 60 which were elected by Scotland. What had become of the other 53? A large number had gone to Scotland, and were entitled to do so; because those Members that came from a great distance were put to far greater inconvenience than those that came from a short distance. They were entitled, therefore, to absent themselves at as early a period as possible. Again, the effect of the Estimates coming on so late was that few Members were able to go over them, and the Government were just left to control the whole expenditure themselves, without any influence being brought to bear upon them from the House. He did not make any personal grievance of the delay, because, during the long period he had been in Parliament, he had always, with one exception of a few days, remained until the House rose; but it was a great injustice to those who, from whatever cause, were not able to remain so long. Another ground of complaint was that, when questions of importance came on at 1, 2, and 3 o'clock in the morning, the public had no opportunity of knowing what took place, from there being no report of their proceedings published.

Sir ANDREW LUSK thought that if they dealt with their Business like business men, they could get through it well enough. If they adhered to the system of allowing every Member to ventilate every conceivable petty grievance of a beadle or a man in prison before going into Supply, they must expect to have a block of Business.

Mr. MELLOR supported the proposal of the hon. Member for Swansea.

Mr. J. COWEN said, he regretted the Government had not deemed it wise to assent to the suggestion of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). They had had a very considerable amount of talk in the House and out of it during the last Session about the obstruction that was offered to Public Business. He was satisfied that the appointment of a Finance Committee such as was now suggested would do more to further Public Business, and to prevent what was popularly termed obstruction, than any wire-drawn Resolutions such as the Committee that had been sitting upstairs had recently agreed to. Every nation in Europe—or, he might almost say, every civilized nation in the world that had a Constitutional Government—had a Finance Committee. This body acted, not necessarily in hostility to the Government of the day, but as a helpmate and assistant in one sense, and as a check to official extravagance in another. Not only so; but Town Councils, Boards of Guardians, and Railway Boards, all had Committees to which financial questions were referred, where the items of revenue and expenditure were examined in detail, and the action of the authorities was subjected to a much closer scrutiny than it could be before the whole Council or the whole Board. He could not conceive why the Government could object to such a course. They ought not to have—he supposed they had not—anything to conceal. But there were many payments, of a comparatively insignificant character, easily explained to a Committee, which, to explain minutely to the House, would occupy a large amount of time, and not be so effective. The discussions that took place in that Chamber in Committee of Supply were desultory and deceptive. A few Members persevered with the inquiry from time to time, and others just dropped in occasionally as the conversations were going on. The same speeches were made for and against the payment of certain amounts year after year. Time was wasted by these debates, and really no useful information was conveyed, either to Parliament, or to the country. During the period the present Ministry had been in Office, he did not believe the House, with all its talk, had reduced the Estimates by as much as 6*d*. During the five years the late Government were in Office, all the change made was in defeating a single item, of no importance, one Session, and replacing it in the Estimates the next. If a Committee was appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the entire Civil Expenditure, the Members of that Committee would gain information that they could convey to the House authoritatively. An expression of opinion by them upon any Vote would be sufficient to deter needless discussion, and prevent an unnecessary waste of time. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Swansea that the Government were, in a large measure, responsible for the backward condition of much of their Business. They introduced a whole lot of measures at the beginning of the Session; they carried them all on to certain stages, and then they stopped them. They renewed some and did not renew others. He had calculated the time lost in this way during the past Session, and he estimated that there had been fully 10 Sittings of eight hours each, or an aggregate of 80 hours, spent in debating Bills that were not persevered with. This time had been absolutely thrown away. If it had been given to the discussion of measures that were to be really pushed forward, the result would have been that at the end of the Session their labours would have been much more fruitful of useful legislation. The expenditure of this country was not only large, but was rapidly increasing. There was no necessity to get unnecessarily alarmed at this, because the expenditure of every nation in Europe was advancing also. Indeed, wherever a country was increasing in population and increasing in wealth, there would necessarily be an augmented expenditure. It was not the mere increase they had to look to, but the purpose for which the money had to be applied. It was not the amount to be voted, but the object for which it was to be spent, that ought to concern them. They would be unwise to fix a line, and then say everything below that line was economy, and everything above it was extravagance. What they were called upon to do—in this largely-increased national expenditure—was to see that the money was judiciously, economically, and wisely laid out. This the House, as it at present worked, could not do. If, however, there was a Committee appointed in the way suggested, it would certainly enable them to accomplish that end.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 64; Noes 46: Majority 18.— (Div. List, No. 251.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

## SUPPLY—ARMY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a further Supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,845,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for additional Expenditure for Army Services consequent upon the War between Russia and Turkey, and the Native outbreak in the Cape of Good Hope, &c., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879."

Mr. HAYTER rising, pursuant to Notice, to move that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £25,000, the charge for the erection of Huts in Cyprus, said, he had no wish, in proposing that reduction, to enter into a discussion of the larger political questions which the House had been engaged in debating during the previous week. The object he had chiefly in view was to call the attention of the Committee to the enormous increase which the Supplementary Estimate now under their consideration would cause upon the Military Estimates presented to Parliament in the ordinary manner. Even the ordinary Estimates of the Army for this year amounted to £14,965,000, whereas, for the year 1873-4—the last year that Lord Cardwell was at the War Office—the amount was only £13,231,000, thus showing an increase for this year of no less than £1,734,000. But in addition to the £14,965,000, it had been found necessary to provide a sum of £350,000 for pay and allowances for the Indian troops, and the Committee were now called on for a further sum of £1,845,000, or a total of £17,160,000. There might be a slight deduction from that amount, because of repayments from the ordinary Estimates; but that was so small a matter as to make little or no difference in the calculation. The real fact remained, that the country must make up its mind to expend this year a sum very closely approaching to £17,000,000 for military purposes. The military expenditure in India, also, was about £17,000,000, so that the aggregate expenditure on the Armies of the two countries amounted to no less than £34,000,000. The next point to which he wished to draw the attention of the Committee was that if we were to embark on the totally new policy of taking our Indian troops for Imperial purposes out of India, we should be doing not only a very mischievous thing, as regarded the military efficiency of our soldiers, but also adopting a course which would add very largely to the taxation of the ratepayers of the country. We should be reversing the policy of former times, in accordance with which we drew upon England as the reservoir for India, and making India the reservoir from which troops were to be taken for military service whenever they might be required. That, it seemed to him, was a most dangerous change to make. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that the troops which had been recently brought from India to Malta had been selected from all the three Presidencies—Bombay, Bengal, and Madras—and they included Cavalry and Artillery as well as Infantry. The adoption, then, of that course was tantamount to saying that if another emergency happened to arise, it was intended to use the entire strength of the Indian Army for Imperial purposes in Europe, or anywhere else, where their assistance might be wanted. ["Hear, hear!"] He was not surprised that hon. Gentlemen opposite should cheer any allusion to such a policy; but if they would refer to the Report of the Select Committee of 1869, they would perceive how important were the financial considerations connected with the use which they wished to see made of those Indian troops. It was the opinion of Lord Napier of Magdala himself that the use of them out of India would materially affect the question of the economy which their employment in India secured. If they were to fight side by side with European troops, there must be a very large increase in the cost of their food clothing, and medical attendance, not to speak of the necessity of providing for them those increased comforts in barracks which they would see enjoyed by their European comrades. Then arose the question whether the Indian troops were, in any sense, equal to the European as a military machine. Upon that point he did not wish to say much; but he must call attention to the fact that, with one unanimous consent, our military authorities had decided that no Colony could be left if it had guns to be manned, to be defended by Native troops only. More than that, it would be found that in all the great wars which had occurred in India, there had been a nucleus of Europeans to stimulate and encourage the Native soldiers. It had been so from the days of Plassey downwards; and the European troops had always been called upon to bear the brunt of the fight. At the battle of Plassey a single European regiment had laid the foundation of our military supremacy in India. At Meanee, one regiment, the 22nd, had borne the brunt of the day, and at Ferozeshah—the most desperate battle, perhaps, fought in India—50,000 fresh troops under Akbar Khan had retired without striking a blow, because their rear was threatened by English artillery. Next came the question of the relative pay of the officers and men of the two Armies, and he wished to point out to the Committee that the very lowest subalterns in one of those Native regiments was at the present moment receiving higher, or at any rate equal, pay with the senior officer of an English regiment — the officer, for instance, in command of the 42nd Highlanders. The evidence of His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, he might add, went distinctly and strongly to show that if the officers and men of the two Services were fighting side by side, it would be absolutely necessary to consider the whole question of their relative pay, and to place the officers of both—at least, approximately—on an equality in that respect. Then came the question of using Indian troops merely for garrison duty. The result of so employing them would, in his opinion, be to involve the country in a great expense; for it was undoubtedly the view of the ablest witnesses who had been examined before the Committee, to which he had referred, that they could not be called upon to serve in any of our Colonies for a longer period than three years. They might, of course, be forced to do so; but it was pointed out in the Report of the Committee that such was the desire of these men to return to their homes, that if they were kept away from them for any length of time, discontent would in all probability arise in their ranks, almost amounting to mutiny, and that our prospects with respect to recruiting in India would, in consequence, be seriously injured. The expense, also caused by the camp-followers, who invariably accompanied the Native troops, must be taken into account. On that point, the statistics of the Abyssinian War threw some light. He found from the draft Report of the Chairman of the Committee on Abyssinian Expenditure, that the number of Native troops employed by Lord Napier of Magdala in the Abyssinian Expedition was 15,000, and that they had brought with them an equal number of camp-followers, besides a number of animals. Of these baggage animals, no less a number than 28,673 died, and they cost this country the sum of £1,147,000. He would not go into the enormous expenses for transport incurred during the war, which amounted to no less than £4,000,000 including the hired vessels as well as those belonging to the Government. He trusted before we were again embarked upon such a policy as that, the country might know how far it was intended to carry it. The House ought to know from the right hon. and gallant Secretary of State for War how long it was intended to keep the Indian troops in Cyprus. They knew that those troops were an enormous expense to this country; because not following the precedent of former years—and, he believed, rightly departing from it—the whole of the expenses of these troops would be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. He rejoiced that such a course had been adopted, not only because it was just to India, but because it would now be made apparent to the country what this policy cost us. With regard to the Vote, he would ask if it was likely that any permanent expenditure would have to be made on barracks in Cyprus. He understood that these huts were to be made of a class of iron which he was informed on good authority would corrode with the night dews of the Mediterranean, and wear out very rapidly. Then there were to be metal roofs, which would, of course, get exceedingly hot during the nine months' hot season, with the probability of seriously affecting the health of the troops. He need not point out to the Committee that already an epidemic had broken out amongst the troops, and that many men were down with fever in one of the Indian regiments. He understood that the 42nd Highlanders were to be encamped on the highest parts of the Island, because it would hardly be permitted to treat them with neglect. But these were not the only expenses Cyprus was likely to cost England. A large sum would have to be spent before the roadsteads could be turned into harbours, and this must be done if we were going to hold the Island permanently. The House also knew that a large expense would be required for drainage and water supply. He would detain the Committee no longer. He would only say that the employment of the Indian troops was by no means an economical measure, because we obtained a very inferior article for a much greater expense. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £25,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a further Supplementary sum, not exceeding £1,820,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for additional Expenditure for Army Services consequent upon the War between Russia and Turkey, and the Native outbreak in the Cape of Good Hope, &c., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879."—(*Mr. Hayter.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Mr. Raikes, I will not intervene for more than a few minutes between the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War and the Committee. I think it is somewhat remarkable that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman should not have risen in the first instance, and have given some explanation of these Supplementary Estimates. As I understand the Vote was put from the Chair, and had it not been that my hon. and gallant Friend who has just addressed the Committee rose to make the observations which he has made, the Vote would have been passed without any explanations whatever. Sir, I can understand that the Government may not think it necessary upon this occasion to enter into any detailed explanations, or any further explanations, as to the policy of employing Indian troops in Europe. We have already passed Estimates which more or less sanctioned that employment, and I understand the Government do not think it necessary that any further explanation, in the absence of debate, should be given by them upon that point. But these are the first Estimates in which we have had before us any part of the expenses which have been incurred in connection with the military occupation of the Island of Cyprus, and I do think upon this occasion we have a right to expect from the Government that they should place the Committee in possession of all information which relates to it, and in reference to what has been done, and what is going to be done in Cyprus. Sir, I must admit that in the absence of explanation I am totally at a loss to know what has been the object of the military expedition which has taken place, and of troops being sent to Cyprus. I understood my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say last night that the ordinary garrison of Cyprus would be 2,000 men; but I believe 8,000 men have been sent there. What have 8,000 men been sent there for? What is there in the state of Cyprus, or in the state of our relations with any European Power in connection with Cyprus, which makes it necessary to send that large Force into Cyprus? Not only was such a course not necessary, but the country has been placed at a great disadvantage by such policy. To begin with, there is a very large expenditure for transport, and far more serious and important than that is the fact that a large number of men have been sent to an Island, as I understand, Sir, imperfectly provided with accommodation to receive them, and an Island the climate of which is not at all conducive to health. I think there is very serious reason to fear, unless we hear an explanation from the Government to the contrary upon the point, that very grave sickness may break out amongst the troops so hastily sent, and without any preparation whatever; and we have a right to expect from the Government some information as to the reasons which induced them to send these troops, and what preparations and precautions they have made for the preservation of health. Sir, it is said that the Indian troops were going to India, and that they would have already been sent but for the absence of transport, and for the difficulties of their being sent through the Red Sea at this time of year. If such orders have been sent out, I think the policy of the Government is still more incomprehensible. If these Indian troops are now sent from Cyprus to India, I think the question will arise, Why were they sent to Cyprus at all? It would not be, perhaps, altogether unreasonable to expect from the Government upon this occasion some explanation as to the permanent military expenditure which is likely to be involved by this occupation. Barracks, I presume, will have to be erected, military stores will have to be provided, and there will be all the other expense which is always connected with the military occupation of any possession. Perhaps, it is probable the Government will not be in a position to give us any full information upon those points. It is quite evident that the policy is one hastily adopted, and I should not be much surprised to find that neither the Admiralty nor the War Office are in a position to give any very accurate or detailed information upon the military or naval value of Cyprus, or as to the works and expenditure which will be necessary in order to make its advantages as valuable as possible. At all events, whether we are to have any explanation or not as to the permanent expenditure likely to be entailed upon the country by this occupation, I do think we have a right to know what were the reasons for this sudden and, as it appears to me, totally unnecessary expedition which has taken place, and what are the preparations and provisions which have been made against the outbreak of disease and sickness amongst those troops which have been so hastily sent.

Colonel STANLEY: I can assure the noble Lord that it was far from my intention to withhold any information from the Committee, or in any way to shrink from making a statement. The reason I acted as I have was this. The Motion of my hon. and gallant Friend

(Mr. Hayter) stood upon the Paper, and I thought it a matter of courtesy to him that he should have an opportunity of at once proceeding with his Motion. I may, perhaps, be out of Order in answering the queries of my hon. and gallant Friend. He has referred to the Indian troops, and I am bound to point out that there is nothing whatever abont the Indian troops in the Estimate which is before the Committee. But it is a small point, and, with the permission of the Committee, I will answer briefly the questions which my hon. and gallant Friend has asked me in respect to the Indian troops.

Mr. HAYTER: I beg my right hon. and gallant Friend's pardon, but there is a reference to the Indian troops in the Estimate.

Colonel STANLEY: Oh, yes; so there are a few small charges which have some connection with the Indian troops, but these escaped my notice. Now, with regard to these troops, my hon. and gallant Friend has spoken as if we contemplated using these troops habitually. I do not think from anything I have said, or anything any Member of the Government has said, it can have been taken for granted that the use of these troops would be under all circumstances habitual. The position we have taken is this. These troops were available, and as they had been used several times before, we thought, at the time we employed them, that the emergency was such as justified their employment. But I am bound to say I have carefully endeavoured to guard myself from ever implying that the use of these troops would be habitual; and, on the other hand, I have given a distinct explanation in a contrary direction. My hon. and gallant Friend has said a good deal as to the expense of these troops; but if he chooses to take that ground, I must say I am of opinion that, as a matter of fact, these troops, taken regiment for regiment, are of no greater expense than the British troops. I will merely state facts—I do not wish to enter into an argument one way or the other; but I make out, taking one establishment with another, it will be seen that the cost of a British regiment is not less than £40,000 a-year, and my decided impression is that regiments of Indian troops would cost, even under the circumstances in which they are now employed, decidedly less. Of course, I except transport charges. There is, no doubt, inconvenience, as was mentioned by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) in bringing officers to serve side by side at different rates of pay. But that arises in this way. We thought that the Indian troops, being entitled to their own rates of pay, should bring them with them; but, at the same time, we did not see, on the other hand, why European troops serving in the Colonies should receive a higher rate of pay merely because they were brought from India. Well, Sir, I do not think I ought to follow this subject more, and I would rather pass on at once to what I have to say with regard to the circumstances of the occupation of the Island of Cyprus. Now, I find myself in some difficulty, because the information I have at present is, as it must be, of a very tentative character. But I have, probably, as good a means of information as anyone can have. But one of the great difficulties is to ascertain precisely what the circumstances of the Island are. The circumstances under which the occupation of the Island took place, I suppose, I need hardly refer to. I will point out that when it was decided that the occupation should take place, a High Commissioner was appointed in the person of Sir Garnet Wolseley. He was chosen as High Commissioner and Administrator in the name of the Queen. Sir Garnet Wolseley, having had some similar experience as it were, took out with him, in the first instance, certain selected officers, well known to him, who had been employed under similar circumstances and other places; and who, by their administrative capacity and vigour, both of body and mind, were naturally considered to be the best to assist him in the very arduous task he has undertaken. The £10,000 mentioned in the Estimate, and of which I spoke the other day to my hon. and gallant Friend, include the Staff pay of these officers. Sir Garnet Wolseley is placed on the same footing as the Governor of Malta and Gibraltar, exercising the double capacity of Civil and Military Governor. He is assisted by those officers who draw their special service pay, amounting, in most cases, to £1 a-day. We have been askd why the charge for government is not larger; and, Sir, I believe if hon. Members had examined the facts carefully, they would have seen the reason for it. The fact is, the charges of the government and administration of the Island will, for the greater part, be paid out of the revenues of Turkey. The High Commissioner has very wisely, as I understand, decided not to disturb, more than he can help, the existing system of administration, at all events, until he is quite certain he has got something better to put in its place. What he has done, therefore—and I am sorry I cannot place the Correspondence before the House, but it is only from private letters I have received from officers —is to send an officer into each district of the Island to report to him, to act as a sort of Resident, and therefore bring the authority of the Island in direct communication with the Lord High Commissioner. He himself has occupied a seat of government at Nicosia, and the troops are distributed in various portions of the Island, the principal portion being in camp in the neighbourhood of Larnaca. I understand that they are in perfect health, and that there is an abundant supply of water. It has been often said there is no water at all in the Island. No doubt, as in all other countries in that part of the world, a certain amount of prudence and care were required, and above all, any unnecessary exposure must be avoided. Those who are there must also take all reasonable precautions against fever and malaria. The greater part of the Island is by no means unhealthy. There have been a few slight cases of fever; but I have had letters up to a week ago, and I have had a communication by telegraph since, and I am not aware that any deaths have occurred. Certainly no epidemic has been spoken of as general; though it has been stated that the weather is very hot, and care therefore is necessary. With regard to the troops going to the Island imperfectly equipped, as the noble Lord has said, I can only say——

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I did not say imperfectly equipped. I said they had gone without any preparation for their reception.

COLONEL STANLEY: I thought the noble Lord said imperfectly equipped. Well, we thought it was not expedient to make arrangements for these troops until, at all events, Sir Garnet Wolseley had had ample opportunity of inspecting the Island, to say where they should be distributed, and what arrangements should be made for them. The troops took their camp equipments with them, and I understand there has been no difficulty in their camping them at once in the stations which had been assigned to them. And I may here say that nothing I have seen in any paper leads me to think there is any difficulty in landing. A great deal has been said about the necessity of harbours and roadsteads, and a good many observations have been made as to the expenses which will be absolutely necessary. So far as I can understand it, there has been no difficulty in landing stores; and, although the Island does not possess a harbour, in the ordinary sense of the word, there is a considerable trade carried on there, and ships of large tonnage have good facilities for loading and unloading. Then we are asked why the Indian troops were not sent home at once, and how long they are to be kept in the Mediterranean? We are also asked why we sent them from Malta to Cyprus. With regard to the first question, as we hope, and believe, the emergency which induced us to bring them to Malta has passed, there appears to be no sufficient reason why we should keep them longer in the Mediterranean than is absolutely necessary. Accordingly, when the weather and the other conditions admit of their proceeding on their voyage, these troops will return to India. I am not sure that a few Cavalry horses will not be left behind; but, with that exception, I think we may take it for granted that the bulk of these troops will, in the course of a month or five weeks, be upon their homeward voyage. It may be a few days, more or less, on one side or another; but I cannot say exactly. We must wait for the transports and the weather, and we must trust the work to those who have practical experience, and who know exactly what means exist for the purpose. Then we have been asked, as I said before, why these troops were sent to Cyprus? In the first place, no particular object was to be served, in the long run, by keeping them at Malta; and, secondly, as they carried their camp equipage with them, they were as well placed at Cyprus as at Malta. More than all that, I must remind the Committee of what has been taking place elsewhere—that it is impossible to say, looking at the change of government, despite the fact of the flag of England has been very well received by the Cypriotes, it is not absolutely certain that there may not be a disturbing element in the population, the Government thought they would be acting judiciously in sending not only a sufficient, but an overpowering Force. In coming to that conclusion, it was agreed, also, that these Indian troops should not be broken up, but kept together, under the same commanders, as they had been before. We have been asked a great deal with regard to these expenses, and why we did not propose more expenditure as absolutely necessary? I may say that these Estimates are taken for Army Services. With regard to the Civil Service, there may be, later on, several works which it will be desirable to undertake; but, inasmuch as those have been carried on before, I apprehend the expense will fall rather as charges upon the administration of the Island. Those do not come under the Army charges. I do not see that they come, in any way, under that head; and, therefore, I have not thought necessary in the Supplementary to include them. With regard to the £25,000 for huts, so far as I am aware, hut accommodation can be provided for a somewhat less sum; but, as we know, there are always some incidental charges in connection with buildings of that sort, and I thought it advisable to take an Estimate of £15,000, which will cover the whole cost. I believe these huts will afford accommodation for 3,000 men, and they will afford sufficient protection for them until we are able to say what course will be taken, and how the Forces shall be distributed throughout the Island. As far as I understand, there are existing on the Island buildings which, when properly put in order, may be very properly applied for the purposes of barracks for the troops; but, at the present time, they are not so available, and the medical authorities are not satisfied about the sanitary state of some of the buildings, and we would not put men where it was known to be unhealthy. Therefore, we think they had better have huts, where they can easily be disposed of, and where they are still within reach of those who may require their services. With regard to the Force it may be ultimately necessary to maintain there, I would ask the Committee not to look upon Cyprus as they would upon Malta or Gibraltar—as a fortress — but as an Island, by no means barren in the way of natural defences. The permanent garrison of the place does not appear, as far as we can tell, to require to be of very great strength, and I should think if we left two European battalions, and, probably, a battery of Artillery there, they would prove sufficient for the internal police and ordinary administration of the Island. I have endeavoured, so far, to give the Committee a straightforward account of the information in our possession. It will be seen from it that the chief officers under Sir Garnet Wolseley are examining into all the circumstances of the district under their charge and are reporting to him. I trust very shortly to receive fuller information; but up to the present time the letters I have had only give the results of a few hours' labour, and before that full information can be given which must be obtained. So far as I understand, supplies are plentiful, and though, no doubt, some enterprizing persons have bought up, as a speculation, a good deal of house property with the idea that rents will be raised thereby, we are by no means in their power, and the provision which the Committee are now asked to make will have the advantage of enabling us to be independent—to ascertain clearly what the resources of the Island are, and how to utilize them best for the Public Service. I hope I have not taken up too much time. I have endeavoured to give the information I possess, and if occasion occurs for supplementing it, the Committee may rest assured I will take advantage of it.

Mr. T. CAVE said, there was one reason why he cordially supported the expenditure of £25,000 on huts. It had been his duty for many years to superintend the construction of railways in localities similar to the Island of Cyprus, and hence he thought he might be able to give a hint or two to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War as to the management of troops there. In the first place, he might say that persons from the mainland, if they worked during the summer months, suffered great mortality, and as heavy a death rate as 60 per cent had occurred in his experience; whereas if, during the four hot summer months, such workmen were re-conveyed to the mainland, they were able to bear the fatigue of the other eight months with only the ordinary disease and death. The course usually adopted in such climates by natives was that when exposed to the atmosphere before sunrise, or after sunset, at the moments when the transitions took place, they covered their heads, the result being that chill and resulting fever was much less frequent than would otherwise result. Above all, care should be taken that every man should be properly housed at nights, and it was on this ground that he supported the provision of huts for the troops. Any expense which might be occasioned thereby would be repaid by securing the health of officers and men; and in making such a provision he was sure the Government would be supported by the House and the country. Whenever the men he had employed were encamped, the leaders of the party took care that the encampment should not be near marshy or uncultivated ground, where the proportions of fever cases rapidly increased. The water he always took care should be pure and, if possible, filtered. The grapes of the Mediterranean Islands were abundant, and most nutritious; but he advised the Government to reduce, as far as possible, the supply of fermented and alcoholic liquors to the troops in Cyprus.

Mr. ONSLOW said, the officers who had gone to Cyprus had had great experience in India, and he knew no one who would better manage his men in a hot climate than Sir Garnet Wolseley. The House would recollect that Sir Garnet Wolseley had had practical experience in the handling of troops in every conceivable climate. He had looked carefully at the names of the Medical Staff who had been sent out, and he found that those who were chiefly responsible for the health of the troops had had much experience in hot climates, and he could not conceive it possible that they would recommend Sir Garnet Wolseley to encamp his men on marshy or apparently on unhealthy ground. At the same time, he hoped, as the House was soon to be prorogued, that his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War would give some assurance that all special Reports of Sir Garnet Wolseley should be laid before hon. Members during the Recess as soon as possible. He must express a hope that some law would be made for the close time for game, because he could not help thinking that it would be a very wise thing if the game of the Island was preserved. If something of the kind were not done, we should find the game in the Island would become exterminated, considering the number of sportsmen said to be on their way to our new acquisition. He might also say to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War that he hoped the Indian troops would not be hastily withdrawn from Cyprus. Whether it was true or not that the Russians were advancing on Affghanistan, it was a serious rumour, and no troops should be removed from Cyprus until the rumour was confirmed or denied. He agreed that when everything was settled down, two battalions of Infantry and a battery of Artillery would be sufficient to maintain the peace of the Island.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he felt much indebted to his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Bath (Mr. Hayter) for having brought the matter on. He had heard the few remarks of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War with some surprise. He had said he was sorry to detain the House; but he (Mr. W. E. Forster) should have been glad to have heard him speak for very much longer. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) really did not feel that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman gave any satisfactory answer to the question of his noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) as to why these troops were sent to Cyprus? The right hon. and gallant Gentleman gave three reasons for this being done. The first was that the Indian troops were going home. Well, they certainly need not have taken Cyprus on the way. The second answer was that Cyprus was on the highway to India. Well, he believed that that would cost the taxpayers a considerable sum—the Indian troops going by Cyprus rather than going directly. It would have been much better for them to have gone straight to India from Malta, and he could not see why Cyprus should have been made a halting place. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had explained the matter by saying that the Government had sent a large and overpowering force to Cyprus to overawe the people if they did not receive the British rule with quietness.

COLONEL STANLEY: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. What I said was that although the British Fleet might be received very well, there might always be in a large population some disturbing element.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he would accept the explanation of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. But the large population of which he spoke numbered from 120,000 to 140,000, and he could not for a moment conceive that for the purpose of overawing such a population it was necessary to send to the Island a force of armed and drilled men, who were in the proportion of one drilled man to every three or four able-bodied men in the whole Island. It was utterly impossible that that could be the case; and beyond that it was quite clear that the Government themselves at first did not think it necessary to send such a force, because they despatched Mr. Baring to take possession of the Island before the troops arrived. He did not think they had had any answer whatever to his noble Friend's question as to why these troops were sent, and he supposed they hardly would get any answer. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Onslow) suggested a forcible answer, but one which he could hardly imagine—that the Government had determined to garrison Cyprus because the Russian troops were going towards Afghanistan. Well, Cyprus might or might not be on the high road from Malta to Alexandria, but it certainly was not on the high road from St. Petersburgh to Afghanistan. One other remark which the hon. Gentleman made was worthy the attention of the Government, and that was whether, as we were sending our troops to the Island, and could not tell what they were to do, they might not afford relaxation for the officers by taking care of the game of Cyprus, as well as everything else there. But the annexation of the Island was a very serious matter with regard to the effect it would have upon future taxation and upon the Revenue, and yet upon it the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had given no information whatever. He had said absolutely nothing as to the objects of the Government in acquiring the Island, or as to sending the troops there, or what the Government intended to do with the Island, as one of our military defences, in the future. He had simply said it was not a fortress, nor a naval or military station, and that it was quite different from Gibraltar or Malta. But still the House remained absolutely in the dark, and he was quite sure the Government would not throw any further light on a measure which had excited so much attention, and which had been spoken of as a measure of almost magnificent proportions.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT hoped his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Bath (Mr. Hayter) would not press his Amendment, because there was one thing which was quite plain, that as the troops had been sent to Cyprus there must be some place there in which to quarter them. He was sure there was no man who would wish that the troops should be exposed to such a climate as it was known was to be found in Cyprus at this present time of year, and they would all wish for proper precautions to be taken to see that the troops were well housed, and protected from the extreme heat of the sun. Therefore, he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed, as he was certain if it was carried the most mischievous consequences might ensue. With regard to what had fallen from his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) was bound to say that he rather felt like him—that there had been no satisfactory answer given to the noble Lord. It might be, and it most likely was, that Malta was very much overcrowded at this hot time of the year, and that the troops were to be sent back to India. But, Cyprus having been ceded, it was naturally thought, and he considered properly thought, that it would be a good opportunity to move the Indian troops from Malta to Cyprus. And even if it were done for nothing else, it would show the people of Cyprus—and that would be communicated to the inhabitants of Asia Minor—that England was determined, after having taken over Cyprus, to pursue her policy there; and, having undertaken to carry out that policy with regard to Asia Minor, he was not one of those who would shrink from the undertaking. But that which would be required in the future would need the most careful consideration to determine, because he defied any Government in the world, with so short an experience, to say what would be wanted. He desired to see the Government go gradually forward, and see that no greater expense was incurred than was absolutely necessary. The country having endorsed the policy of the Government, he was absolutely certain the people would not shrink from any necessary expense to enable them to carry out that policy. There was another point on which he wished to say a word or two, and that was one which had been touched upon by the hon. and gallant Member for Bath—he alluded to the difference between the pay of the Indian officers and the pay of the officers of the English Army. This was a hard case, and one which must receive the very serious consideration of the Government. He did not agree, nor did he believe for one moment, that the Government had any notion or idea of employing these troops unless under circumstances of very great emergency. But when such an emergency did arise, and they brought from India 7,000 or 8,000 Indian troops and 2,000 British troops, and took them to Malta or any other place, it was very hard that the Indian troops should receive the same amount of Indian pay, while the English troops should have the same rate of pay as if they had gone from England to Malta, and no question of emergency had occurred. The Government were bound to deal with such a matter, because it was creating great dissatisfaction, and they ought to see that officers had the same amount of pay when called upon to do the same work. Another point for the Government to consider was that in reference to officering Indian troops. At present, officers might be transferred to the Civil Service, and he insisted that they should say whether they would remain in the Civil Service at an increased pay, or serve on in the Army, and not take the increased pay of the Civil Service, and be allowed afterwards to go back to the Military Service and receive a large pension. It was an unwise thing to allow this to be done. There was only one other point on which he should have liked to have had some information, and that was in answer to the observation of the hon. and gallant Member for Bath that it was unwise and mischievous that English troops should serve beside Indian troops. He could not see anything mischievous in the matter.

Mr. HAYTER desired to correct the hon. and gallant Gentleman. What he said was not that Indian troops should not be employed with British troops, but that the opinion of competent authorities was that they should not be left in English garrisons in sole charge of the guns.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT was very glad to hear the correction, because he could not help thinking that such an assertion would have been very unfortunate seeing the loyalty and earnestness with which these men came forward when called upon. He would only in conclusion say, although the country had been put to great extra expense with regard to many things which had been done by the Government, that expense had not been altogether thrown away. The Government had called out not only the Indian troops, but the Reserves; and he gave every credit to the noble Lord who inaugurated that movement—and he rejoiced at the way in which the Reserves had turned out in obedience to the summons of their Queen.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, that he had read over what had been uttered from time to time by Cabinet Ministers with reference to Cyprus. From the time that the occupation of the Island had been first mooted, there had been great difficulty in ascertaining what the motives and policy of the Government were—how they were going to administer the Island, and what the use of their administration would be? Having regard to the objects that the Government had in view, he would call special attention to what had been said in "another place" by the Prime Minister. He made a very important statement with regard to Cyprus; and yet, last night, the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted that it was only recently that the idea of occupying Cyprus entered into the mind of the Government. It was clear that this was perfectly true, and that these huts were in existence long before the Government thought of occupying Cyprus; and that, in fact, they were ordered for another expedition. Of course, he did not say that the huts were the same; but a certain number of huts were ordered and delivered, and if they were not in use, they ought to have been made use of for this purpose. It would be desirable to know where these huts were, and what was the expedition upon which it was proposed to employ them. They had been told that the idea of occupying Cyprus was hastily conceived. But, on the other hand, Lord Beaconsfield said—

> "But, at the same time, I must say, on the part of the Government, that it is a great error to suppose that they decided upon the occupation of Cyprus without being in possession of adequate information."

If the Government were in possession of adequate information, they appeared to have had less sense. Lord Beaconsfield went on say—

> "Parliament is entitled to possess that information when affairs are in that state that we think these documents can be produced without injury to the Public Service."—[See *ante*, p. 27.]

But the noble Lord had also said that Europe had now returned to a state of almost Millenial peace, and if that were the case, really the time had arrived when the Government, before asking the House to vote money for this purpose, should lay upon the Table of the House the documents giving the information promised by the noble Lord the Prime Minister. He would ask the Committee to consider that this money was to be voted for military purposes in the Island of Cyprus. But the Ministers had given them no idea of what their policy would be in Cyprus, or how they proposed to administer the affairs of the Island. They had only a vague notion given them of what would be done, but nothing definite. The Administrator, they were told, was to try to administer the government on the lines upon which it had been conducted by the Turks. But what law was it they were going to administer, and how and under what circumstances was it to be administered? Either the Government had no clear and definite idea of administering the Government of Cyprus, or they were concealing from the House some plan which they had in view with regard to the matter. He would ask the attention of the Committee while he briefly pointed out that the occupation of Cyprus was, at that moment, the only thing that this country had obtained in return for the whole of the money it had spent—all it had gained was the miserable opportunity of occupying Cyprus. The point to which he desired to call the attention of the House was the agreement that if Russia should take possession of any further territories then we should interfere. But the Treaty did not say that if Russia should transgress the spirit, but not the letter, of the Berlin Congress, England should take action; it simply stated that if Russia should take possession of any territories, this country should intervene, and that was a very different thing. So far as he could see, under this Convention, Russia was perfectly free to declare war and cross the frontiers, provided she gave an undertaking not to enter into possession of any territories she conquered. In return for the Guarantee given by this country, the administration of the Island of Cyprus had been placed in its hands. But how was it to be administered? In what manner was provision to be made for executing our engagement? They had not heard from the Government how far, and under what circumstances, the jurisdiction of this country in Cyprus extended. They had heard some very singular statements of Her Majesty's Ministers on this question. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, when he was asked with regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, said the Porte had engaged to consult this country with regard to the reforms that were to be introduced, and he went on to say that he thought that the Treaty of 1856 would have been broken if England had annexed the Island of Cyprus; but that, as it was, the actual Sovereignty of the Island was still in the Sultan. Thus, it was admitted, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, that the Treaty of 1856 would have been infringed if England had accepted the Sovereignty of the Island. But it was contended that it would not be broken, as he understood the Home Secretary to argue, under the circumstances of the case, by which England had only to administer the government. The Attorney General, when questioned by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), said that the Island was to be administered by Her Majesty, who would exercise sub-jurisdiction over the lands and people of the Island. Cyprus, was not to be any part of the territory of the Crown, it was only to be kept and administered by Her Majesty according to the terms of the Convention. When it was asked what the occupation of Cyprus meant, hon. Members were referred to the Convention; and when they questioned the Government as to the meaning of the Convention, they were referred to the occupation; so that they were asked to vote for money for Cyprus, with regard to the policy and administration of which he did not believe that even Her Majesty's Government could form any very definite idea. The only effect of the Convention was that the Island had been occupied, and that they were now called upon to vote money for it; and the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War told them that, in the meantime, the Government would ascertain what the circumstances of the Island were, and lay them before the House. That was in the face of the statement of the Premier, deliberately made in "another place," that the occupation was not undertaken without full information, which should be presented to Parliament in due form. He was surprised that the House should submit to the Government acting in this manner, and he could not think that it was wrong that they should continue, day by day, to press the Government to give them some idea of what was in their minds when they conceived and executed their policy. In conclusion, he would ask the right hon. and gallant Gentleman whether he would not give some definite idea of what the policy of Her Majesty's Government was before he pressed the House to vote money in the dark for these purposes?

MR. RITCHIE ventured to say that there were very few who would agree with the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins). He believed that it was the opinion of the vast majority of the country, and a large majority in that House, that the Government had, by a wise and judicious expenditure of money, saved the country from a great and disastrous war, and had restored peace to Europe. Looking at the state of anxiety in which they had remained for many months past, he could not feel otherwise than that Her Majesty's Government had acted wisely and carefully in this matter, and that if they had acted differently this country might now, instead of enjoying the blessings of peace, be in the midst of a desolating war. He could not agree with the hon. Member for Dundee that the Island of Cyprus was all we had got for the money we had spent; in his opinion, its acquisition was one of the smallest gains that we had obtained for our money. It had been said by the hon. Gentleman that there was the greatest difficulty in ascertaining the police of the Government with regard to the occupation of Cyprus. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) had also complained that the Secretary of State for War did not state the reason for the occupation of Cyprus, or what was the policy in keeping it. But they all knew that last night the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated plainly and distinctly what the policy of the Government was in keeping Cyprus. He told them that there were two objects; one was that we might be near at hand and have a basis of operations in case we should be called upon to carry out the provisions of the Convention we had entered into with the Turkish Government; the other was that England should have some place near the mainland where it could show to Turkey that, by just administration, it was quite possible to carry out necessary reforms in Asia. When it was said that no explanation had been given of the policy of the Government, he was bound to say that that allegation was not borne out by the facts of the case. The hon. Member for Dundee alleged that the Government had not had adequate information; or, if they had had proper information, they had not produced it. But the Government were unable to go into minute details as to all the circumstances that might arise in the administration of the Island. It appeared to him that the statement that the Government acted on adequate information was by no means irreconcilable with the fact that the Government were at present unable to go into minute details. When Lord Beaconsfield spoke of information with regard to Cyprus having been obtained, he, no doubt, spoke principally with reference to the policy of the acquisition. It was impossible that the Government could produce a cut-and-dried scheme for the administration of Cyprus; that could only be ascertained by experience. The Government were taking proper measures by the course which they had pursued to place themselves in the best position to get information; and he had little doubt that, after some experience, Sir Garnet Wolseley and the other officers with him would enable the Government to give hon. Gentlemen in that House all the information they desired.

Mr. RYLANDS: I do not suppose for a moment that it is the intention of my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Bath (Mr. Hayter), who has made this Motion, to press it to a division; but it gives us an opportunity—to which, I think, we are entitled—to bring before the Committee, and also before the country, as well as we are able, the circumstances under which we object to this expenditure. My right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War has said that Parliament has condoned the Government in the course they have taken—namely, in taking this new departure. Of course, it is a matter of necessity that, if we choose to adopt an Imperial policy, we must be prepared for an Imperial expense. We have in past times done a great deal to spread civilization in other lands; and, I believe, without any display, and without any bombastical expression on the part of our Rulers, we have shown in the face of the world the high influence and character of the British people. We have done all this, but we are now proceeding upon a new line which is expected to be surrounded with much glory and much prestige. We are now departing upon a line on which we are going to seek some new honour and glory, and on that line we must be content, if we choose to pursue it, to follow the example of all Imperial Governments; and we must forget, to a certain extent, the interests, and welfare, and prosperity of the people under our control, in favour of new claims for a higher character of national influence and national control. Well, Sir, we are for the moment in for this policy. I am quite aware that, when we criticize the conduct of the Government, as we are entitled to do, and ask them what they are going to do with this Island, and what is to be the next step, they tell us that it is a tentative step. Well, the whole of their policy has been tentative. I challenge the Government to tell us why they brought these Indian troops to Europe at all. The Committee does not know why they brought these Indian troops to Europe, and we do not know where they intended to place those troops when they had got them into Europe. I believe the first idea of the Government was a filibustering idea. ["No, no!"] But I say yes, and I say it upon the authority of a late Member of the Cabinet, and I have the greatest confidence in that Nobleman. That noble Lord said the first idea of bringing these troops to Europe was a filibustering idea of seizing upon territory in Asia Minor, or upon some Island in the Mediterranean. Will the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War tell us that the Government first intended to place these troops at Malta? I say that we have no evidence that there was any idea of placing them in any particular place. The Home Secretary told us that the Government had acted upon information which they received from a high authority with regard to bringing the Indian troops to Europe; but, when that information which the Government received from a high authority was found to be untrue, it was then, I believe, that the intention to bring these troops to Malta was formed. Now, when you got these troops to Malta, you had again to inquire—what are we to do with them? The Government did not know what to do with these troops. As for the idea of the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow), that these troops should be placed at Cyprus in order to protect Afghanistan from Russia, I am sure the Government, who think we may be expected to swallow a good deal, will not expect us to swallow that. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War gave us what I thought to be a very extraordinary reason for taking the Indian troops to Cyprus. He seemed to think it was possible that the population — restricted to something like 18,000 or 20,000 adult males—in Cyprus would, on some ground or other, possibly rise up against British occupation. Why, British occupation of the Isle of Cyprus is the greatest God-send that could possibly happen to the people of Cyprus. Why, the Greeks presented our Lord High Commissioner naturally enough with an Address, in which they expressed the great pleasure and satisfaction with which they viewed the British occupation of the Island, and then they charged an exhorbitant rent for the use of their houses. That was natural enough too. To say that the British occupation of Cyprus might possibly lead to a revolution or rebellion that would require 8,000 or 10,000 troops to put it down is a complete romance. I must say that it appears to me that the whole transaction of these Indian troops is to cost us an enormous sum of money, and I believe the Government have acted without due consideration. I believe, in the first instance, they were led into it by false information. If that is so, when they got new information, there was no need, instead of sending them back to India, to send them to Cyprus. That, I suppose, was done to cover the operation, and it will entail upon this country great additional expense, which might have been saved if the Government had taken different measures. I agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) in saying that the Government have not told us what their object and policy is in regard to Cyprus. We have heard two voices in the Cabinet. One class of Ministers of the Cabinet make the maximum representation as to the policy, and the other section minimize the operation altogether. Those taking the maximum view say we have got Britain overlooking Asia Minor, and Britain is prepared to carry by this means into the countries subject to Turkey new branches of industry, new precautions for life and property, a new system of justice, and all the different arrangements which distinguish our civilization as compared with the Government of Turkey. In order to do this we must have a large Force, and spend large sums of money. But that is not what the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer contemplates. Nothing of the sort. He says, in this Island we are to set up a model Government, which will act as an example to Turkey, and we shall then have the Sultan and his advisers adopting the same means to secure the same prosperity. In fact, Cyprus was to be a large model farm. Every hon. Gentleman who has gone in for a model farm knows what that means. It means vast outlay, with little to show for it; and that will be the result of the annexation of Cyprus. The House of Commons, however, is now prepared to swallow anything. All the Opposition can do is to protest against the course taken by the Government. But one step would lead to another—one expenditure to a further expenditure; and, unless I am much mistaken, we shall find, in a few years, that this unsound policy will lay on the people of this country very serious responsibilities indeed.

Mr. MUNDELLA would detain the Committee but a few minutes; but he wished to ask the right hon. and gallant Gentleman in charge of the Vote how he proposed to convey to their homes the troops that had been brought from India? Whatever might be the policy of Her Majesty's Government—whether he agreed or disagreed with it—he thought both sides of the House would concur in what he had to say, that those troops should be conveyed home at a reasonable cost. He was sure that no one would be more grateful to him than the Chancellor of the Exchequer for having raised the question in the House. It would be in the recollection of hon. Members that Parliament voted several thousands of pounds for payment of the transport of those troops. The mode of transport and the cost was very much criticized at the time; and the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty promised to give him a Return, showing the total charge of the transport and the chartering of the ships. It was believed at the time that the expenditure in this respect was of a most lavish, wasteful, and, he thought he might say, discreditable nature. He said this in the presence of business men, who would correct him if in error. He would not use one word in exaggeration, but he must say again that the sums charged for that particular service was discreditable and unbusiness-like. According to the Return which the right hon. Gentleman supplied, it appeared that 28 vessels were employed, steamers and transports, in the conveyance of those troops to Malta. The cost of the steamers ranged from £3,000 to £7,000 per month, and he wished to know whether they were still in the service of the Government? He would ask whether the country was paying a monthly——

The CHAIRMAN pointed out to the hon. Member that in his remark he was anticipating the discussion on the Navy Supplementary Votes.

Mr. MUNDELLA understood that the Question before the House had reference to the transport of the troops. He wished to know whether the Admiralty declined to make itself responsible for chartering those vessels to India? If not the Admiralty, who was responsible? Somebody should know, because he saw a note to this effect—

> "The arrangement for the transport of troops was made in India by the Indian Government after communication with the Transport Department of the Admiralty."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER rose to Order. He did not know whether the hon. Gentleman was quoting from the present Supplementary Estimates or the Navy Estimates?

MR. MUNDELLA said, that he was not quoting from either, but from the Return which had been furnished to the House. What he wished to know was this—were the vessels which were chartered to convey the Indian troops to Malta still retained in the service of the Government, and what were the terms, as set forth in the charter-parties, and were the transports to be employed in taking the Indian troops back again?

THE CHAIRMAN ruled that the hon. Member was not in Order in pursuing an inquiry of the kind, upon the Question before the House.

MR. MUNDELLA would defer the Question, therefore, until it arose on another Estimate.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK considered that the House and the country must feel very much indebted to the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Bath for having raised the discussion; for the result was that some fragments of information had been given as to what the Government proposed to do with the Island of Cyprus. He trusted the hon. and gallant Gentleman, however, would not carry his Motion to a division, however much they might be opposed to the occupation of Cyprus for the purpose for which it was alleged it had been taken. He felt convinced that none of the objects would be accomplished; still, it would be apparent to everybody that the troops should be properly housed, and therefore he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend would not press his objection to the particular item before the House. Now, amongst the objections which were taken by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to the statement of his hon. and gallant Friend, was one which struck him (Sir Henry Havelock) more particularly, and that was that he objected to its being supposed that the policy with regard to the Indian troops was an habitual policy. Now, he considered there was considerable reason for the policy to be so described. Had not the Government thought of the illimitable resources of India, of which those troops were said to be only the vanguard? It was not many days since an hon. Gentleman sitting on his side of the House had drawn their attention by telling them that the arrival of those 6,000 troops had answered the purpose for which they were brought—that they had terrified Russia, and so prevented war. That remark seemed to him (Sir Henry Havelock) to be one of the most extraordinary he had ever heard——

THE CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. and gallant Gentleman that he was not in Order when he referred to what had passed in a preceding debate.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK continued by observing he could not suppose that that was really the purpose for which the policy of the Government was initiated. Although he should be the last to depreciate the military resources of the Empire, he could not conceive that the employment of 6,000 troops in the Island of Cyprus had had any effect in the way of preventing war with Russia. All the suppositions of hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House were unsubstantial. The occupation of the Island had no basis of reality about it. What did they hear on the previous night, but that the Island was supposed to be of great value, on account of its strategical character? He had since endeavoured to ascertain what truth there was in the assertion, but had not succeeded, nor did he expect to get anything that would enlighten him on the point. It had been indicated that the Island of Cyprus was a strategical place with regard to Afghanistan; and, again, they had been told it was not a strategical place at all. This last statement he believed to carry the greatest amount of probability, if they were to judge from what they had heard from the Secretary of State for War.

COLONEL STANLEY had wished the House to understand that Cyprus was not to be considered as being like Gibraltar or Malta.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK said, it might not be considered as a fortress, but it was to be a strong place in the Mediterranean. It appeared that the Government did not propose to make it a fortress, or anything of the sort, because they had said that only two battalions and a battery were to be kept there. He would ask the House whether, under those circumstances, Cyprus could be considered as a strategical place? Would a place of great military operations be occupied in that way? It showed that the Government did not know what to do with the Island, nor were they aware for what purpose it ought to be occupied. They had, in fact, dragged the troops from India for a purpose, the precise object of which they themselves did not know. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had contradicted the statement that it was originally contemplated to make some seizure on the coast of Syria, and when he (Sir Henry Havelock) asked him to be kind enough to explain whether that was the construction which they were to put upon the policy of the Government, he was met—as the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had been—by the most significant silence. He ventured to think that this was a matter to which the attention of the country would be directed over and over again, because it seemed impossible for hon. Members to elicit more information than they had at present obtained. The question of the future employment of the Indian troops was one to which the serious attention of the Government must be directed. He had seen a report in the papers to the effect that these Indian troops, who started from their own country under circumstances of the greatest credit, had become discontented with the monotonous life they had been called upon to live, as well as with the unhealthy nature of the service they were obliged to perform. They said they never suspected, when they were brought from their own country, they would have to do monotonous duty in a small Island in the Mediterranean. Incidentally, he must be allowed to say, before he sat down, he regretted very much that the inquiry on that important point which had been initiated by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had, under certain circumstances, ended in nothing at all. He feared there was a tendency to shirk the question for the present, as to whether the Indian troops were to be profitably employed in the future in garrison or other duties in our Colonies? Then, as to the expense of their transport. If it was intended as a stategical measure, when they were brought from India, they had cost just about three times as much as double the number of troops from our own country would have cost. If there was anything in the statement that the Indian soldiers had been taken to Malta by way of a threat to Russia, why the end could have been accomplished from our resources at home, which were doubly and trebly sufficient for the purpose, at half the cost. It had been estimated at £1,000,000; but no doubt it would be at least £1,750,000. He would undertake to say that if the Government intended to make a demonstration, they could, from the Home resources, for the sum of money they had spent, have occupied Malta with at least 21 battalions of British Infantry. The experiment, however, had been tried, and he hoped that no greater strain would be put upon the willingness of the Indian troops than could be helped. There was another question which still remained unanswered. The British Government were going to occupy the Island of Cyprus, but with what force? Was the Force sent there a prelude to the raising of a large indigenous Native Force of Greeks and Turks? He thought that when the matter came to be thoroughly sifted, the people of England would find that they had been put to an enormous expense for no object whatsoever. As a threat against Russia, the movement of troops had been totally inffectual—without result. If it was intended to avail themselves of men at half the cost of British soldiers, the object had failed; and, everything considered, it was evident the Government had no real policy in the matter at all.

MR. CHILDERS said, there were one or two points which the House ought to understand before they went further into details with regard to the question of Cyprus. He was sure it would be to the convenience of both sides of the House, as well as to the Government, that no misconception should arise in the matter; and, therefore, he had ventured to interpose. He wished the Government to explain to the House exactly and precisely what administrative and financial arrangements would be adopted in connection with the occupation of the Island, an occupation which had been admitted to be of a novel character. To what Minister would Parliament look for responsibility in connection with the civil and military government of the Island? Would the revenues of Cyprus be paid in gross into the Exchequer, and the military and civil expenses be charged on the Estimates; or would Parliament only be asked to defray any excess on those revenues? In what shape would the payment to the Porte appear in the public accounts? Would the payment to the Porte be a varying and not a fixed sum? [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No.] According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it was to be a fixed sum. Then, being a fixed sum, would it be charged in the Consolidated Fund, or on the revenues of the Island. All these things ought to be settled by Her Majesty's Government with the approval of Parliament at the outset, so that the accounts of the expenditure and revenue of the Island should be throughout on the same basis. Again, under what Department of the Government would the administration of Cyprus be placed? To whom were they to look as the responsible Minister?—to the Colonial Secretary, or the Secretary of State for War, or the Foreign Office, or the India Office? He hoped the House would see that until these questions were answered any debate on the detail of future arrangements would be imperfect.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER did not object to the questions put by the right hon. Gentleman, and he was not at all disposed to say they were not allied with the subject under discussion. He would therefore endeavour to answer them; and perhaps he might be allowed to do so by making, in the first instance, a reference to an observation which had fallen from the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock). When he spoke of their policy, he said that, as far as he could make out, it was an unsubstantial policy, because it did not appear to have many sides. Now, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) considered otherwise. The fact of its having too many sides would not give it an air of reality, for, according as it was approached from one point to another, it would present itself differently to the observer. Now, in regard to the charge that, when he was asked a question, he had maintained a significant silence, he wished it clearly to be understood that the history of the movement, which had ended for the moment in the Indian troops going to Cyprus, was simply this. As the House was aware, there was a state of affairs at the time which rendered it probable that some military operations might have to be undertaken by the British Government in the Levant or the Bosphorus. On that account, the Vote of Credit was taken. The Reserves were called out, and various other steps were taken, in order that the Government might be ready for that which might be necessary; and, undoubtedly, when the Indian troops were brought from India, it was with the idea that their employment might be necessary with reference to some operations of war, though it was not stated for what particular purpose they might be required. They were, accordingly, taken to Malta; but the Government found, as they had, indeed, been conscious for some time, that that station was inconvenient for so large a number of troops, and that another movement would be necessary. Subsequently they came to the conclusion that it would be the proper course on the part of Her Majesty's Government to join in a defensive alliance with Turkey with reference to her Asiatic territories, and they thought it important, in order to enable them to fulfil that obligation, that they should have some place, where, in case of necessity, troops could be accommodated other than in the contracted area of Malta. Cyprus was accordingly selected as a proper and convenient station for the purpose. It had been alleged that Cyprus was not a strategic point. He did not know what that necessarily meant—whether it applied to a fortress only, or to a convenient place to contain a body of troops at any time when a large number of troops might be required. The possibility of having a large number of troops there when they were required was a different thing from maintaining there the small Force which was necessary for general purposes in the Island of Cyprus. It was not intended to keep a large Force in the Island. It might, perhaps, be asked—"Why, then, have you taken the Indian troops there?" The answer to that question must have suggested itself in the course of these discussions. The troops were no longer wanted in Malta, owing to the happy conclusion of the difficulties which had led to their being brought there. The natural course would have been to send them back to India; but it was not convenient to send them back at this season of the year. They must necessarily suffer very much if they were sent back at once, and it was desirable that they should remain in the Mediterranean for some weeks longer. Then there arose the simple question whether they should stay in Malta or go to Cyprus. There were many considerations which made it desirable that they should go to Cyprus. In the first place, Malta was contracted in its area. Then it was an advantage that, on our first presenting ourselves in Cyprus, we should do so with that amount of Force which would show that we were there with a certain power, and that we should obviate the risk of anything like that which had happened in another part of the Dominions of the Porte, to which he did not wish further to refer, as the circumstances there were very different from ours. We had no occasion for anything in the nature of a great display of force; but there was, he thought, some advantage in making, in the first instance, some acquaintance with the country, and in rendering it possible for the authorities there to send detachments of troops to different parts of the Island, in order to ascertain its capabilities and its wants, with a view to future administration. He would now offer an explanation on some points raised by his right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers). The Committee would understand perfectly well that in this matter there was necessarily a good deal which must remain open, for two different kinds of reasons. One reason was that for our own sake it was necessary that we should make adequate inquiries. Although for some little time past we had been considering the capabilities of Cyprus, and although we had been collecting a good deal of information which was valuable, still it was necessary that we should send out responsible officers of our own to conduct inquiries, and to report on the position of affairs. Another reason, which seemed not to have occurred to the Committee, was that we occupied this Island in a very peculiar manner, and under very peculiar conditions. We did not take the Island as British territory, but we occupied it under a Convention with the Porte, which Convention stipulated that the Sovereignty of the Porte should remain. That being the case, it was impossible for us to deal with the Island off-hand, as we might do with an island which we had conquered, or which had been absolutely ceded to us. It was necessary, in whatever arrangements were made, that we should have regard to the views and the feelings of the Porte, and that what was done should be done with due consideration and by arrangements which must be made with the Turkish Government. This, of course, involved also some further considerations. The Government had been asked what was the precise law which they were going to administer in Cyprus, and what would be the precise state of things there? Of course, these were questions of the very highest importance. They were questions which the Government were far from neglecting, but which could not be resolved off-hand without communications that were now going on and that must necessarily take some time. For instance, with regard to the practical point as to the revenue, it was the case that the revenues of the Island would be in the hands of the British Government, subject to the payment to the Porte of a certain sum which was to be ascertained, and which would be a fixed sum. That sum was to be ascertained by taking the average of the excess of revenue over expenditure in the Island during the last five years. The custom had been that the expenses of government were all paid first out of the revenue, and the balance was remitted to the Porte. We had approximately arrived at this sum, and when it was definitively ascertained, an arrangement would be made under which it would be remitted to the Porte. His right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract desired to know whether the revenues would be brought into the Imperial Exchequer, as the expenses with regard to Cyprus were going to be voted by Parliament? That was a matter which would require some consideration. He doubted, however, whether the most convenient course would be to bring these revenues into the Exchequer. The best course, he thought, would be to organize in Cyprus a proper system by which the revenues would be applied there to defraying local expenses; but if there were any expenses so distinctly of an English character that they ought to be borne by the English Government, such expenses would, of course, have to be voted by Parliament. But the expenses properly belonging to the administration of the Island ought to come out of the revenues of the Island. Perhaps it might be asked, what would be done supposing the revenues were insufficient for the purpose? Well, in such a contingency, we should be in the same position in reference to Cyprus as we occupied in regard to a British Colony which was similarly circumstanced. This was a matter connected with the whole question of administration, which we must consider carefully and deliberately. Then he was asked to state under what Department of State the Island was to be placed. This, again, was a point which required very careful consideration. In the first instance, when the troops were sent to the Island, it was under the War Office; because, in fact, the movement was of a military character. Sir Garnet Wolseley was, of course, nominated by the whole Government; but he was sent out by an instrument issued by the Secretary of State for War. It was not intended, however, that the Island should remain under the administration of the War Office. It could not be under the administration of the Colonial Office, for that would seem to imply that Cyprus was a British Possession, whereas it was not a British Possession. At the present moment the Island was under the administration of the Foreign Office—that was to say, the Foreign Secretary was the Minister of State to whom communications were to be addressed, and through whom they would pass. The Foreign Secretary was, however, in communication on this subject with the India Office, in respect to personal questions relating to the selection of officers, and so forth, and also with the Treasury. It was considered important that in all the proceedings which might take place, the Treasury should be consulted, so that that Department might have a voice in the settlement of any scheme in which they would ultimately, no doubt, have a great deal of interest. At the present moment there was comparatively little to do except to wait for the Reports which were expected from Sir Garnet Wolseley as to the various measures to be taken with reference to the future administration of the country, and the arrangements to be made with regard to the revenue. He hoped the Committee would see that in saying this he was saying all it was in his power to say. There was no wish for concealment on the part of the Government; but the circumstances were of such a character that it was only possible for him now to give this kind of adumbration of the scheme which would be proposed.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he was unable to agree with the concluding words of the right hon. Gentleman, that it was only possible at present to give what he called an adumbration of the scheme for administering the affairs of the Island. Some one Minister must have this responsibility, and there had been ample time to settle who this should be. The Treasury would have, of course, the same powers of finance that it had in every Public Department; but were they to understand that it was contemplated to put the Island under the Foreign Office, in the same sense that Crown Colonies were under the Colonial Office? The Foreign Office was wholly unused to administering the affairs of any country. He hoped the Government would pause before coming to the conclusion that the administration of Cyprus should be handed over to the Foreign Office. He ventured also strongly to protest against any plan which would remove from the control of Parliament the expenditure which might be incurred with respect to the Island. Cyprus was not a Colony, but we were renting it for certain Imperial purposes; and its cost was part of the general Imperial Expenditure.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD held that, as Cyprus was not to become a portion of the British Dominions, it would be highly inconvenient to bring the accounts of the Island into the general accounts of this country. For his own part, the more he considered the Convention, the more he was inclined to question it on financial grounds. He understood from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that we were about to enter into partnership with the Sultan as regarded Cyprus. Nothing could be more incongruous than for a country like this to enter into a partnership with a despotic and insolvent country like Turkey. The revenue of the Island had been estimated at 22,000 purses, or nearly £100,000 net. Such a revenue could not be raised from 100,000 people without the greatest hardship. He found that should the occasion arise of our having to obtain from the Island, which was not very likely, as it depended upon Russia surrendering the fortresses she had obtained in Asia Minor, that we were not to obtain any compensation for the public works and other works of improvement which we might have carried out there. In his opinion, it would be much better to buy the Island out and out from the Porte, and he would suggest that the arrears which Turkey owed to British capitalists on the Guaranteed Loan might be set off as the price of the purchase.

Colonel STANLEY earnestly appealed to the Committee to pass the Vote, as it was of great importance.

Mr. LOWE said, he had had some considerable experience with the Colonies, and with government by the Colonial Office, and he felt there was no possible Department that could govern Cyprus with satisfaction except the Colonial Office. Besides, there were so many more men in that Office than were required for the work that this extra labour could be undertaken by that Department without adding to the expenditure of the country.

Mr. HAYTER expressed his satisfaction with the tone of the debate which had taken place, and begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Major NOLAN asked the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to give the amount of travelling expenses allowed from the point at which they set out?

Colonel STANLEY invited the hon. and gallant Gentleman to confer with him on the subject.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

## CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

### Class I. — Public Works and Buildings.

(2.) £5,520, Supplementary sum for Royal Palaces.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was proposed to vote the sum of £500 as part of the amount of £5,000 for the external restoration of St. George's Chapel, Windsor. A good deal of restoration was required in the interior of the building, but externally the gurgoyles and bosses had been decaying, from the effects of the weather, for a long time past. Decay affected those ornaments before it attacked the structure itself. Everyone who was acquainted with King's College, Cambridge, knew how the decorative work had been ruined by the application of improper material. At Windsor, money had been expended in continuing the work of restoration all round, in a manner similar to that which had been carried out with regard to the gurgoyles and bosses. By voting the sum of £500, he believed the Committee would be sanctioning the continuation of work that must end in destroying the architectural beauties of the edifice.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he had recently seen the Chapel at Windsor, and it appeared to him to be necessary for its preservation that the work which was in hand should be continued. The Committee would agree with him when he said that the decay which was going on ought to be arrested as speedily as possible. The work was of a character that must take some time to accomplish, and he thought the Committee would be acting wisely in passing the Vote.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £10,000, Science and Art Museum, Dublin.

### Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments.

(4.) £30,000, Supplementary sum for The Mint, including Coinage.

### Class III.—Law and Justice.

(5.) £210, Supplementary sum for Revising Barristers, England.

### Class IV. — Education, Science, and Art.

(6.) £5,000, Supplementary sum for National Gallery.

### Class V.—Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services.

(7.) £10,800, Supplementary sum for Diplomatic Services.

Mr. RYLANDS supposed that Mr. Rivers Wilson still held the position as

Controller of the National Debt. The Committee was asked to vote £1,500 as his salary in that important and responsible position. Mr. Wilson had been appointed also as a British Director of the Suez Canal, and for that duty he received £300 per annum. He had also been sent out on a mission to arrange the finances of Egypt, and for that he (Mr. Rylands) did not know whether he received any salary or not. He took it for granted, however, that in some way or other Mr. Wilson was adequately remunerated for his services in that particular. Now, the sending of Mr. Wilson abroad seemed to him to be a course that was unwarrantable, and not to be justified by the result. He occupied an important position at home, and it was necessary that he should be there to attend to his duties. Either the office was an unnecessary one, or Mr. Wilson's services could not be dispensed with. He knew very well that many gentlemen in the Government Departments did the work of the heads of the Departments very well during their absence, and it might be so with regard to Mr. Rivers Wilson; but still that was not a proper course to be followed. If it was so, it raised the presumption that the staff of his Department was too large, and that was the impression he had formed in his mind. Mr. Wilson occupied a high position in the permanent Public Service of the country, and he had also the distinction of being a British Director of the Suez Canal; indeed, he was one of those fortunate individuals who, whatever Party was in power, always obtained cordial support. He (Mr. Rylands) would be glad to hear from the Government, under what circumstances they considered it right and justifiable for this public officer of the Crown to be away in Egypt; how long he was likely to remain there; and what advantage they expected to result from his performance of duties abroad? Unless there was some very strong reason to the contrary, he hoped the Government would consider the propriety of calling upon Mr. Rivers Wilson to make the selection either of serving the Crown in this country as Controller of the National Debt Office, or to accept service under the Khedive, for which, no doubt, he was extremely well qualified.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the employment of

Mr. Rivers Wilson in Egypt was one of a temporary character, and he hoped to be clear away by the month of October. He had on more than one occasion explained to the House the ground on which it was thought necessary by the Government to appoint a gentleman to take part in the mission of inquiry now going on into the finances of Egypt. No doubt, Mr. Rivers Wilson held very important offices at home, and which he discharged with great ability. The routine duties, however, could be performed without his actually being present, and Mr. Repington, his deputy, was a gentleman who did that portion of his work exceedingly well. Mr. Rivers Wilson's superintendence and advice was always of the highest value. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) should be glad at any future time to discuss the question with the hon. Member; but he hoped the House would at once consent to the Motion.

MR. WHITWELL would not object to the Motion; but he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to say whether Mr. Rivers Wilson would be able to present a Report to the House on the work he had been doing. Was he a mere adviser?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that Mr. Wilson was not merely an adviser of the Khedive, but he was a British Commissioner, one of a body who were charged with conducting an inquiry by a Commission of different nations into the financial condition of Egypt. Of course, Mr. Wilson's Report would be made public.

Vote *agreed to.*

(8.) £8,000, Cyprus.

---

(9.) £6,000, Supplementary sum for Post Office Packet Service.

(10.) £19,865, Abyssinian Expedition.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

## SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [6th August] *reported.*

First Eighteen Resolutions *agreed to.*

Nineteenth Resolution *postponed.*

Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*

Postponed Resolution to be considered *To-morrow.*

---

## EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

### MOTION FOR LEAVE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to continue various Expiring Laws."—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

## WAYS AND MEANS.

## EXCHEQUER BILLS AND BONDS (NO. 2) BILL.

Resolutions [August 6] *reported,* and *agreed to:* —Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. RAIKES, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 295.]

## NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1876-7.

*Resolved,* That this House will, To-morrow resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon the Grants for Navy and Army Services in the year ending on the 31st day of March 1877, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year.

*Ordered,* That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments which were presented upon the 18th day of February and the 12th day of March last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

House adjourned at one minute before Six o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

### *Thursday, 8th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Marriages (Fiji) * (195).

*Second Reading* — Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) (190).

*Committee* — Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) (128).

*Committee—Report*—British Museum (Transfer of Collection) * (183); Commons Regulation (Expenses) * (181); Statute Law Revision (Ireland) * (185).

*Report*—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) * (193).

*Third Reading*—Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) * (176); Highways * (192), and *passed.*

*Royal Assent* — Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 46]; Consolidated Fund (No. 4) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 45]; Public Health (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 52]; County of Hertford [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 50]; Police (Expenses) Act Continuance [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 36]; Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 35]; Innkeepers [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 38]; Truro Chapter [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 44]; Weights and Measures [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 49]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 37]; Prison Authorities Act, 1874, Amendment [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 40]; Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 41]; Freshwater Fish Protection [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 39]; Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 43]; Commutation of Tithes [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 42]; Roads and Bridges (Scotland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 51]; Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 48]; Elders Widows' Fund [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 47]; Local Government Provisional Order (Darenth Valley) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxi]; Corrib (Galway) River [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxii]; Epping Forest [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxiii].

## LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 190.)

(*The Lord President.*)

### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE DUKE OF **RICHMOND** AND **GORDON** moved that the Bill be now read a second time.

LORD **DENMAN** said, he had known many narrow escapes from accidents in agricultural districts in Scotland. He might observe that the alteration by Clause 4 of this Bill of the paragraph numbered "Secondly" of Section 3 of the Locomotive Act, 1865, was likely to be useful, as there would be no necessity for anyone to go in advance with a flag in order to give warning of the approach of a locomotive; because paragraph 5 of the same section required it to be stopped immediately on any person holding up his hand—of course, this only applied to day travelling—whilst, if any accident should happen, the 12th clause of the same Act especially reserved the right to damages in respect of any injury in consequence of the use of a locomotive. He believed, however, that their Lordships would agree with him that prevention was better than cure, and he would venture to suggest that the road authorities should have power, not only to stop locomotives on highways for eight consecutive hours, but for such number of hours in summer as would make it necessary for the locomotive to travel almost entirely by night, and at other seasons of the year according to the duration of the night.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House *To-morrow.*

## TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 3) BILL—(Nos. 128-130.)

(*The Lord Henniker.*)

### COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

**Lord HENNIKER** explained that it was a Bill to confirm two Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act relating to the Glasgow and Ibrox tramways and the Wrexham district tramways. By the Amendment he was about to propose to the Committee, all the clauses which related to the use of steam power upon tramways in regard to the Glasgow and Ibrox tramways were struck out, while the second Provisional Order, which related to the Wrexham tramways, had been abandoned. The other Provisional Order—the Glasgow and Ibrox tramways—would be amended in so far that the use of steam would not be allowed; but for the sake of making an experiment, the use of what was termed the Scott-Moncreiff system, which was a motive power supplied by compressed air, would be permitted. The operation of this confirming Bill, when amended as he now proposed, would be confined to two years. Their Lordships would see, therefore, that the scheme was a purely experimental one; and he hoped, by the beginning of the next Session of Parliament, the construction of the tramway would be so far advanced that the Select Committee that was proposed to be appointed to inquire into the subject of the use of mechanical power and steam on tramways would have the advantage of the experience gained by the working of this Scott-Moncreiff system before they made their Report. No other tramway could so well supply information on this subject as this one. The Provisional Order for the construction of this tramway was granted last year; and, therefore, if it were thought desirable not to allow the continuance of the Scott-Moncreiff system after the lapse of two years, they could use animal power only.

**The Earl of REDESDALE** said, that he had no objection to the passing of the Bill with the Amendments made by the noble Lord; but, at the same time, he confessed that if the matter had been brought before him, he would not have assented to it, because it gave an advantage to a particular Bill which all the others which had been dealt with did not possess; and, considering that they were dealing with private undertakings, he thought that they ought to be treated all alike, whether it was proposed to propel the cars by means of compressed air or not.

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

## EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD TRAINING SHIP.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

**Earl FORTESCUE** inquired of the Lord President of the Council, Whether it was true that the London School Board had bought a ship for training purposes; and, if so, whether he could inform the House what was the estimated cost of the purchase and fitting up of that ship, and what were the numbers and salaries of the staff employed in it, and what arrangements were proposed to be made about the meals of the boys to be trained on board. The noble Earl said, that a report had reached him that a ship had been purchased at the expense of the ratepayers, which he thought ought not to have been the case, because the School Board seemed to forget that their rate was levied upon one kind of property alone. He was not disposed to join in a too general condemnation of the course which had been pursued by the London School Board, because he believed that since its establishment it had done a great deal of good; although he doubted the prudence of some of the steps it had taken, and entertained no doubt whatever of the too great costliness of others. What he desired to do was to ascertain for the information of the already heavily burdened ratepayers of the Metropolis, whether the London School Board had done anything of the kind; and, if so, exactly what it was? He thought it desirable that they should have some details respecting the ship alleged to have been purchased. He must confess he viewed with some jealousy the proceedings of school boards in some parts of the country. For instance, in Bradford, a particular class of school had been established for boys of a more advanced age than usual, and he thought that, in some degree, the result had been inadequate. He would not, however, attempt to raise any discussion on that point at present, and he merely alluded to it to show that there was a disposition on the part of school boards generally, with reference to expenditure, that required some watchfulness on the part of the public and by Parliament. With respect to this particular purchase, he concluded that inasmuch as the boys would be trained on board, they could hardly land for the purpose of taking their meals. In other training ships, the boys had their meals and slept on board. He could hardly believe that that was contemplated by the school boards in the case of boys who were neither paupers nor in receipt of charitable assistance.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that the Question which had been put to him by the noble Earl was one in respect of which he was unable to give him any information at present, further than he believed it was the fact that the London School Board had made such a purchase. It was not a matter within the Educational Department of the Privy Council; because, in making this purchase, the London School Board had acted under the 15th section of the 39 & 40 *Vict.*, in which it was provided that in the event of any such purchase being contemplated, it must be made with the sanction and approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE said, that the case was really one of great importance, and he was sorry that his noble Friend (Earl Fortescue) had not asked the Home Office for a little further information. If he was really responsible for it, he pointed out that the education of boys who ought to be maintained by their parents in the training ship was really the introduction of an expense to the country at large which had not hitherto been incurred, and was, therefore, quite a novelty. If this was the beginning of a new system, he considered it deserving of serious inquiry.

EARL FORTESCUE then gave Notice that he would put a Question to the noble Lord who represented the Home Office in their Lordships' House on this subject to-morrow.

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
before Five o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday, 8th August*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* the County of Argyll, *v.* the Right hon. John Douglas Campbell, commonly called Marquess of Lorne, Chiltern Hundreds.

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—NAVY ESTIMATES—CIVIL SERVICES, Class II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS; Class III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

*Resolutions* [July 15, August 5, August 7] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—Consolidated Fund (£21,556,807 7*s.* 5*d.*).

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1876-7—*considered in Committee.*

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consideration *put off.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Leave*—*Ordered*—Expiring Laws Continuance.

*Second Reading*—Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) * [295].

*Committee*—*Report*—Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland) [253].

*Considered as amended*—Statute Law Revision * [263].

*Third Reading*—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) [215], [House counted out].

*Withdrawn* — Collection of Rates (Dublin) * [220]; Municipal Corporations Acts * [238].

## *PRIVATE BUSINESS.*

### CHRISTCHURCH, NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, TITHES COMMUTATION BILL—[*Lords.*]—(*by Order.*)

CONSIDERATION, AS AMENDED.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."—(*Sir Sydney Waterlow.*)

Mr. T. CAVE said, the House was good enough to allow him yesterday to explain why he took the liberty of opposing this Bill in its present stage, and of objecting to its being read a third time. He would, therefore, not trespass on the time of the House by making any further reference to the facts of the case, except to explain why it was he was anxious the Bill should not be allowed to proceed. He was a Member of the Select Committee which considered the Bill upstairs. He knew nothing of the facts of the case whatever until he went into the Committee. The Committee were equally divided, both in reference to the Preamble of the Bill, and in regard to each of the important clauses, and both the Preamble and the clauses were carried by the casting vote of the Chairman. In order to make himself understood, it was necessary that he should explain, in a very few words, that it was by a Statute passed in 1545, that St. Bartholomew's Hospital became the lay impropriators of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and that, under that Statute, they have the right to demand tithes at the rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound. In consideration, however, or in part consideration of these tithes, St. Bartholomew's Hospital was bound to keep in repair the parish church.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—

The House went;—and being returned;—

Mr. SPEAKER *reported* the *Royal Assent* to several Bills.

Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."

Mr. T. CAVE said, that when the Speaker was called to the other House, he was just remarking that, by a Statute of 1545, St. Bartholomew's Hospital had authority to levy tithes at the rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound; and they were bound, in part consideration of the receipt of these tithes, to keep in repair the parish church. They did repair the parish church until the time of the Great Fire of London; but ever since that fire, they had ceased to repair it. He believed that his hon. Friend the junior Member for Maidstone (Sir Sydney Waterlow) would tell the House that, in his opinion, they were only bound to repair the chancel, and not the church, and that they had repaired the chancel from that time to the present. In 1872, St. Bartholomew's Hospital raised a claim to levy this sum of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound, although they had accepted an equivalent of 1½*d.* for about two centuries. The parish of Christchurch resisted this claim, and they did so on the following grounds:—First, because they considered the payment of £200 a-year, which they had made for two centuries, as a customary payment; secondly, because the 2*s.* 9*d.* leviable on yearly rents was imposed when the rents were principally ground rents, and a sum of money was paid in the shape of a fine for the renewal of the lease, the fines being greater in amount than the rents themselves. Among the resisting petitioners —and he begged particularly the attention of the House to this fact—among the petitioners who resisted the litigation of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, were the firm of Messrs. Tylor, the brassfounders of Newgate Street, and, in addition, the trustees of Christ's Hospital. Messrs. Tylor were all powerful people in the parish of Christchurch. They were greatly trusted by their fellow-parishioners. They permitted themselves to come to the front in respect of this litigation, and, acting in conjunction with Christ's Hospital, the parishioners trusted them, and believed they would not feel at liberty to accept any compromise on their own account without the consent of the parishioners generally, and those who were joined with them in paying the costs of the litigation. The facts of the case, however, as it appeared to him, did not justify that confidence. St. Bartholomew's Hospital, having perhaps reason to fear the strength and force of the resistance offered to them by a firm like Messrs. Tylor, and a powerful corporate body like Christ's Hospital, made attempts to "square," and did, in fact, "square" those representative bodies, as he would venture to call them. They "squared" them in this way—They told the petitioners that they had the right to claim from them the rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound, but that they were ready to enter into a compromise for the payment of 6*d.* in the pound at once, the sum gradually rising to about 1*s.* at the end of 10 years. That was the arrangement which was to be made as a compromise. But how did the House think St. Bartholomew's Hospital settled with Messrs. Tylor? Messrs. Tylor were a strong and powerful firm, and were not easily to be set aside. St. Bartholomew's Hospital, therefore, found it convenient to settle with Messrs. Tylor for the payment of 6*d.* in the pound for ever. With Christ's Hospital, they entered into a compromise still more extraordinary and still more immoral. The House would find, if they referred to the Bill, that there was a clause inserted in it—Clause 13—which put outside the parish limits all ground which might become afterwards chargeable with these rates. This was done by a process scarcely honest. He dared say his hon. Friend the Member for Maidstone would put another construction on the matter; but it certainly did seem to him (Mr. T. Cave) to be a transaction which he could designate by no other name than dishonest. They agreed to regard land and buildings as being outside the parish, when, in point of fact, they were within it, and to let off a powerful and wealthy Corporation like Christ's Hospital with the small additional payment of £100 a-year. Now, it had long been known that it had been in the contemplation of Christ's Hospital to take the boys now under their charge in Newgate Street into the country, and to convert the large space of ground belonging to them, in the parish of Christchurch, into building ground, from which they would receive a very large and important rent-roll. The result of this transaction would be that any tradesmen taking shops belonging to Christ's Hospital would have an immense advantage over all other tradesmen in the neighbourhood who happened to live outside the limits of Christ's Hospital. Such tradesmen would be handicapped against the tradesmen who lived on premises which belonged to Christ's Hospital. The opposing petitioners found themselves to be sold by these two compromises. At the same time, they considered that it would be impossible to continue the litigation further, without the assistance of these two powerful parties, and they agreed to come to a compromise with St. Bartholomew's Hospital on their own account. They were afraid that if they did not effect a compromise, they would be held liable for the payment of the full rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound, and, as a matter of fact, a compromise was settled between a large number of parishioners—but not those who were now opposing the further progress of this Bill—and St. Bartholomew's Hospital, the terms of the compromise being that the parish should pay a rate immediately which would realize £1,100 a-year, that this sum should be gradually increased to £1,600, or nearly 500 per cent at the end of five years, and ultimately to £2,200 a-year at the end of a further period of five years, at which sum it was to remain in perpetuity. This compromise was submitted to the Master of the Rolls, who made some very significant remarks when it came before him. He did not disguise his anger and contempt—for that, practically, was the interpretation to be put upon the statements made by the Master of the Rolls—he did not disguise his feeling in regard to the great injustice of a great Corporation seeking, after the lapse of two centuries, to tax, for their own purposes, upon so enormously increased a scale, the whole of the parish which, unfortunately, was placed at their mercy. Perhaps, he (Mr. T. Cave) might be allowed to read one remark which was made by the Master of the Rolls. The learned Judge said, in fact—"What things are done in the name of charity!" and then went on to say that unless St. Bartholomew's Hospital accepted a reasonable compromise, he thought legislation would be necessary in order to protect the parishioners from the consequences. In regard to the Bill which was at present before the House, it had been introduced into Parliament in order to give legality to this compromise. He was a Member of the Select Committee which sat upon the Bill upstairs. The Committee listened with full attention to all the statements that were laid before them, and, after hearing the case, the Committee-room was cleared, in order that the question might be discussed between the Members of the Committee as to whether or not the Preamble of the Bill should be passed. In the end, it was only passed, after strenuous opposition of one-half of the Members of the Committee, by the casting vote of the Chairman. In the same way the important clauses of the Bill were passed, each clause being carried by the casting vote of the Chairman. The Chairman himself frequently used the argument which had been employed by counsel, that if the Committee did not pass the Bill in the shape in which it was asked for, the promoters would not take it all, but would go on with their litigation. This argument was urged upon the Committee by the Chairman, and he believed that it had considerable weight and influence with his hon. Colleagues, who permitted the Bill to pass. He was now going to ask the House to refuse to permit the Bill to take a stage to-day, simply on the following grounds:—First, he wanted to give to the dissentent petitioners a little longer time to consider the compromise —namely, until next Session. He believed that if an interval of this kind took place, the parties interested would be able to arrive at a fairer compromise than that which was contained in the present measure, and he made the Motion, which he had placed upon the Paper, in order to afford them an opportunity of doing so. St. Bartholomew's Hospital had agreed to settle with Messrs. Tylor at the rate of 6*d.* in the pound. If they would settle with all the parishioners on the same terms, he should not have a word to say. Surely they ought to be treated all alike? Surely a wealthy man ought not to be let off with 6*d.*, while others, who were not in an equally favourable position, were required to pay 1*s.* He believed that a compromise on these terms would entitle St. Bartholomew's Hospital to about £800 a-year, and the petitioners who opposed the Bill were quite willing to accept a compromise for the payment of £800 a-year. If that were done, the House would not be further troubled on the matter. He had been told that the arrangement made with Messrs. Tylor had been broken off, and that Messrs. Tylor were willing to come into the same arrangement as the rest of the parishioners. He believed that that was not true, and his reason for believing so was derived from certain statements which had been drawn up and placed in his hands; but which, unfortunately, he was not at liberty to use on the present occasion. He might add that such a proposal had never been made in that House before, as to give the force of legality to an attempt to raise a rate, after a lapse of two centuries, which amounted to 10, 20, and 30 times the amount of the original rate, and this without the slightest notice to the parishioners. The House would see that the owners of real property, having this claim forced upon them, would find the value of their property depreciated by 10, 15, or 20 per cent. If such a thing were to occur in regard to the actual value of a large landed estate, he ventured to say that the House would hear a great deal about it. When the Bill was last before the House, the Chairman of Ways and Means told the House that he found it his duty to vote for the Bill; but he made it tolerably clear that he did not approve of it. There was another reason why he (Mr. T. Cave) asked the House to refuse the Bill, and it was that there was no recorded instance of an Act being passed, after a fixed payment had been made for more than 200 years, which multiplied that payment, by a compromise, to 10 times the sum originally levied. He could not believe that the House would consent to sanction such a compromise. An arrangement of this nature did appear to him to be most unfair, and he could not help thinking that the treatment of the parishioners of this parish under the Bill was most unworthy of a great Corporation like St. Bartholomew's Hospital. He begged to move that the Bill, as amended, be taken into consideration that day three months, and he might add that he should trouble the House to divide upon the Motion.

Mr. PLIMSOLL seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Thomas Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. GREGORY remarked, that before expressing his views in regard to the Bill, he was anxious to state that he had no interest whatever in the measure, and had nothing whatever to do with the property that would be affected by the Bill. His only object in rising was to put the case as fairly as he could for the consideration of the Bill by the House. It appeared to him that the case itself was a very short and simple one. He did not at all question the accuracy of the details which had been entered into by the hon. Member for

Barnstaple, because he knew nothing of the circumstances that were laid before the Committee upstairs. He dared say that they would be explained by hon. Members who were Members of the Committee. What he wished to speak upon was the general ground, and the general principles of the Bill, and he would ask the House to consider what would be the result if they rejected it. Now, he thought that anyone who referred to the statement of the case before the Master of the Rolls must be satisfied that he would have decided against the parishioners who were sued for the recovery of those tithes, provided the case had gone on to its conclusion. He told the plaintiffs that that would have been his course in regard to the case; but he added that if he could find any principle of law that would enable him to decide against them, he certainly should. These words, used by the sitting Judge, might be taken as an assurance that there was no principle of law which enabled him to decide against the plaintiff, and the House might pretty fairly assume that so far as the judgment of the Master of the Rolls was concerned, it would have been in favour of the claim of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. Under these circumstances, he (Mr. Gregory) went upon the principle that the plaintiffs were right in their contention that they had a right to obtain what they asked for; and that if the case went on, there must be a decree for the full payment of the demand made by St. Bartholomew's Hospital up to 2*s*. 9*d*. in the pound. Now, what was the alternative? The alternative was provided by the Bill now before the House. By means of that Bill, the plaintiff, instead of enforcing their claims to 2*s*. 9*d*. in the pound, proposed to make a compromise which would ultimately amount to the levy of a rate of 1*s*. in the pound, reduced by particular circumstances to about 10*d*., or less than one-third of what they were entitled to claim. At present, the suit in Chancery stood over until Michaelmas Term. It would be heard again at the Michaelmas Sittings, and the Master of the Rolls would then be asked to pronounce his judgment. The learned Judge had already intimated what that judgment would be, and there could be no doubt that the litigation would end in a decree enforcing the full claim to the rate of 2*s*. 9*d*. in the pound. Under these circumstances, he asked if it would not be much better to accept the Bill now before the House, especially as it had already undergone the consideration of two Committees, one of the House of Commons, and one appointed by "another place." There was just one other point he was anxious to mention. The Statute, which permitted composition in the matter of tithes, could not apply to this particular case; but by it the Legislature had certainly sanctioned the principle of composition, and he ventured to say that that was, in reality, the principle adopted in the present instance. The House must also bear in mind this fact, that the parishioners who opposed the Bill were very few in number, and that the great majority of them had abstained from any opposition, and were satisfied with the Bill as it stood. He believed there was no doubt of the accuracy of this proposition. Even the hon. Gentleman who moved the rejection of the Bill did not pretend to represent any great body of the parishioners interested in the matter. Upon these grounds, he felt bound to oppose the Amendment, and to vote for the passing of the Bill.

MR. PLIMSOLL said, the hon. Member for Sussex (Mr. Gregory), who opposed the Amendment of the hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave), appeared to have forgotten, or perhaps he did not know, that the Master of the Rolls, in intimating his opinion in support of the claim, also thought that the injustice would be so flagrant that there would be no difficulty in obtaining an Act of Parliament to repeal the Act under which the claim was made. The opponents of the Bill were ready to run all the risks of the rejection of the Bill, and to fight it in "another place." Now, nearly every Member of the House had property somewhere. Who could tell that there might not be some dormant Act of Parliament three or four centuries old, which might be revived after the lapse of that number of years, and render the owners of property liable to pay a claim of 2*s*. 9*d*. in the pound? If such a thing were possible, it would be a very serious matter to the owners of property everywhere. He also believed that the Governors of Christ's Hospital were divided on this question themselves. When the House were divided on this subject, about 10 days ago, at his (Mr. Plimsoll's) instance, when he went into the Lobby, a much respected Member of the House came to him and said he was one of the Governors of the Hospital, but he was quite ashamed of the claim put forward by his colleagues in the name of charity; and he walked out of the House without dividing upon the Bill. He (Mr. Plimsoll) hoped the House, for the sake of justice, would not pass such a monstrous measure. He might add that upon the occasion he referred to, the hon. Tellers who told against him were both Governors of the Hospital.

Mr. ALLCROFT wished to say a word in regard to the statements which had been made upon the other side. The Governors of Christ's Hospital were charged with making an immoral bargain. Now, the bargain was that instead of paying £200 a-year they should pay in future £100 a-year more, and the terms made by them with St. Bartholomew's Hospital were that the Hospital should take off £200 a year from the amount collected in the parish. Therefore, whether the bargain was immoral or not, the parish of Christchurch did not suffer to the extent of a single penny in consequence of it. The hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave) spoke of the area of Christ's Hospital being about to be used for building purposes, and that it would escape these rates. He wished to say that the area of Christ's Hospital was in three different parishes, and out of the portion of land on which the Hospital stood only a very small part of it was subject to this charge. But besides the area of Christ's Hospital on which the building stood, and in regard to which the compromise was made, they had extensive property in the parish which would be dealt with under the Bill in regard to rating exactly the same as the rest of the property in the parish. He had been induced to make these remarks, because he felt it right that he should correct some of the mis-statements which had been made.

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID said, he knew nothing of the case until he heard it discussed in the House the other day; but he did think the matter bore a peculiar aspect. They found that under an Act of Parliament more than 300 years old, it was proposed by a charitable authority to increase the rates of the parish to an enormous extent. They were church rates in their origin, and were used as church rates for the maintenance of the church for many years. Now, although church rates had been abolished, and no alteration had been made in the payment of these rates for more than 200 years, it was now endeavoured to make this heavy additional charge. There ought to have been some Statute of Limitations which should have barred these gentlemen long ago from making such a claim as this, and from attempting, in the name of charity, to tax a very large parish for purposes, which were in their origin church rate purposes, at a rate of nearly 500 per cent more than the parish had been in the habit of paying for 200 years. If that was not a very strong proceeding in these days, he did not know what a strong proceeding was. He would ask the House to look at it from another point of view. Persons might have acquired property in the parish in total ignorance of this liability. He had no connection with the City of London in any way, but he was astonished that the City should put up with a proceeding of this sort, because there might be other claims to be started hereafter, and he did not see where the thing was to terminate. He thought they ought not to pass a Bill which one of the Judges of the land said would sanction a claim which was a monstrous abuse of authority, and which, according to that Judge, would involve a payment which was unjust in its nature. He thought the right thing for the House to do was to say that this Bill must stand over for another year; and in the meantime they should call upon the authorities of St. Bartholomew's Hospital to consider well what they were doing in the name of charity, and not to explode a mine in the district in which they were situated, under an Act of Parliament 300 years old, after their predecessors had entered into an arrangement which had been carried out for more than 200 years. He thought the case of the Hospital was a very weak one, unless there was some technical flaw which would override the case of the opposition. He must say that of all matters such a matter as this ought not to be decided by the casting vote of the Chairman of a Committee of four. Under these circumstances, he thought that time should be given for the reconsideration of the question.

MR. RAIKES: I must apologize to the House for rising to address it again on this subject. I have already addressed it at some length in regard to the history of this Bill. The hon. Baronet (Sir Julian Goldsmid) appears to be in a state of some confusion in regard to the objects of the measure. The hon. Baronet appears to me to object to the Bill, because he considers it to be an extension of the principles of church rates; and I think there are other hon. Members in this House who, having a strong aversion to anything like church rates, oppose the Bill on that ground. Now, so far as I understand the matter, the Bill has no reference to church rates whatever. The only question involved is one of property subject to tithe rates, and it does not involve the question of church rates in any shape or form. There is another point upon which the hon. Baronet seems to be mistaken. He appeared to think that the Master of the Rolls had stigmatized this Bill as a monstrous proceeding. Now, the object of this Bill is to put a stop to that proceeding which the Master of the Rolls stigmatized as monstrous.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID: I do not like to interrupt the hon. Member; but what I wanted to say was that the Master of the Rolls stigmatized the revival of a claim which had not been brought forward for 200 years as a monstrous proceeding, and adjourned the case, as I understand, in order that steps might be taken for getting rid of this claim altogether.

MR. RAIKES: I am glad that the hon. Member understands the matter rightly, but I think that the words he actually did use were the words which I have quoted. The Master of the Rolls, no doubt, used very strong terms in speaking of the claim which had been put forward, and as the hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave) has referred to what I said the other day, I am bound to add that he has quoted me correctly. If I had been the arbitrator to whom the matter had been referred, I do not think that I should have decided in favour of the precise compromise which is embodied in the Bill. I do not stand here now as the apologist of the promoters for the course they have taken in the matter. I am satisfied that the House will not determine the issue from this point of view, but will regard it as a question of the interests of the parishioners in this particular parish. The London City Churches Act, which I quoted the other day, provides that this particular parish should have power to agree by a resolution of its vestry, to compromise any claims which might be got up in respect of tithes. The vestry have full powers given to them by that Act, and this Bill is, I believe, an outcome of an agreement of this kind. That is, I think, a matter on which there can be no doubt and no question. The claims put forward by St. Bartholomew's Hospital would amount, I am assured, to no less a sum than £7,000 a-year, chargeable upon the parish; whereas the arrangement come to by the vestry with the plaintiffs provides that the charge shall only be £1,100 a-year at present, rising to £1,600 a-year at the end of five years, and finally becoming a charge of £2,200 a-year. Therefore, it is quite clear, assuming that the claim of St. Bartholomew's Hospital is a good one in law, that the parish have made an exceedingly good bargain. Hon. Members who have spoken to-day appear to think that by opposing this Bill they would be rejecting the claim of St. Bartholomew's Hospital; whereas, in point of fact, by rejecting the Bill, they would probably saddle the parish with the full liability of £7,000 a-year instead of £1,100, £1,600, and £2,200, which is the full extent of the claim sanctioned by this measure. It must be borne in mind that the Master of the Rolls did not reject the demand made by the Hospital. The Master of the Rolls clearly indicated that however much he disliked the claim put forward, he was probably powerless to resist it, and if those opposing this measure have their way, and the Bill be rejected to-day, we shall only have to look forward to the imposition of the full amount of £7,000 a-year as the result of this endeavour to resist the imposition of £1,100 a-year. What has happened with regard to the Bill in this House? We are told that upstairs the Bill was carried only by the casting vote of the Chairman. I hardly think that much should be made of the precise proportion in which the Committee decided. The decision of the bare majority is the decision of the Committee, and as such is entitled to the respect of this House. The hon. Member for Barnstaple has shown us by his advocacy of the views of the opponents to-day, that they were well and ably represented upon the Committee. There is an additional reason why the promoters of the Bill should be entitled to some consideration at the hands of the House. The Bill has only reached this House very late in the Session. All the parties who had the right to be heard before the Committee had full opportunity of being heard; but the Committee decided in favour of the Bill, and in the ordinary course it would have been read a third time and passed through all its stages. My hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury, however, interposed with a new clause on behalf of the Post Office, and the course taken to-day gives us an illustration of the effect of introducing new matter, which has not been brought before the Committee. If the House accept the Amendment, they will show that there is considerable uncertainty in decisions of the Committees upstairs, and will increase opposition to Private Bills in all their stages. I am sorry to detain the House so long on a Bill of this sort; but there has been something said in regard to Messrs. Tylor, who were opposed to the Bill, to which I am bound to refer. I am not in the confidence of Messrs. Tylor, and I am not entitled to make any statement on their behalf as to what induced them to withdraw their opposition to the measure; but I am assured by information that has reached me that the statement made by the hon. Member for Barnstaple as to the reason which induced them to withdraw their opposition is not correct. I think, however, that he said himself he understood the shadowy arrangement he referred to had been abrogated. The House must not therefore be led away by any notion that Messrs. Tylor have been "squared." Messrs. Tylor have been treated exactly the same as the rest of the parishioners, and I believe they are quite contented with their position.

Mr. T. CAVE: They were "squared" originally, and if the bargain has fallen through, it has not been from any unwillingness on their part. I may say most authoritatively that they are entirely malcontent with regard to the Bill.

Mr. RAIKES: I believe that Messrs. Tylor are not so much opposed to the Bill as the hon. Gentleman seems to think. Then, again, with regard to Christ's Hospital. Very much has been made of that case; but all it amounts to is that a compromise has been effected whereby that Hospital, instead of paying £200 a-year, will in future pay £300 a-year. I believe the whole effect of this Bill will be to require Christ's Hospital to pay permanently £100 a-year more than they do at present, while the parish itself will be relieved to the extent of £300 a-year, in consequence of the bargain made by Christ's Hospital. That I think is not an unfair proposal, for it must be borne in mind that the large bulk of the property of Christ's Hospital, according to the statement of the hon. Member for Worcester (Mr. Allcroft), who represents Christ's Hospital in the matter, is not within the parish of Christchurch at all. I confess that the matter is one of great difficulty. I think I have shown the House that, so far as I am concerned, I very much regret that such a claim should have been put forward by St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and that in consequence of the arrangement made by the parish, the House should be called upon to sanction such an arrangement. But I do not wish the House to run away with the impression that if they reject the Bill they will do good to the parish. It appears to me, on the contrary, that they will do a very considerable injury; and, considering that this Bill is the result of an agreement made between the plaintiffs in the suit on the one hand, and the parish on the other hand, I think it is undesirable, because a few Gentlemen happen to dissent from this arrangement, that the House should reject a measure which is the result of a general consensus of opinion among all the parties concerned.

Sir HENRY JAMES remarked, that a great deal that had been said by the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Committees would meet the entire concurrence of the House; but there was one thing that had not been noticed. As he understood, everyone who brought an impartial judgment to bear upon the matter—the Master of the Rolls, his hon. Friend the Chairman of Committees, and everyone else—seemed to agree that the claim of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, if not immoral, was a most objectionable claim. In considering the matter, he started from that point, and the view presented was, that St. Bartholomew's Hospital having brought forward a most objectionable claim, regarded in a moral point of view, and one which that House ought to be the last to sanction, it was proposed that they should resist this immoral or objectionable claim, and they were asked by way of compromise to pass a Bill which provided that instead of receiving the whole £7,000 a-year, the Hospital should receive £2,200 a-year, after an interval of 10 years. The House was asked to take upon themselves the responsibility of accepting that compromise, and of giving to St. Bartholomew's Hospital a sum of £2,200 a-year at the end of 10 years. He was quite aware of the answer which the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Committees had given—that if they did not allow this compromise, it would be the worse for the parish. But, in the first place, there were parishioners who took a different view, and wished their legal rights to be determined. Under those circumstances, he thought it would be a strong measure to compel persons who were prepared to go to litigation to have a compromise, against their own will, forced upon them. There was another view in which the matter might be regarded. When the authorities of St. Bartholomew's Hospital received this sum, originally, it only amounted, in fact, to the sum of £200 a-year; but, by virtue of an old Statute recently discovered, it was found that the rate levied upon the rental value of the property would produce a much larger sum, the property itself being in a much different position at the present day from that which it occupied formerly. It was, however, felt that it would be a great injustice if the authorities of the Hospital were now to be allowed, at the end of 200 years, after having been willing to receive £200 a-year for the whole of that period, to raise the sum by virtue of an old and forgotten Statute to £7,000 a-year; and if the claim was endeavoured to be enforced, it would be the duty of the Legislature to step in and take that sum away from the Hospital. A lapse of 200 years might be fairly considered, from every proper point of view, to have got rid of vested rights. As it was by virtue of an Act of Parliament that the Hospital made the claim, it was only just that Parliament should consider what their fair rights were. If the claim were considered to be an immoral claim, it would be the duty of the House to alter it. If the House rejected the Bill, it might be that the hon. Member for Sussex (Mr. Gregory) would be right in his supposition that the judgment of the Master of the Rolls would go against those who wished not to be bound by this compromise. There might be, for all he (Sir Henry James) could tell, a technical judgment of £7,000 a-year against them; but Parliament had the means of setting that matter right, and as one Committee had decided by acknowledging the compromise entered into, that £2,200 a-year was a proper sum to give to the Hospital, it might be the duty of some other Committee to determine what was a proper sum for the Hospital to receive, so that the Hospital might be saved from the disgrace of having it said—and it had been uncontradicted by any Governor present — that the claim put forward was an immoral claim, and a claim that ought not to be supported. It would be, he thought, an act of injustice to those of the parishioners who objected to the compromise, to pass the present Bill; and he, therefore, supported the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Barnstaple, which would afford time for the re-consideration of the matter, with the view of determining what was the proper sum St. Bartholomew's Hospital was entitled to receive.

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW trusted that the House would bear with him for a few moments while he offered some reasons which, he thought, ought to induce the House not to reject the Bill. All would agree that some very strong language had been used against the Governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and the House ought to give those who represented the Governors an opportunity of saying what they had to say in respect of the course pursued. He would touch, for a moment, upon the last point raised by the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James)—namely, that the Governors of the Hospital had been following an immoral and objectionable course in bringing their suit before the Master of the Rolls. But the Master of the Rolls acquitted them of all blame in the matter, and said that as trustees they were bound to obtain a legal decision upon the question. It was in consequence of the suggestion of the Master of the Rolls that the Governors had felt it right to introduce the present Bill. They were anxious in some way or other to have a compromise settled, as all they desired was to obtain a legal position, so that, as trustees, they might be able to take that which they were legally entitled to take. That was all that the Hospital desired. The hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave) had charged them with having made an immoral arrangement with Messrs. Tylor. He wished to say, with regard to that charge, that those who looked through the Bill would see that although, in the first instance, it was proposed that Messrs. Tylor should, under a compromise, pay a fixed sum, instead of being placed on the same basis as Christ's Hospital, it was afterwards determined that they should be placed on the same footing as the rest of the parishioners, and they accepted that arrangement. There was, however, some reason why they should have been placed in an exceptional position. They had land which was not yet covered, and therefore it was felt that they might be dealt with exceptionally in the matter; but when the case came before the Master of the Rolls, they consented to be placed in the same position as the other parishioners. Therefore, as the Bill stood, no parishioner stood on a different footing from another, except the trustees of Christ's Hospital, for reasons which had already been explained to the House. A great deal had been said in regard to the view taken by the Master of the Rolls. He would not trouble the House with any expression of opinion of his own; but he would prefer to read the words of the Master of the Rolls himself. The case lasted throughout the whole of one day, and the plaintiffs naturally did the best they could to make out their case before the learned Judge. The Master of the Rolls intimated that he was clearly of opinion that his decree must go against the defendants — Messrs. Tylor and Phillips—two of the largest ratepayers, who had been selected to fight the battle on behalf of the parish. In consequence of this intimation, a meeting of the parishioners was called the same night, and at that meeting there was a unanimous vote that the compromise which had previously been suggested and discussed should be accepted. In order to show the view which the Master of the Rolls took, he (Sir Sydney Waterlow) would read some of the remarks made by the learned Judge during the hearing of the case—

> "*The Master of the Rolls.*—I will do this—if you will both agree on terms—that being the present condition of matters, I will make an absolute decree which shall bind both, that is, in the shape of a compromise."

Mr. Chitty, who appeared for the Hospital, said—

> "I do not know whether we can get the Bill through by consent. Would your Lordship assist us in any way judicially in getting the Bill through?
>
> "*The Master of the Rolls.*—Yes; I will say this, that I think the compromise is not—as at present advised—at the disadvantage of the parishioners. I will not give a final opinion. I will say this much for you to help you through with the Bill, not intending to give a final opinion. . . . . I think it is a reasonable offer. The defendant now agreeing to withdraw all opposition to the Bill, and if the Bill passes each side to pay their own costs and let the thing stand over to the first cause day in November. . . . . And if there is any difficulty with the Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords, you may say, according to my present—not final opinion—but according to my present view, the arrangement is, in point of law, an advantageous one to the parishioners. . . . . . . It is perfectly well understood. I will tell you what I will do—I will let the cause stand over to the first cause day in next Sittings, Michaelmas Sittings, of course, with liberty to either party to apply. If there is anything you want from me I shall be most happy to assist you.

He wished to call especial attention to the last two sentences—

> "*Mr. Chitty.*—And your Lordship thinks the arrangement is proper for us also? We are a Charity.
>
> "*The Master of the Rolls.*—I have no doubt about that, Mr. Chitty; I will express that in any terms you think fit."

The Governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital had throughout been guided in this matter by their legal advisers, and were fully justified in attempting to get a decision upon it in a Court of Law. Under the City Tithes Act, passed some years ago, the several parishes were authorized to commute their tithes by arrangement with the owners; and by a comparison with what had been done in similar cases, the present compromise would be seen to be a very fair one. Besides, by Act of Parliament, the ratepayers were bound by the majority of the Vestry; and the longer a settlement was delayed the worse would be the compromise, because the larger would be the sum with which a compromise must then begin.

MR. W. E. FORSTER did not think anyone would blame the trustees for acting as they had done. They were told they had a legal right to this money; and it would have been difficult for them to avoid attempting to obtain what that legal right gave them. But it seemed to him that that legal right was, in fact, an actual wrong. It was an attempt to revive a claim which had been dormant for more than 200 years; and he could not help thinking that hon. Members who had spoken in support of the Bill now before the House—and even the Chairman of Ways and Means himself—had forgotten for the moment that they were addressing a Legislative Body. The House of Commons was not merely an interpreter of the law, but a maker and a reformer of the law; and if it were the case—as seemed to be admitted—that this was an unjust claim, it was the business of the House, when the subject was brought clearly before it, to set matters right. He was informed that if the Bill were now rejected the course of litigation might go on; but they must remember that the Master of the Rolls had given a very strong hint to Parliament, in saying that this was a case for legislation. That being so, it would be a strong measure to refuse the wish of even two or three parishioners; and he could not see, and had not heard, any reason why the Legisture should not prevent an injustice being committed, and endeavour to effect a reform in the law.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS said, he desired to explain the course which he intended to take with reference to the Bill, in view of the period of the Session at which the House had now arrived. It seemed to him that what Parliament ought to avoid doing was to bind unwilling parties to a compromise, from which, if they were prepared to litigate on their own behalf, they might escape as individuals. He understood that the suit which was raised in this case was instituted by a few parishioners, who took up the cudgels, so to speak, nominally for the rest; but under circumstances which did not really bind the others as to the result. If the Bill now under discussion were to pass, the hands of those who were concerned in this matter would be undoubtedly tied, and they would be debarred from disputing by litigation this extraordinary claim. At an earlier period of the Session he should have been disposed to move the re-committal of the measure, in order to have secured, if possible, that it should not have been allowed to operate upon unwilling ratepayers; but there was now no time for taking that course. The Bill was, no doubt, a reasonable one as regarded those who were prepared to be bound by it, but it was not reasonable in relation to those who were not so prepared; and unless the supporters of the measure were ready to suggest some way of escape from the difficulty, he must vote against the third reading of the Bill. At the same time, he might be allowed to say that, individually, he believed it was a foolish thing on the part of a minority of the ratepayers to oppose the proposed compromise. But if those ratepayers were prepared to litigate on their own behalf rather than submit to the arrangement, it was no part of the duty of the House to thrust down their throats that which was unwelcome to them.

COLONEL BERESFORD said, he regarded the Bill as unjust and extortionate. He had no belief in compromises. The matter might be compromised, apparently, to-day; but there was no reason why, at some future period, the £7,000 should not again be demanded. Having no faith in such an arrangement as that now suggested, he should also vote against the Bill.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 71; Noes 78: Majority 7. — (Div. List, No. 252.)

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *put off* for three months.

---

## PARLIAMENT—CLARE COUNTY WRIT.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS *reported* from the Select Committee on Clare County Writ; That they had agreed to the following Resolution, which they had directed him to report to the House:—

> "That your Committee are of opinion that Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, whose title to a seat in the House of Commons has been called in question, being now absent in Australia, should upon due notice have an opportunity of being heard in defence of his seat. And your Committee report that it being impossible that Sir Bryan O'Loghlen should be heard during the present Session, they recommend that the proceedings of this Committee be now adjourned, and that the Committee be re-appointed next Session in order that before a final decision shall be taken on this case, such notice may have been given to Sir Bryan O'Loghlen as may enable him, if he think fit, to be heard in defence of his seat. And your Committee further recommend that the Secretary of State for the Colonies be requested to communicate forthwith a Copy of the Resolution of this Committee to Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, which shall operate as full and sufficient notice to him to be prepared at the commencement of the next Session to appear, if he think fit, in defence of his seat."

Report to lie upon the Table.

Minutes of Proceedings to be *printed.* [No. 343.]

*Resolved,* That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to give directions to Her Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to communicate the Report to Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Her Majesty's Attorney General for Victoria.

## *QUESTIONS.*

## NAVY—ENGINE-ROOM ARTIFICERS.

### QUESTION.

Dr. CAMERON asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is not a fact that by a Fleet Circular (No. 21), issued in June 1877, certain improvements were made in the position of engine room artificers in the Navy, and a certain uniform prescribed for them; whether within the last few months they have not been for the first time ordered to wear the badge of a chief petty officer; whether there is any truth in the statement that this order had given rise to so much dissatisfaction among them that many of them have demanded their discharge from the Service; and, if he would explain what reason there is for enforcing an order on a point apparently so unmaterial if, as it is alleged, it is regarded with so much distaste by the persons to whom it refers?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, it is true that in 1877 new Regulations were issued regarding the position of engine-room artificers, and prescribing a certain uniform for them to wear; but it is the right and the duty of the Admiralty to make such alterations as they think fit. The Queen's Regulations provide that the officers and seamen of the Fleet shall wear such uniform as Her Majesty shall from time to time direct. In February, 1878, the engine-room artificers were ordered to wear the distinctive badge of their rank in common with other chief petty officers. In some few instances dissatisfaction was expressed, and some men demanded their discharge, which was refused. The reason for enforcing the order lies in the imperative necessity of requiring obedience to orders when given, as a point of discipline. The badge is one of rank and not of degradation, and is so viewed by the great majority of the men. Since it has been required to be worn, the applicants for entry have been so numerous that the numbers are complete, and no more can now be taken into the Service.

## ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1870—WYMINGTON.—QUESTION.

Mr. RYLANDS (for Mr. Chamberlain) asked the Vice President of the Council, with reference to the want of a public elementary school in the parish of Wymington since 1870, Whether he is aware that no further progress has been made in the provision of school accommodation since his answer to a question on this subject last March; and, whether, under these circumstances, he is prepared to order the formation of a School Board so that the necessary provision for elementary education in the parish, which had been delayed for eight years, may at last be made?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, in the answer of my Predecessor in March last, a detailed account was given of the exceptional difficulties in providing a school which this small parish had to overcome, and the consequent delay. The Department have been assured that a public elementary school has been erected, and we are in communication with the locality as to the engagement of a certificated teacher. So long as the locality makes and is making a *bonâ fide* effort to voluntarily provide school accommodation, I should be very reluctant to impose a school board upon them, though, of course, there is a limit to the time during which the effort must be completed.

### RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, 1877—CONTINUOUS FOOTBOARDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. GREGORY asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been directed to the Report of Accidents on Railways in the United Kingdom during the year 1877, and the renewed recommendation contained in such report of continuous footboards to the carriages; and, whether he proposes to take any steps for giving effect to such recommendation?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: Sir, in the absence of my noble Friend, I can assure my hon. Friend the Member for East Sussex that our attention has been directed to the Report he refers to, which is, in fact, the Report of our own Department, and to the recommendations therein contained. Lord Henniker, who represents the Board of Trade in the House of Lords, was instructed to inform a noble Lord, in answer to a Question on the subject of continuous footboards, that we were preparing a circular letter to the various Railway Companies on this matter. That letter has now been prepared, and if my hon. Friend will move for it, I shall be happy to lay it upon the Table.

### INDIA (FINANCE)—THE INDIA DEBT. QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, When the House may expect the Returns which were promised on the 21st June, 1877, in the following words of the Under Secretary:—

> " . . . A Return was in preparation showing the total amount of the India Debt, and another of Income and Expenditure was in preparation . . . . the Secretary of State . . . . had accordingly ordered them to be produced annually?"

Mr. E. STANHOPE: Sir, my noble Friend, now the Vice President of the Council (Lord George Hamilton), was referring to some suggestions made to him by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), who was good enough to communicate with the India Office last year. Mainly in consequence of his suggestion, a Return—No. 256 of Session 1877—was issued, and another has been prepared which he has not yet seen. I may add that, as regards Debt, we have already given four Returns this year—two of them on the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member.

### CRIMINAL LAW—PROSECUTION OF CRIME—LEGISLATION.—QUESTION.

Sir EARDLEY WILMOT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to bring in next Session the Bill so often promised for the appointment of a Public Prosecutor, or any other measure having for its object the amelioration of the Law regarding the prosecution of crime?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had stated some time ago that he intended before the close of the Session to introduce a Bill with reference to Coroners, and he still proposed to do so, in order that it might be printed and discussed in the Recess, with a view to its being referred to a Select Committee next Session. A Bill had also been prepared for the purpose of dealing with the appointment of Public Prosecutors, and he thought it might be a wise course to refer that Bill to the same Committee.

### INDIA—THE STRAITS SETTLEMENT—TROOPS IN PERAK—PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that the officers and troops sent from India to serve in Perak during the outbreak there are not to receive any extra pay or allowances, and that the officers and troops already stationed there at the time of the outbreak are to receive only such additional allowance as will bring their pay up to the ordinary Indian rate; if he would explain what is the reason for this apparent departure from the promise of the late Secretary for War, who on the 9th April 1877, in this House, said—

> "It has been arranged that they" (the officers and troops serving in Perak) "shall have the same advantages as were enjoyed by the European troops sent to Abyssinia;"

and, whether those European troops did not receive the "donation batta" in addition to the usual Indian pay?

Colonel LOYD LINDSAY: Sir, practically, the same advantages were granted to the troops serving in Perak as were granted during the Abyssinian Expedition, except as regards "donation batta." Working pay was granted to the non-commissioned officers and men of the British troops, while serving in the field in Perak. Extraordinary field allowances for six months has been granted to the officers, which, together with the Straits "consolidated Colonial allowance" for four months, and the ordinary regimental pay, amount to about the same as India pay and command pay. The "donation batta" was given to the troops in Abyssinia after, and in consequence of, the victory at Magdala, being a "grant determined after a campaign, and on the special circumstances of the campaign." It being thus special to the victory at Magdala, it was not contemplated by the late Secretary of State for War in his reply on the 9th of April, 1877.

## NAVY — THE NAVAL REVIEW AT PORTSMOUTH.—QUESTION.

Captain PIM asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If there is any objection to increase the number of tickets to be given to honourable Members to see the Naval Review on the 13th, and especially if the Members' ticket can be made transferable?

Mr. A. F. EGERTON: I beg to inform the hon. and gallant Member that the arrangement will be this. Each Member will be entitled to two tickets, one for himself and not transferable, and one for a member of his family. Any hon. Member wishing more tickets will have to apply to the Secretary to the Admiralty for them; but the accommodation being limited, it is impossible to say whether such applications will be granted.

## PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—MUSICAL INSTRUCTION.—QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether his attention has been called to Memorials on the subject of musical instruction in public Elementary Schools, lately addressed to the Council by the Bishop of Manchester and others; and, whether he proposes to take any steps with a view to the revision of the system of musical instruction which now exists?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, I have read the Memorials alluded to, calling attention to the present system of musical instruction in public elementary schools. We propose to send Mr. Hullah, our Inspector of Music, as soon as the musical examinations of this year are over, on a tour of inspection abroad, in order that he may investigate and report upon the system of musical instruction in vogue in France, Germany, Austria, and other foreign countries. Until we have received his Report, it would be premature to take into consideration, with a view to revision, the present system of musical instruction.

## LAW AND JUSTICE — LEICESTER ASSIZES.—QUESTION.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the Government propose that a third Assize should be appointed for Leicester in October; and, if so, whether pleadings are to be made deliverable in the Vacation?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker), in reply, said, it was not intended to appoint a third Assize for Leicester in October.

## INDIA—THE MADRAS CIVIL SERVICE—CASE OF MR. F. LASCELLES.

### QUESTION.

General SHUTE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he has considered the case of Mr. Francis Lascelles, late of the Madras Civil Service; and, whether he is prepared to agree to the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into all the circumstances attending it?

Mr. E. STANHOPE: Sir, since my hon. and gallant Friend placed his Motion upon the Paper, I have looked carefully into this case. It appears that the prosecution of which Mr. Lascelles complains was held nearly 40 years ago. The facts have since been inquired into over and over again, and successive Secretaries of State have pronounced against entertaining Mr. Lascelles' claims, and have refused to re-open the question. I cannot, therefore, consent to the appointment of a Committee, or hold out the slightest hope to Mr. Lascelles of any re-consideration of his case. I cannot but think that if my hon. and gallant Friend were aware of all the facts, he would not be disposed to press the matter further.

### POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPHIC DEPARTMENT) CHARGES.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. ANDERSON asked the Postmaster General, If he has considered, or if, before the Telegraph Conference, he will consider, the expediency of adopting a letter scale or syllable scale of charge, in place of the present word scale, with a view of encouraging the use of short words, and thereby enabling the wires to convey a greater number of messages?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: Sir, the question of adopting a letter or syllable scale of charge for telegraphic messages has been considered; but there are practical difficulties in the way of its adoption. It is probable that the question will be again considered at the next Conference.

Mr. WHITWELL asked the Postmaster General, Whether the International Conference on Postal and Telegraphic matters will take place this year; and, if not, whether he will direct that the inequality of the rate between telegrams from the Continent to London and telegrams from the Continent to the provinces will be removed by action of the Home authorities?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: Sir, the Postal Congress was held in Paris in May and June of this year. The Telegraph Conference will meet in London in June of next year. I have no power to alter the rates for telegrams; but negotiations are now going on with foreign Governments for the assimilation of the London and provincial rates.

Mr. WHITWELL asked, whether matters would be settled before next year?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he had reason to hope it would be settled speedily.

### CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS ACT—CARLISLE.—QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE (for Mr. Chamberlain) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he intends to order a prosecution of the persons (including an Alderman and Councillor of the borough and a Guardian of the Poor) who werer eported by the Commissioner to have been guilty of corrupt practices at a recent municipal election in Carlisle?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the matter had been put in the hands of the Treasury Solicitors, who did not advise a prosecution.

### INDIA (FINANCE) — THE INDIAN BUDGET.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. HOPWOOD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, when he proposed to consider the Indian Budget, on Tuesday next, he had taken into consideration the fact that many Members of the House had made arrangements to be present at the Naval Review on that day; and, whether he will take the Committee on a day more convenient to the majority of Members?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I do not know whether I am to infer from the Question that we are not likely to have an attendance on the day named. If so, it will affect other Business besides the Indian Budget. I am afraid at this period of the year we could not think of adjourning over the day, and, on the whole, I think the best arrangement is that we have proposed. We have already had a great deal of discussion on Indian finance this Session. It is, of course, a very important subject, and I have no doubt many hon. Members will forego the pleasure of seeing the Naval Review in order to take part in its consideration. I am sorry if we interfere with any hon. Gentleman who wants to go to the Review, but at present I am afraid I cannot propose any other arrangement.

In reply to Mr. Fawcett,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the Indian Budget would be the first Order of the Day on Tuesday next, unless it were necessary to put some formal Business before it.

### TURKEY AND RUSSIA—BULGARIA.

### QUESTION.

Mr. BRUCE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will lay upon the Table the

Report of Consul Blunt on the proceedings in Bulgaria consequent on the Russian occupation?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, there was no objection to lay upon the Table the Report referred to by his hon. Friend. He thought the best course would be for his hon. Friend to move for it, and it would be granted as an unopposed Return.

## SALMON FISHERY INSPECTORS.

### QUESTION.

Mr. HOPWOOD asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the appointment of Salmon Fishery Inspectors under 24 and 25 Vic. c. 100, is necessary for the public service; and, whether he intends, in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, to renew the power of appointing them?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in reply, said, during the time he was at the Home Office he was fully satisfied, and he believed that opinion was shared by the Secretary of State, that the result of the labours of these Inspectors was that a large source of the food supply of the people was not only increased, but reduced in price. As the exertions of the Inspectors would tend still further to increase that supply, he thought their services were necessary, and he had taken steps to provide for the continuance of the section of the Act under which they were appointed by the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

## POPULATION STATISTICS — THE REGISTRAR GENERAL'S RETURNS.

### QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the President of the Local Government Board, If he has had his attention drawn to the delays in submitting to Parliament the Annual Reports of Births, Marriages, and Deaths of the three divisions; and, whether any improvement can be effected by more promptly rendering these Reports, so as to extend their utility?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, that his attention had been called to the delay in the presentation of these Reports. He had communicated with the Registrar General, who had informed him that he would take, and had taken, measures in order that the next annual Report should be produced in April next instead of July. With regard to Scotland and Ireland, the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Lord Advocate were in communication with the Registrar General of those countries.

## FIJI—STATUS OF THE NATIVES.

### QUESTION.

Dr. O'LEARY asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether a Fijian native is to be deemed a British subject; whether, as such, he is entitled to engage himself as a labourer on a plantation owned by Englishmen or other owners of property in Fiji; and, whether the Governor of Fiji has been invested with such extraordinary powers as would enable him to forbid such natives to leave their native towns, on their being willing, after their term of service had expired, to re-engage themselves under their present employer for a new term of service under conditions most advantageous to their employers and agreeable to their own wishes and interests?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, that a Fijian Native was a British subject, and was entitled to engage himself as a labourer, subject to the regulations which had been made for the protection of the Native population of the Islands. He did not know what was referred to by the third paragraph of the hon. Member's Question; but certainly no information of any such action having been taken by the Governor of Fiji had reached him.

## EXCHEQUER BILLS AND BONDS (No. 2) BILL.—QUESTION.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, seeing that the Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) Bill had been put down very low on the Paper for that night, he would take steps so that in future stages of the Bill it would come on at a time when there would be a full opportunity of discussing the questions connected with it?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he would endeavour to do so.

## NAVY—TRANSPORTS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—QUESTION.

Mr. MUNDELLA asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether all or any of the transports which were chartered for the conveyance of the Indian troops to Malta were still retained by the Government; and, whether it had been necessary for any of them to return to Bombay to obtain the required supplies for the rations of the troops?

MR. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, that nine sailing ships had been ordered home for discharge some weeks ago, and if not already discharged, they would be immediately they arrived in this country; 15,944 tons had been re-chartered at from 20*s.* to 22*s.* per ton; the *Bangalore*, a Peninsular and Oriental steamer, was discharged in India on the 27th of July, and four British Indian steamships had been ordered to be discharged immediately. He was not aware that vessels had been ordered to India with rations.

### PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. DILLWYN,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, there would be a Morning Sitting to-morrow; but he was not able, at present, to fix the Business.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

### NAVY—THE ROYAL NAVAL RESERVES.

#### RESOLUTION.

CAPTAIN PIM: Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the present condition of the Royal Naval Reserve; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the Royal Naval Reserve is not adapted for the present requirements of the Nation, and should at once be superseded or at least supplemented by a large increase of Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers; and that in order to secure efficiency such men should be trained on board sea-going gunboats stationed round the Coast and available for service on the shortest notice."

Sir, I do not propose to take up the time of the House by going into the state and condition of the Coastguard, but will confine myself chiefly to the Naval Reserves raised from the Mercantile Marine, and that splendid body of Volunteers, the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers. I should not have addressed the House on this subject had I not been, nearly 20 years ago, when in command of H.M.S. *Gorgon*, intrusted with raising and organizing the Royal Naval Reserve in our Northern ports, and had I not, from that day to this, taken a deep interest in the Force, and in the Voluntary movement generally. To give an idea of the present value of the Royal Naval Reserve, I must ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes, while I lay before hon. Members a few facts about the British Mercantile Marine. Our Mercantile Marine consists of about 25,000 ships, of which, say, 5,000 are steamers. These vessels are manned by some 200,000 persons, of whom certainly not more than 20,000 are real British seamen, the rest being made up mostly of foreigners and riff-raff of the worst description—drunken, mutinous scoundrels, with no knowledge of their work—in fact, a disgrace to the flag under which they serve. I am bound to say that the best of these men are the foreigners, especially some 8,000 to 10,000 Russian Fins, who are now serving in our Mercantile Marine; but I have seen very many ships with not an Englishman on board—not even the captain. Take the case of the *Lennie*, *Caswell*, and many more. Sir, it is from such men as that we have to draw our Reserves; and the late Admiral Superintendent of these Reserves reported in a Return, laid before this House last year, that all the available British seamen in the Mercantile Marine—some 12,000 or 13,000—had entered the Reserve. The original idea was that the nation should have 30,000 seamen out of the Merchant Service as Reserve men to man our Fleets in time of war, and I submit to the House that this number was not one too many; but we find, from the Admiral Superintendent's Report, that we have every available British seaman, and that the total amounts only to 12,000 or 13,000. But, Sir, I will show to the House that we dare not take any of these men away from our merchant ships in time of war, and that, practically, we have no Reserve whatever from our Merchant Service; that it is a snare and a delusion, and that the nation is paying some £200,000 per annum for what is worse than useless; and that at a time when, for the same money, the services of at least 30,000 Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers might be easily obtained. We dare not take any of the so-called Royal Naval Reserve men in time of war, even if they happened to be at home, and for this reason—that our own merchant ships must be manned to lay out coals, stores, munitions, troops, &c.; and, above all, bring home our food supply, without which we should be starved into submission in a month. We are a great nation, but we must have food; and, as I take it, no shipowner would risk his vessel with foreigners and riff-raff in the day of need, it is quite evident that our 12,000 or 13,000 Reserve men could not be spared from our merchant ships for a single day. I have more than once pointed out the grave danger to England in respect to her food supply, and the employment of foreign seamen, who, of course, would either leave in war time, or remain only to seize, scuttle, or otherwise destroy our helpless merchant ships on board of which they were serving. That this is no imaginary danger is more than shadowed forth in the proclamation, which I hold in my hand, of the Czarewitch, in respect to fitting out Russian privateers—the full text of which is published in *The Morning Post* of the 13th of May last. I will only read one clause—

> "Will our sailors be able to attack? Of course, they will, for they are Russians. But we must give them an abundance of good and rapid ships, and they will soon find out the weak points of our new adversary. Dozens of vessels, under the command of competent captains, may be scattered over all the commercial routes of our new enemy and put a stop to his universal trade. A month's blockade like this will have a singular effect upon that trade, and the heaps of gold of which he is so proud will almost melt away like snow."

As regards the urgent necessity of keeping up our supplies, I must ask the indulgence of the House to a few facts and figures. At the risk of being accused of repetition, I will again point out that the population, according to the statistical Return, in the year 1801, amounted to 10,472,048; and increased from this to 34,000,000 in 1878. That the United Kingdom was not dependent on foreign countries for the supply of wheat for the first 35 years of the present century. During the period which has elapsed since 1835, a remarkable change has taken place; the requirements of an increased population, the consequent demand for an increased quantity of food, have combined to render the country dependent for two-thirds of its supply of food on foreign countries. Of wheat alone, it appears that the annual importation had risen to a total of grain of all kinds, including flour, to 107,521,642 cwt. in 1875, and last year to 1,000,000 cwt. more. Sir, last year we imported no less than 1,000,000 tons of grain from America, mostly in English vessels. I think I have shown that our Mercantile Marine is in a most deplorable condition, and that, practically, we have no Naval Reserve. I now come to the second part of my Motion—namely,

> "That the Royal Naval Reserve should at once be superseded, or at least supplemented, by a large increase of Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers; and that in order to secure efficiency such men should be trained on board sea-going gunboats stationed round the coast and available for service on the shortest notice."

It is needless to take up the time of the House by eulogizing the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers. I can only say that in all my experience I have never seen more zeal or better drill on board the smartest man-of-war than I have seen at Liverpool and London on board the drill ships used by the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers; and, moreover, they are always on the spot, ready for service. Sir, the Government proposed to utilize our merchant steam ships in the event of war by putting guns on board. There never was a greater mistake. Our long narrow merchant steam vessels are totally unfit to carry guns. I believe they would capsize when light, and getting out of coals, or, at all events, when the guns were fired all the rivet-heads would be started or fall out, and the vessels never see a harbour again. What we want is a number of sea-going gun vessels with the longest-range guns on board. These vessels—of which there has been a mechanical drawing for some months in the Tea Room—would cost some £30,000, as against £70,000 or £80,000 for a merchant steamer. What I say to the Government is this—Encourage the Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, increase their strength from 500 to 30,000 at least, and station sea-going gunboats, each carrying a heavy gun, at every point where there is water enough to float them. This Force alone, manned by Volunteers, would set at defiance any and every hostile combination against England. Seamen and handy sea-going small craft is what England wants, and it will go hard with her if she does not strain every nerve to obtain them. The Navy is the life's blood of the nation; good and efficient Reserves are essential to it; therefore, Sir, I beg to move the Resolution of which I have given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the Royal Naval Reserve is not adapted for the present requirements of the Nation, and should at once be superseded or at least supplemented by a large increase of Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers; and that, in order to secure efficiency, such men should be trained on board sea-going gunboats stationed round the Coast and available for service on the shortest notice,"—(*Captain Pim*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. W. H. SMITH regretted that it was not possible for him to agree to the Motion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had stated that there were only 500 Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, and they consisted of three brigades, stationed in London, Liverpool, and Bristol. The total number of officers and men was 1,056, and only 592 were efficient men. The question really was, what was the best Reserve that could be obtained? He believed that the first and second class of the Royal Naval Reserve —composed, as they were, of *bonâ fide* sailors—were the best kind of Reserve we could get. The first-class numbered 11,753 men, and the second 5,642. But, said the hon. and gallant Member, the first-class Reserve men would not be available in time of war. There he differed from the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and his impression was shared not only by his Colleagues, but by almost every naval officer he had come into contact with. In the event of war the maritime trade of this country would inevitably fall off to some extent, and numbers of those men would consequently be set free for their naval duties. If there were 30,000 men in the Royal Naval Volunteers, he thought that would be a sufficient resource on which to draw for the Navy. He believed both classes of the Reserve to be efficient men, who knew how to handle a ship, and considered that they would be most efficient in time of war; but he could not say the same of the Royal Naval Volunteers, who had not had the same practical training at sea. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had spoken in somewhat severe terms of the seamen of the Mercantile Marine. Well, it was not his duty to vindicate the character of the seamen of the Mercantile Marine; but he might remind the hon. and gallant Member that they had contributed a good deal towards the strength of this country, that they formed a very powerful body of men, and that they performed important functions, not for this country alone, but for the whole world. He did not know that it was necessary for him to say any more on this subject. Looking to the training and experience of the men of the Royal Naval Reserve, he could only add that he placed great reliance upon them, as his Predecessors had done, though he earnestly hoped they might not be called upon.

MR. D. JENKINS believed that the seamen of to-day were just as competent for the duties required of them as those of 20 years ago, though, no doubt, owing to the extensive employment of steam now-a-days, they were less skilled in seamanship. As for the Royal Naval Reserve, his impression was that there were too many dockyard-men, "lumpers," and stevedores among them, and that greater care ought to be exercised in selecting them.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

## GREENWICH HOSPITAL—AGE PENSIONS.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR, who had the following Notice on the Paper:—To call attention to the case of certain Greenwich Pensioners, who being resident in the Colonies, their age pensions were on that account suspended from 1865 to 1876, and to move—

"That, in the opinion of this House, residence in the Colonies should not be any disqualification for the enjoyment of Greenwich Hospital pensions, and this House is further of opinion that some provision should be made for paying the arrears to the men whose pensions were on this ground withheld,"

said, he would urge the House to put a little gentle pressure upon the First Lord of the Admiralty, who, he was sure, would be glad to receive it, in order that he might give what was due to some 40 poor old fellows who had faithfully served their country. He could not but think that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Admiralty Department would not object to gentle pressure being put upon him in order that he might be the instrument of doing justice to a deserving class of men. The Admiralty excluded men who were otherwise entitled to pensions, but who were in the employment of the Government, and that exclusion afforded no ground of criticism; but what was the meaning of excluding men whose only fault—if it could be called one—was that they resided in the Colonies? They were surely, while in our Colonial Possessions, entitled to all the rights of Englishmen, and from length of service and good conduct would be awarded pensions if in this country, and therefore should receive them in the Colonies. Officers were not excluded on account of their residence in the Colonies, and he thought that no distinction should be drawn between the officers and the men in this respect. For 10 years they had from time to time brought their claims before the Admiralty; and he hoped that, being so well founded, they would be now practically recognized. He would make a very earnest appeal to the right hon. Gentleman and to the House to grant this very reasonable request.

Captain PRICE supported the appeal made by the hon. Member who had just sat down on behalf of residents in the Colonies who were entitled to Greenwich pensions. On this subject he would suggest, and if he had had an opportunity would have moved—

> "That in any alterations which it may be necessary to make in the Greenwich Hospital Age Pensions, care should be taken to deal on a footing of equality with all persons who, under existing regulations would become entitled to them on reaching the required age, and who, on entering into an agreement to serve in Her Majesty's Navy for a term of years, may reasonably be expected to have made these pensions an important factor in their calculations."

An Order in Council had been made in June last to the effect that, owing to the strain on the funds of Greenwich Hospital, the number and amount of the pensions granted should be reduced, and it limited the number of aged pensioners to 7,500. He had no doubt that retrenchment was necessary, but it should not be effected at the expense of a particular class. In 1865, an Act was passed providing that a certain portion of the revenues of the Hospital should be devoted to the payment of pensions to seamen of good conduct who were 55 years of age or upwards, and had served in the Navy a certain time. Of course, the result would be an increased strain upon the funds of Greenwich Hospital; but, he argued, the Admiralty should have made this discovery before. How was it that the discovery had only now been made? How was it a gradual retrenchment was not made, beginning some time ago, and thus avoiding the drastic measure of taking away pensions altogether, and giving the benefit of Greenwich age pensions to men not so deserving of them, perhaps, as those who had been deprived of their allowances? If that was shortsighted, what could be said of the doings of the Admiralty in 1875, when the age was actually put back from 70 years to 65, thus throwing an increased strain upon the funds? He was told that one reason for something which had been done was that men who entered the Service many years ago, and who were engaged in the Russian War, were arriving at that age which enabled them to claim their pension from Greenwich Hospital. But what were the actuaries of the Admiralty about not to have been able to foresee what was going to occur? He wished to call the attention of hon. Members to the limits proposed to be fixed by the Admiralty as to the number of the Greenwich pensions, and point out that there were anomalies in the present system which he hoped would be provided for. The point he wished particularly to raise was, whether they were willing to break faith with meritorious public servants? He thought they were not. In these days men were engaged for 10 years in the Royal Navy, and at the expiration of that period they were to be invited to enter upon a further period of 10 years. Before doing so, a man naturally looked not only to the immediate pay he received, but what he would have in the future, how he got on in the Service, and the amount of Greenwich Hospital pension to which he would be entitled. But, under the Order in Council of which he complained, he would be debarred from that Greenwich pension. The other day he asked the question, whether the Order in Council was to apply to those who had already engaged to serve, or whether it was to apply only to future engagements? and the answer he received was that the Greenwich Hospital age pensions formed no part of the agreement under which the men served. But would it be denied that these men, who had already entered upon their second period of service, made the existence of these pensions a most important factor in their calculations? It could not be said that these men did not look so far forward as to consider the pensions, or that there was any uncertainty about them if they waited until they were the necessary age. The Government sheltered themselves under the plea that these pensions were given at the discretion of the Admiralty; but the pay and pension of every servant of the Crown was given at discretion. Again, it was said that these men were so well paid, and received such high pensions, that they ought to be in a position to make proper provision for their families in the event of their death; but there being no certainty as to the amount of pension to which they were entitled, how could they be sure about making such provision? He thought there was much ground for complaint, especially on the part of second-service men, against the present system. If he were asked to suggest what ought to be done, he would first recommend the laying down of the broad and equitable principle as an unalterable rule—that, rather than break faith with men in the Public Service in this or in any other matter, the Government should ask the House to grant a certain sum of money from the Consolidated Fund, and then make any retrenchment they pleased in the future. As a matter of fact, there had been grants to Greenwich Hospital—in 1870, of £20,000; in 1871, of £11,000; and since 1872, of £4,000 a-year. Another alternative was that the dates might be put back which would mitigate the hardship of the recent Order. A third alternative was that if the funds would not allow of 9*d*. a-day being paid to all classes, the rate should be reduced to 6*d*., and the reduced pensions paid to all, instead of one class being deprived of pensions. It was not wise that men should be allowed to leave the Service at the age of 38, and that thenceforth they should be kicking their heels while we did not know whether we could lay hold of them or not. The average cost of a pensioner, taking into consideration the cost of the men to be put in their places, was 4*s*. 9*d*. a-day, and the men might be induced to remain in the Service up to the age of 45, by giving them 6*d*. a-day extra, which would reduce the cost of a pensioner to 4*s*. 3*d*. We ought not to give more pay than it was necessary to give to procure the right article. The way to have a contented Navy was to give the men plenty of work and good food, to maintain strict discipline, and kindness; but whatever we did, we ought most scrupulously to keep faith with the men. He could not, by the Rules of the House, press his Motion now; but when the Hospital Vote came on, he should ask the House to consider whether the whole of this retrenchment ought to fall on the men, or whether any portion of it should be borne by the officers, and with that view he should move to reduce the Hospital Vote by £1,500.

SIR MASSEY LOPES thought that the Government had already in effect done what the first part of the Resolution asked them to do. These pensions could not be claimed as a matter of right, but were given at the discretion of the Government, as was shown by the terms of the Act of 1865, which said it should be lawful for Her Majesty in Council, from time to time, by Order in Council, to give such pensions as she thought fit, and to prescribe the conditions under which they were to be enjoyed. Therefore, the Admiralty had not gone beyond their powers, and it was within their discretion to make alterations. The fact was that the amount of the pensions had enormously increased during the last three or four years. He would remind the House that in 1877, when partly by improved arrangements, and partly by the sale of an estate, the income of the Greenwich Hospital was raised by £14,000 a-year, the Government thought it a fitting opportunity for removing what were considered anomalies, which were that men in the Colonies should be deprived of pensions, or that men who were otherwise employed by the Government should lose them; and these two concessions increased the demand on the Greenwich Hospital Fund by £3,000 a-year. But when the Government were asked to pay arrears for the last 10 years, he could only say, on the part of Greenwich Hospital, that the funds would not bear it. As regarded the Hospital pensions, they were not now limited to any number of men. Formerly, the men did not exceed 5,000, and the amount expended was £48,000. But in 1874-5, the number of pensioners had increased to 5,925, and the amount expended was £56,262. In 1878-9, however, the number had increased to 7,497 men, and the amount given to them to £78,231, so that the cost in four years had been increased by £22,000; and there was reason to believe that this great increase would go on at the same rate, as, according to the present system of things, the men were obliged to leave the Service after a certain term. His hon. and gallant Friend had complained of the pensions being small; but Greenwich Hospital was a charity, and it could scarcely be said that a man with a pension of 2*s.* 6*d.* a-day was a fit object to receive its benefits. Pensions to petty officers and others which averaged from £30 to £35 a-year could not be considered as unsatisfactory; at any rate, it was more than they were entitled to under the old system. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Childers) had laid down a rule which he thought a very good one—namely, that at least £10,000 a-year should be set aside from the income of Greenwich Hospital Estates, in order to meet an emergency, and they had endeavoured to carry out that rule; but this year they were unable to do so, the surplus being only £6,000. He could only say they very much regretted to make these alterations; at the same time, he could not think the hardship was as great as had been represented.

Mr. CHILDERS wished to say a few words on this subject, as he was principally responsible for the Act of 1865. He contended that its operation had been beneficial. The great object of it was to bring about a state of things which should make the seamen who received pensions more comfortable at the homes of their friends than they experienced at Greenwich Hospital. Having introduced the Act referred to, and also the Act of 1870, he had paid particular attention to the financial aspect of this question. From the first, they appropriated in pensions and on the school, the whole income of the Hospital Estates, barring a surplus of £10,000 a-year, which should be set aside for a time of war, when the strain on the Hospital funds might be very heavy indeed. But little by little there had been a tendency to bring fresh burdens on the Hospital. First, the Merchant Service had obtained grants, then the age for the higher pension had been reduced from 70 to 65, then the children of officers were supported at private establishments; and then pensioners in the Colonies were admitted to the Greenwich allowance; although, under the former system, no seaman resident in the Colonies ever dreamt of being admitted to the benefits of the Hospital. They were not, therefore, entitled to the pension which took the place of those benefits. The Government, however, had thought fit, of their great bounty, to extend that advantage to seamen in the Colonies; and, having granted that boon, there would be some difficulty in refusing the arrears. The success of the Artillery and Engineer officers in India with respect to their arrears was a precedent difficult to resist. He would, however, earnestly hope that the Admiralty would adhere to the financial scheme originally laid down.

Sir JOHN HAY said, that the pensioners in the Colonies had a strong claim on the Admiralty for the arrears which appeared to be due. The hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor) had done good service to these persons and to the Navy by bringing the subject before the House. With regard to the question which his hon. and gallant Friend (Captain Price) had brought forward, he waited with some interest the statement on the part of the Admiralty. He always understood that in consequence of the loss of the pension fund by the sale of the Estates, as there was a constant increment in their value, it had been recognized in the debates that the Consolidated Fund must be fairly chargeable for any increase of the pensions. Though the Greenwich Hospital might in days gone by have been considered as a charitable institution, yet these were pensions and not charitable payments. He thought his hon. and gallant Friend was perfectly justified in contending that every boy who entered the Navy for the future should be made aware that he entered it under fresh regulations, and that every person now in the Navy ought to have that which he had a fair right to expect and which he saw his comrades obtaining, unless he had been told that he was not to obtain it. Therefore, the clearest intimation ought to be given to the parents of boys entering at 14 that they were to expect a different scale of pensions. He quite agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend that whatever charge might be thrown on the Consolidated Fund faith ought to be kept with the seaman.

MR. M'LAREN said, he would give his earnest support to the case of his hon. Friend the Member for Leicester. He contended that good faith should be kept with the sailors who had entered the Service under certain regulations.

MR. RAMSAY hoped that the system of pensions would not give a certain number of seamen advantages over others. Any such system would prove very undesirable, and would promote ill-feeling among the men.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, he cordially concurred in the observations which had fallen both from his right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) and his hon. and gallant Friend behind him (Captain Price), that good faith should be kept with the sailor and the public servant, and that any sacrifice which was necessary ought to be made in order to keep good faith. He did not admit, however, that good faith had not been kept with the sailor in this case. His right hon. Friend pointed out that these Greenwich Hospital pensions were a substitute for admission into the Hospital. Every man had not a right to enter, but the men who applied were received at the discretion of the authorities of Greenwich Hospital. In lieu of that admission, the Act provided that it should be lawful for Her Majesty, "from time to time," by Order in Council, to appoint such pensions as She might think fit, &c. Now, if words meant anything, the words "from time to time" meant that the pensions granted should be, from time to time, revised by the Admiralty. The real fact was that there was a fund intrusted to the Admiralty for distribution under certain regulations which they were bound to lay down from time to time. Any person allowed a certain portion of that fund was entitled to it for the rest of his life; it could not be taken from him without a breach of faith. The Admiralty had recommended Her Majesty's Government to pass an Order in Council limiting the number of persons who were entited to pensions to the maximum number which had yet been reached—a course which had been proved to be necessary by the very large number of pensioners. Seeing that the fund was being drawn upon so largely, it had been thought right to limit the number to 7,500 persons. As he read the Act of Parliament, no seaman in the Navy had an actual right to any pension. A pension might be granted, and every seaman had a right to expect that the trustees of the fund would divide it properly. Who, then, were the persons entitled to pensions? A pension, it should be remembered, was not a reward for good conduct or for superior intelligence. It was a gratuity out of the funds which the nation possessed to seamen who had served their country well and who had reached an age when such a gratuity became desirable or necessary to them. Of course, no one who had not a good character could receive a pension. It might, however, be his misfortune and not his fault that he had not become a petty officer. Then came the question whether such a man might not, on the whole, be better entitled to an increase of his means of subsistence than other men who were receiving more money per week? In his judgment, the Admiralty had acted rightly, on the whole, in distributing this limited fund among a large number of men whose naval pensions were small, instead of giving it to men who were comparatively well off. He thought they were bound to distribute it to meet the necessities of the greatest number. As to the payment of arrears, that would simply be equivalent to taking the money from somebody else. His own opinion was that these men had been treated with great liberality. The pensions which now existed were a substitute for the eligibility to go into Greenwich Hospital. It was clear that a man residing at Melbourne or in New Zealand would not leave his friends and come over here in order that his claims for admission to Greenwich Hospital might be considered. Reference had been made to the heavy sums which the House was asked to vote annually for pensions, and he confessed that in proposing those Votes he felt a certain amount of alarm lest Parliament should say that they were becoming too onerous.

## COAL MINES — HAYDOCK COLLIERY EXPLOSION.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. MACDONALD rose to call attention to the evidence tendered at the inquiry into the cause of the Haydock Explosion, whereby over 190 lives were sacrificed; also to the verdict of the jury, which ran as follows:—

> "We believe there has been a fouling of air connected with an outburst, or fall of roof; but by whom the gas was ignited there is no evidence to show. The explosion was caused by a faulty ventilation, and by an accumulation of gas in goaves near Evans's Place, which has been expelled from thence by a fall of roof, assisted by other fouling which was known to exist previous to the explosion by the firemen and others;"

and the following recommendations:—

> "There should be two firemen's reports, one for each shift, and that the ventilation should be in future carried out according to the wishes of the Government Inspectors. The lamp system is good, but requires better supervision, and especially the machine to fasten the lead rivets should not be left carelessly in the mine."

The hon. Member said that, after the discussion on mining accidents, not long ago, he would not have claimed the attention of the House had not the question been one of a very serious character. On December 26th, 1868, an explosion occurred in Haydock Colliery by which 26 persons lost their lives. An inquest was held, and the Inspector reported in terms not very flattering to the manager. He stated that there had undoubtedly been an accumulation of gas. Now, in any well-managed colliery an accumulation of gas ought not to be allowed to exist. It was a crime to permit such accumulation. If gas was there, workmen ought not to be there. But the workmen, in this case, were allowed to go into the colliery, an explosion occurred, and 26 persons lost their lives. One would have thought that after that calamity, there would have been extra care and skill in the management of this mine; but in July, 1869, there was another explosion in it, and 59 persons lost their lives by that explosion. Within eight months an explosion occurred under nearly the same circumstances, the only difference being that the Inspector declared that the mine was well managed, and the manager was an "exceedingly good manager." How a destruction of 85 lives by explosion by gas could result under the management of a good manager, he was totally unable to see. He might be told that there was neglect on the part of those who were under the manager; but he had yet to learn that the owner or the manager of a mine could relieve himself from the obligation imposed on him by the Mines Inspection Act. If the manager was not aware of the accumulation of gas, his ignorance was a crime. In about nine years after the explosion last referred to, the country was startled, on the 7th of June, by that terrible explosion which took place at this mine, whereby 195 persons lost their lives. The Home Secretary sent down a legal gentleman to see that the inquiry on the subject was properly conducted. That inquiry was, he (Mr. Macdonald) thought, searching and complete. It lasted about 10 days. Nearly 200 witnesses were examined. Many witnesses told the tale of the condition of this mine. One gentleman was so irreverent as to place the accident on Him who rules the affairs of this world. But the evidence told an entirely different tale. He had collected statements of a few of the witnesses to show that if the mine had been worked carefully or skilfully, the manager must have known the actual condition of the mine. He was able to produce evidence from various witnesses to the effect that many of the workmen were aware for long periods before the explosion that there was an accumulation of gas in the mine. At the coroner's inquest, three witnesses appeared in connection with the management. The first, who was a foreman, stated that there was no gas in the mine; but on cross-examination he had to admit that during weeks before gas had been oozing out and showing itself in the goaf, that barriers had to be put up, and that he had never communicated these facts to the manager of the mine. Next, the certified manager stated that it was not a gassy mine; but he admitted that he had seen gas in it. Then came Mr. Chadwick, the manager, the effect of whose evidence was that the men under him were permitted to make magazines of gas which might at any moment explode and destroy the lives of the miners, and that they thought these things were too trifling to deserve notice. Although the Inspector of the district called it a well-managed mine, it was acknowledged that none of the discipline requisite for safety was observed. The experts ascribed the explosion to a sudden outburst of gas, but three experienced Inspectors of mines were called —Mr. J. Dickenson, Mr. Hall, and Mr. Hedley—and their testimony went to show that no sudden outburst of gas was necessary to account for the explosion, and that it had been occasioned by defective ventilation. He might be told that he ought to leave the Government to deal with that matter in its own way in consultation with their Law Officers; but if he took that course, the subject would probably lie over for another six or seven months, during which time they would, perhaps, have other calamities of the same kind occurring that would obliterate the Haydock disaster from men's minds. In 1875, 143 persons were killed near Barnsley by an explosion in a mine in which, according to the verdict of a jury, the general and special rules of the colliery had been disregarded; but nothing had been done in that case. Again, in October last, 209 persons were killed at Blantyre Colliery, and the inquiry disclosed that every rule for the good government of the mine had been neglected, that men were allowed to do what they liked, to use naked lights, and to fire shots. But the person under whose management that occurred was still manager of the mine; and so far as he knew, not one sixpence was the manager compelled to pay for the destitution he brought upon the homes of the 209 persons who were killed. No step had been taken to make anyone answer in a Court for what had happened. About 25 years ago, when two serious colliery accidents had occurred in Scotland, one through fire-damp and the other through men falling down an unprotected mine, the Procurator Fiscal of the district brought the managers of the mine before a jury at Glasgow on a charge of murder; and though the verdict was "Not proven," the practical effect was to put a stop to similar accidents. For more than 20 years they had not known a similar accident, and shaft accidents were unknown. He was confident that that would be the result whenever the owners or managers of a mine were put on their trial; and he could say, from what he had himself seen after the Blantyre explosion, that popular indignation demanded the trial of those whose negligence had been culpable. If they were not to be punished, the Government ought at once to institute an order of merit for the destruction of life. These constant disasters produced a feeling of deep resentment in the mining districts, and unless Parliament took steps in the matter, it was to be feared that the miners would become so exasperated by the constant and preventable destruction of the lives of their friends and relatives that they would take the law into their own hands. He was prevented by the Rules of the House from moving the Resolution which it was his intention to have done; but he called upon the Government to institute an active system of inspection and inquiry, and to take measures that offenders against the existing mining laws should be severely punished.

MR. BELL, who had had some considerable experience as a coal-owner, said, he had had many opportunities of judging of Inspectors of mines; and he was bound to say, as the result of his observation, that, generally speaking, no gentlemen more carefully and honestly performed their duties than those selected by the Government. It was a question, however, whether the Inspectors did not, in many instances, have too much imposed upon them. It was impossible frequently to examine sufficiently closely the various ramifications of a coal mine; but there ought to be no difficulty in determining whether or not the ventilation was defective. He had been surprised in some calculations he had made—and which had been verified—to find what immense destructive forces were contained in a few thousand feet of gas which might easily be allowed to accumulate; but which, by constant care, could easily to detected and measured. The difficulty which colliery managers had to overcome, therefore, was to introduce sufficient air into the mine to dilute all the gas in it below the exploding point. He therefore considered it erroneous on the part of the hon. Member for Stafford to deny the existence of sudden outbursts of gas. These sudden outbursts rendered it imperative on the part of coal owners to have a large excess of ventilating power, which therefore, in the ordinary conditions of the mine, gave a great margin of safety.

He thought a different organization in the mode of inspection might produce satisfactory results in reducing the number of accidents and the consequent loss of life.

Mr. PLIMSOLL urged that many accidents arose from the ignorance of miners as to the atmospheric conditions in which they worked. Their recklessness was otherwise unaccountable. He could give instances of negligence which he had noticed on the part of workmen in several mines which he had visited in South Yorkshire. In one case, an ignorant man, who was showing a party of ladies through a mine, came upon a "blower" of gas, and having a naked light in his hand, lit the gas and produced a flame as large as the great jets of light often seen in the streets of London when a gaspipe without a tap was lighted. In each of the mines to which he referred disastrous accidents had afterwards occurred, over 200 lives being lost through one of them, and 150 lives through a second. He believed that the theory of a "sudden outburst of gas" was often made to cover cases of pure and simple negligence. Although, undoubtedly, there were sudden outbursts of gas, yet there was generally plenty of warning of such an event by the bulging of the coal; and he did not believe one-half the accidents conveniently attributed to them were actually caused by them. He believed if the Home Secretary would act on the suggestion of the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald), and prosecute and punish, in all cases of proved negligence, the parties responsible, they would soon find a large diminution in the number of accidents.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said, that the hon. Member for Stafford had pursued a somewhat inconvenient course on the present occasion. He had brought a serious charge against the owner of a particular mine in which an accident had occurred, and had read extracts from the evidence given at the Coroner's inquest. He must be aware that the subject was under the consideration of his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State, and that it would be impossible for him at present to express any opinion, either adverse or favourable. Not long ago there was an interesting discussion on this question. The hon. Member might, he thought, be content with that, as far as the general case was concerned; and he was hardly justified in asking the Secretary of State to give an opinion on this particular case. The debate which had taken place had been so far satisfactory that it had produced an instructive speech from the hon. Member for Hartlepool (Mr. Bell) and an interesting narrative from the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll). As soon as the Government heard of the accident at the Haydock Colliery, they sent down a legal gentleman to conduct the inquiry and to report to the Home Office. The hon. Member for Stafford was wrong in supposing that it was imperative upon the Home Secretary to send all Reports upon mine accidents to the Law Officers of the Crown. In this case, however, the Report of the gentleman who had been sent down to assist the Inspector, as well as the Report of the Inspector himself, had been laid before two eminent counsel, in order to ascertain whether there had been an infringement of the law, and if so, whether a prosecution could be sustained? Upon the opinion of those gentlemen being received, the Home Secretary would not be found shirking the responsibility which attached to him. No Secretary of State who ever administered the affairs of the Home Department was more ready to listen to abuses or to complaints which might be brought under his notice. He understood the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stafford to express a wish that the Government would make inquiry, and if there was negligence proved, to prosecute. The Home Secretary had always done that. Under the circumstances, he did not think the House would desire to prolong the discussion.

Mr. BELL explained that he had expressed no opinion upon this particular explosion.

Mr. BURT thought the Under Secretary of State was scarcely justified in complaining of his hon. Friend the Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) for having brought forward this question. No doubt, it was a very inconvenient mode in which to raise the discussion, and, under ordinary circumstances, his hon. Friend would hardly be justified in taking the steps he had taken; but it ought to be borne in mind that this was the close of the Session, and there would be no other opportunity this year of calling attention to the subject. In most of the inquiries into colliery accidents, experts, mining engineers, and others—he would not say that they acted dishonestly—always endeavoured to show that the accident had occurred from a sudden outburst of gas; whereas, as a general rule, the facts were too patent that the mine itself had been a complete magazine of gas, the gas having been allowed to accumulate in immense quantities all over the workings. He was not at all denying that outbursts of gas did frequently occur, and he knew that a pit which might be safe at one moment might, from a sudden fall of the roof, become altogether unsafe. That was all the more likely to occur if there were not a sufficient margin of good ventilation to provide for such casualties; but while he did not at all question that these outbursts of gas did occur, he agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Mr. Plimsoll) that such outbursts were made a sort of mask to cover general mismanagement and bad ventilation. He agreed with the Under Secretary, and was satisfied that the hon. Member for Stafford would endorse the opinion, that the present Home Secretary had shown every disposition to see the law properly enforced. But while acknowledging this, he thought that in cases like the explosions at Blantyre and Haydock, where there had been such continual mismanagement, or, at any rate, very bad ventilation and laxity of discipline, it would have a good effect if the certificates of the managers were suspended. It would even be better to take a stronger step in cases where gross mismanagement occurred, by providing that those who were guilty of such mismanagement should be tried for manslaughter.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, that when he saw the Motion on the Paper, he thought it right to acquaint the hon. Member for Stafford with the fact that it was absolutely impossible for him to express any opinion upon the question at the present moment. The Report of the inquiry had only been for a few days in his hands, and he had thought the best course he could take under the circumstances was that which he had very often adopted before—namely, to ask for the advice of gentlemen of eminence in the Legal Profession, and to ascertain whether any offence had been committed against the law; and, if so, whether there was reasonable evidence on which to institute a prosecution. It would then rest entirely with the Secretary of State whether there should be a prosecution or not. He did not intend to shirk any of the responsibility; but he was quite sure hon. Members would agree that the first step was to get the best advice, and to find out whether there had been an offence against the law or not. There was one observation which he wished to make. He desired to have it fully known all over the country that the Government intended to place the managers of collieries on precisely the same footing as the captains of vessels. Everyone knew, as a matter of fact, that the Board of Trade frequently instituted an inquiry as to whether the captain of a vessel should not be deprived of his certificate on account of proved incapacity or negligence. What he wanted to show clearly, not only for his own guidance, but for the guidance of those who came after him, was that under the Mines Regulation Act, those who held certificates as managers of mines were to be dealt with precisely in the same manner as those who held certificates of competency as commanders of vessels. Most persons looked upon that section of the Act of Parliament as a dead letter; but he wished to prove that it was a living reality. If there was proved incapacity or negligence, there was no right to endanger the lives of the workers in a mine by continuing a certificate. The question of ventilation was another matter which must be inquired into, quite irrespective of whether a prosecution was to take place or not; and in this case there must also be an inquiry whether the Inspector ought to have found out before the explosion whether the ventilation of the mine was defective. That question must be carefully considered, although he had no wish, at the present moment, to attach the smallest blame to the Inspector, as he had formed no opinion one way or the other. It was undoubtedly, however, a question that this, and all other cases, ought to receive careful consideration from the Secretary of State for the time being. He would only add that in every case where negligence was proved, it was his intention, whether the offenders were high or low, to put the law in motion.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER thought it was evident, from the history of the Haydock explosion, that there had been an accumulation of gas in the mine. The question, therefore, to determine was whether the inspection which failed to detect the accumulation was effective or not, and what steps were taken to secure a proper inspection. He was of opinion that until they fixed the responsibility upon those who were responsible for the management of the mines, they would make no effectual provision against the repetition of these terrible disasters.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS referred the hon. Member, as an answer to his remarks, to the Instructions which had been issued to the Inspectors of Mines during the last 12 months.

Mr. BELL remarked, that the Inspectors were fully worked, and that what was required was an additional staff, if more efficient inspection were required.

Mr. MACDONALD pointed out that in most of the previous accidents it was declared on inquiry that the cause of the explosion was bad ventilation.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION — THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION.

### OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he had placed a Motion on the Paper to the effect that, considering it was stipulated by the Anglo-Turkish Convention that reforms, to be agreed upon later between the two Powers, should be introduced into the government, and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Porte in Asiatic Turkey, the House was of opinion that before such Agreement was finally concluded, Parliament should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion on these reforms, and on the guarantees to be provided for their execution. Though he was precluded by the Forms of the House from moving his Resolution, as one Amendment to the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair had been already negatived, he was very anxious to state some reasons that might be urged in justification of it, and he still hoped that he would receive from the Government an assurance which would render it unnecessary if he had had the opportunity of taking the sense of the House upon it. He stated the other day that nothing could be further from his intention or desire than to revive the discussion which took place in the protracted debate last week, and to that promise he should now most rigorously and scrupulously adhere. The past had been sufficiently complained of, and his observations should now be directed to the future. A misapprehension prevailed in certain quarters that in bringing forward this Motion, he desired to make a complaint against the Government, because they were not ready to state to the House the reforms which they thought should be introduced into Asiatic Turkey, and also the guarantees which, in their opinion, would be necessary for the execution of those reforms. Nothing would be more unjust and contrary to common sense than to make such a complaint against the Government. He was willing to leave it to their discretion as to the time when they should make a statement respecting those reforms and guarantees. All he asked was that whenever the time arrived, the English people, through the House of Commons, should have an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the subject. He had heard the remark repeated since the debate of last week—"What is the use of talking any more about this question? The Government are supported by an overwhelming majority, and there is no good in crying over the past." But it was a mistake to suppose that everything connected with the Anglo-Turkish Convention had been concluded. A sort of partnership had been entered into, but the terms of it were left to be determined in the future. The Anglo-Turkish Convention stated that the Sultan promised England to introduce reforms, to be agreed upon later between the two Powers, in the government and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Porte in Asiatic Turkey. The whole of that language showed that the Convention was prospective so far as the reforms were concerned, and surely it was not an unreasonable proposal that the Parliament of England should have some voice in determining their adequacy or inadequacy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and other Ministers had repeated the determination of the Government that this Convention should not be a sham, but a reality. It was their avowed intention, not simply to protect English interests in the East, but to introduce good government for these unfortunate people in Asiatic Turkey, in place of misgovernment. So far as the Government effected that object, they would find in him a willing and humble supporter. Referring to one of the Blue Books on Turkey, issued last year, he found there the declared and emphatic opinion of the Government on this subject. It was to the effect that the whole history of the Ottoman Empire, since it had been admitted into the European concert by the Treaty of Paris in 1856, showed that the Porte was powerless to guarantee the execution of reforms in its Provinces by Turkish officials, who accepted them with reluctance and neglected them with impunity. If that was the settled opinion of the Government 18 months ago, what had happened since to give them any greater confidence in the ability of the Porte to guarantee the execution of reforms? The conclusion at which he arrived was that one might as well whistle to the wind or talk to the tide as to attempt to reform the Government of Turkey, unless guarantees were provided outside of Turkey. In a remarkable despatch of January, 1877, Lord Salisbury said that the happiness of the people in the Turkish Provinces absolutely depended on the personal fitness of their local governors; that the system of Turkish government, as recently administered, gave little chance of securing the personal fitness of local governors in an emergency; and that capable men might occasionally be appointed; but it almost invariably happened that favouritism and corruption were the means for securing patronage. The noble Lord then went on to observe that if, by chance, a capable man should be appointed, he was certain to be removed, unless he was willing to pay a higher bribe for his continuance in office than the bribe offered from head-quarters for his removal. It was, said the noble Lord, perfectly vain to expect any improvement in the condition of these Provinces, unless you removed these abuses, and obtained some guarantees as to the character of the local Governors. Winding up with a significant and important sentence, the noble Lord stated that it was absolutely hopeless to expect to find any remedy for these abuses which was not external to the Turkish Government. After that despatch from one of Her Majesty's Ministers, it might fairly be put to the Government—"If you mean to be satisfied with reforms without outside guarantees, there never was such an idle sham or mockery as this Anglo-Turkish Convention, so far as it can secure better government for Turkey." They were thus brought face to face with this dilemma, from which they could not escape. If they wished to give reality to these reforms, they must be prepared to apply external pressure on the Porte; or, in other words, to adopt a policy of coercion, heard of so much last year. His contention was that the Government ought not to adopt such a policy, without the people of this country having an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. Would the Government be able to displace local Governors, appointed under a system of corrupt favouritism, without such officials struggling to maintain their privileges? Was England prepared to incur the responsibility of sanctioning domestic slavery, which was engrained into social life in Asiatic Turkey? By the 61st Article of the Treaty of Berlin, Europe, and not England alone, made itself responsible, in a certain way, for the good government of a great part of Asiatic Turkey—Armenia. That Treaty specially guaranteed the Sultan against the raids of Kurds and Circassians, and in return the Sultan promised to introduce reforms, the carrying out of which Europe promised to superintend. But, by an Act subsequently made known, the English Government separated themselves from the rest of Europe, and made themselves responsible for good government in Asia Minor. It seemed to him that if we were going to undertake a work which might be as great in its proportions as administering another India, the people of this country had at least the right, before the terms on which that work should be undertaken were finally decided, to have an opportunity of expressing an opinion, not only on what was going to be done, but on the manner in which it ought to be done. The people had also a right to demand an opportunity of seeing whether the reforms, finally agreed upon between England and Turkey separately, would work harmoniously with that understanding arrived at by all Europe to guarantee reforms as far as Armenia was concerned. He had kept his promise of not making any reference to the past, and he had confined his remarks entirely to the future; but he thought that, now peace had been concluded, and there being no longer any cause for further secrecy, it was a most reasonable request that the Government should take Parliament into confidence before it resolved to enter upon an act which might vitally affect the future of this country. The Privileges of Parliament were at stake on this question; for did not its control over expenditure become simply a farce when it was called upon to vote money and deprived of any power of controlling the causes which rendered the expenditure of money necessary? He therefore appealed to the Government to return to the good old practice of taking the House into their counsels, and to undertake that they would not enter into engagements which would throw upon Parliament and the country great responsibilities, without first having obtained their sanction and approval.

Mr. E. JENKINS would venture to address a few words to the House in the same spirit which had animated his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney. He admitted that last week an amnesty had been granted to the Government for all past offences, and their policy must now be taken to be accepted by the House and adopted by the country; but Parliament was now all the more entitled to call on the Government to explain the manner in which they proposed to carry out that policy. He complained that there had been a misunderstanding out-of-doors as to the object of those who in the House asked for information from the Government on this subject. They did not want the Government to lay the complete scheme before the House; but they were anxious to know exactly to what extent the Government had pledged this country in regard to the good government of so enormous a country. It was not fair to charge those who chose to criticize the manner in which the Government had carried out what they called their Imperial policy with a connection with the Manchester school of politicians, which was just now in deserved disgrace. The Convention itself was also thoroughly misunderstood in the country. It was over-estimated. A constituent of his had written to him describing the occupation of Cyprus as one of the grandest events in Lord Beaconsfield's career; but, so far from it being a grand event, in the sense of a great Imperial annexation, it was nothing of the kind; and it was a thing full of nothing but danger, obligation, and expense. If the language, as set forth in one of the despatches of Lord Salisbury to Sir Austen Layard, suggesting the Convention, really meant anything, it was that it was in the contemplation of the Government to supply the Sublime Porte with that force which it did not itself possess. The noble Lord pointed out that the Ottoman Government was incapable of enforcing in Turkey that organization which was essential to the stability of the Government of the country, and that an external force should come in and guarantee that stability. Therefore, he (Mr. E. Jenkins) must ask, what did the Government mean to do? It would seem that their design was not only to introduce external force, but that the exercise of it was to preserve the power of Ottoman rule in Turkey. But what a useless and untrustworthy guarantee that would be! As the matter stood at that moment, he would ask whether the Government had any idea of supplying that external force, and through the medium of Ottoman organization? He was willing to consider first the scheme of the Government in reference to Turkey in Asia, and they were entitled to criticize it. They found that the Convention did express, in a loose way, that scheme, and, therefore, he must ask the Government how they proposed to carry it out, and, first, to what extent had they pledged the resources of this country? The Government had stated that they had not added to our responsibilities in the least; but when they read the terms of these despatches, how could the House reconcile the one with the other. He would not ask the Government to go into the details of the scheme, but to give the House some notion of the principles of the policy which they proposed to carry out. The only thing which they knew at present was that the Government had undertaken the duty of fighting Russia when she next invaded Turkey. Did not that involve an enormous obligation? The Government ought to explain what they meant to do. He would refer to the Reports of Sir William Barron and Mr. Rumbold, to show that the financial condition of Turkey was frightful; there was absolute chaos in the administration. In a country of 660,000 square miles, and with 6,050,000 inhabitants in 1867-8, the whole amount collected in tithe—the principal source of revenue—was 1*s.* 5½*d.* per head. All the schemes for reforming the system of collecting the tithes had utterly failed, and no means had been devised for superseding the old method of farming the revenues. This system enabled the farmers of the tithe to oppress the people by demanding the payment of increased amounts, and it was well known that a system of absolute corruption existed throughout the country. Were the Government going to introduce a new system, or to compel the Sublime Porte to make reforms, not only in regard to taxation, but in the administration of justice, upon which the future welfare of the country would depend? Did the Government intend to undertake the administration of a bankrupt country, and to enforce the carrying out of reforms; or had they simply entered into a paper contract for the effecting of reforms which the Porte never intended to carry out? That was a question which might fairly be asked of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who ought to state frankly what were the intentions of the Government.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I cannot wonder at the anxiety which all hon. Members of this House must feel as to the position in which we stand in regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention and the agreements into which we have entered on a very important and difficult question. I should be the last person to complain of either of the hon. Gentlemen who have addressed us to-night for expressing their opinions on the subject. At the same time, I am bound to say that during the whole of their addresses, and especially that of the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), I could not help asking myself, *cui bono* this discussion at the present moment? Our position, I think, is a tolerably intelligible one, and I must say I had some difficulty in understanding the precise questions which the hon. Member for Dundee wished to put. He has raised a great many difficulties, and has stated with great truth a number of the obstacles inseparable from any attempt to improve the administration of any portion of the Turkish Empire—I have not a word to say against his description of the innate difficulties with which we have to contend. And when it was asked how this and that is to be done, and when it was argued that the task is impossible, I think that the hon. Member is conceivably right, and that the task may, after all, prove above our strength; but, at any rate, the possibility of its accomplishment is not advanced by a discussion on details such as the hon. Member has mentioned. We have entered into a perfectly intelligible agreement, and we have undertaken certain obligations towards Turkey in respect of her defence of her Asiatic Provinces from future attacks by Russia, and as the consideration or complement of that undertaking, Turkey has promised to enter into an agreement with us as to the carrying out of certain reforms. That Agreement of itself shows that these reforms will require very great care, and they will have to be elaborately discussed between the two Powers; but there is no good in the world in beginning by saying they are things that cannot be done. The arguments of the hon. Member, that particular reforms can never be effected, reminds me of the old puzzle of Achilles and the Tortoise, in which it was proved that, under certain conditions, Achilles would never overtake the Tortoise; the answer to such a contention was *solvitur ambulando;* the result will expose the hon. Member's fallacy. We have hope of a certain amount of success; and we are already in communication with the Porte in regard to various points of detail which are well understood, and have already been the subject of a good deal of examination in the Congress, in the Andrassy Note, and in other ways. What we hope to do is to induce the Porte to enter into an agreement to effect such reforms as we can persuade them is desirable; and they will give specific guarantees for the carrying out of those reforms. To say that by any possible reforms we could at once put the Turkish Empire into the position of countries like France or Germany would, of course, be absurd. What we hope to do, and what there is a probability of our doing, is to materially improve the administration of those Provinces in certain particulars which are of a vital character. There are, in particular, three great departments to which we intend to direct our attention — the revenue, the judicial system, and the police. Our object will be to bring about practical improvements which will be guaranteed by treaty, and not by a mere general promise. I do not think we can do more; and I do not think anyone has a right to blame us because now, within a month of the signing of the Treaty, we are not able to come down and put a cut-and-dried scheme on the Table.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he certainly did not expect them to do that.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, he had distinctly stated that they could not expect a cut-and-dried scheme. What he wanted to know was whether they were simply relying on the promise of the Porte in this matter?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: That is just the point. It is on the face of the Agreement that the reforms are to be specified and guarantees given. But the precise details of those guarantees it is impossible for the Government at this moment to state, unless, indeed, we intended to make the undertaking a sham one; for in that case it would be the simplest thing in the world to say that this or that was the way in which we intended to administer the Turkish Empire. We mean business. We mean to endeavour to bring about specific reforms, and they will be made the subject of a specific agreement, which could not be conducted and brought about without communication and correspondence, which must take time. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), I understand, admits the general principle that the matter is one which must be deliberately and seriously looked into; that it cannot be disposed of in a moment; and that he is not disposed to put merely captious questions or to raise captious objections; but he wants to know whether we are going to give fresh guarantees, and whether we will undertake that no agreement shall be made without this House being consulted? Well, I would be sorry to give any pledge of that kind. We have no motive to maintain any secrecy, or show any want of confidence towards the House; but, on the other hand, it is important that we should proceed with

our negotiations and arrangements as quickly as may be, and that we should not have to delay their conclusion in order to wait for a discussion in Parliament. I think the hon. Gentleman himself will see that a discussion in Parliament might possibly prevent the conclusion of really good arrangements, such as the House would like to see concluded. In this country we are in the habit of discussing matters freely, and as if entirely English interests were concerned, and it can hardly be otherwise than that expressions should be used and criticism passed which might cause embarrassment, and might prevent us coming to any proper understanding. Of course, we do not intend to pledge the House or the country to anything in the nature of expenditure of money without the concurrence of Parliament; but supposing we come to some arrangement with the Porte, say as to the mode in which her functionaries shall be appointed or the revenues administered, to delay that until the terms could be discussed by Parliament would, I think, be unwise. At the same time, we are glad of all the counsel we can get. We do not at all underrate the difficulties we have to contend with; in fact, it is because we know they are great, and because we are anxious to overcome them, that we ask the confidence of Parliament in our endeavour to carry out the Agreement.

## NAVY—H.M.S. "EURYDICE."

### OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. D. JENKINS, in rising to call attention to the circumstances attending the loss of Her Majesty's Ship *Eurydice*, said, that he believed the catastrophe was due to either want of skill or want of foresight on the part of some one or another. From all the information he had obtained, he had come to the conclusion that the ship did not possess that stability to enable her to encounter the heavy weather which one of Her Majesty's vessels ought to possess. He did not mean to say that the vessel was unseaworthy; but he had been informed that some nautical men who saw her at Stornoway noticed that she was very crank, and predicted that if she encountered heavy weather the result would be disastrous. At the time of the catastrophe, the *Eurydice* did not appear to be carrying any extraordinary press of canvas. It was said that she was struck by a sudden squall, which allowed no time for shortening sail; but other ships in close proximity outrode it. Seamen who were accustomed to the English Channel knew perfectly well that the most dangerous wind was N., and the closer in the more suddenly came these squalls. He had it from the captain of a ship which was three or four miles farther out, and saw Her Majesty's Ship enter the snowstorm; had seen the clouds, and shortened sail. His vessel was one of 1,000 tons with 19 hands only. Now, what were the facts? The *Eurydice* had 30 tons of permanent ballast, and she depended, to a large extent, on consumable stores for her stability—in other words, her safety. He should like to know what was the weight of water ballast in tanks that she carried; but whatever that might be, he could not believe that those tanks as they were emptied of fresh water were refilled for the purpose of ballast with salt water. The two seamen who were saved said in their evidence that they perceived the ship became more lively, or, in other words, less safe. He could not for a moment believe that a seaman of such experience and ability as Captain Hare could have been upon deck at the time. He found, on referring to the list of casualties to Her Majesty's ships, that when accidents occurred they were generally in charge of junior officers, whose experience was insufficient to enable them to act with decision and promptitude. Junior officers should have a previous training by intrusting them with small independent commands—as, for instance, gunboats—before they were allowed to take posts of responsibility on board larger vessels. There was a strong feeling extant that this ship had not had fair play—that she had been sacrificed by neglect—and that she was not, when sent to sea, properly ballasted. He trusted that the Admiralty would be able to prove that everything was done that could be done to insure the safety of the vessel before she left for her last cruise, and that her loss was attributable to a peril of the sea—which certainly was to him a complete mystery.

Colonel BERESFORD thought that the conclusion the hon. Member had come to was entirely erroneous. The vessel had been lost, not because she had not sufficient ballast, but because, when the squall struck her, she was under full sail, which caused her to lean over, and as her ports were open the water rushed in and overwhelmed her. That was the explanation of the accident which an old sailor who witnessed the occurrence had given him.

Mr. MUNTZ expressed his opinion that if the officer in command had looked at the barometer, he must have seen that a squall was approaching.

Mr. A. F. EGERTON expressed the deep regret which the Admiralty, in common with the whole country, felt at the loss of the *Eurydice*. He regretted very much that the hon. Member had thought it necessary to call attention at the present time to the disaster, as within a very few days the whole matter would be most fully investigated by a court martial, and every detail that could be ascertained in connection with the loss of the vessel placed upon record. He objected very strongly to the manner in which the hon. Member had criticized the conduct of the Dockyard officials. The *Eurydice* was as carefully prepared for the service in which she was sent as any vessel ever fitted out in a Royal Dockyard; and as far as anyone could state, she was a perfectly sound vessel. The vessel was known to be rather a crank ship, but was not supposed to be unsafe. He believed that the weight of her water tanks was 120 tons, and she carried, in addition, 30 tons of ballast. That was the weight of ballast she had had upon all her previous cruises, and he believed there was no foundation for a statement which he had heard made that she was overmasted. There was no doubt she was perfectly fit for service. All her officers were most carefully selected, from her captain, Captain Hare downward, and they were all men of considerable experience. It was the wish of the Admiralty, so far as possible, to intrust junior lieutenants with the command of gun-boats and small craft of that kind, and everything was done that could be done to teach them seamanship. He had only to add that, from a telegram which had just been received, the *Eurydice* was now in 11 feet of water, and the Admiral Superintendent hoped to have her pumped out to-morrow; so that in a very short time she would be in harbour, and then the investigation to which he had referred would be made, and until that was done he deprecated any blame being attributed to any officer or man on board the vessel when she sank.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

## SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. W. H. SMITH said, he thought this would be a convenient opportunity for stating, as far as the Navy was concerned, what changes had taken place in the programme during the four months which had elapsed since he made his Statement in March last. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that application was made to Parliament for a large sum of money, and that of that sum £1,500,000 was to be spent in the purchase of ships. As no Statement had been made to the House as to the results of that purchase, or the application of the money which was to be used for the purpose, he proposed to state to the Committee precisely how the money had been applied so far as shipping was concerned. The sum of £1,434,070 had been expended out of the Vote of Credit in the purchase of iron-clad ships. The ships purchased were the *Neptune*, formerly the *Independencia*, the *Superb*, the *Belleisle*, and the *Orion*. Of these, the first three were completed, so far as the owners were concerned, and this last—the *Orion*—was building on the Thames at the time she was purchased, and the amount which had been spent upon her was only partially paid out of the Vote of Credit. The sum paid for the *Neptune* was £614,350; for the *Superb*, £452,895; for the *Belleisle*, £240,000; and for the *Orion*, as far as she had been built, £126,825. In addition to these iron-clad ships, there were also purchased two ships—the *Tyne*, late the *Mareotis*, of 2,020 tons gross register, as a transport vessel; and the *British Empire*, estimated at 3,400 tons, as a transport, but more particularly as a typical armed cruiser for the protection of commerce and torpedo depôt. For this latter vessel £79,000 was paid out of the Vote of Credit, and £16,000 fall on the Estimates of the year. The total sum paid out of the Vote of Credit for shipbuilding was, in round figures, £1,600,000—that was, £1,445,000 for the *Neptune*, *Belleisle*, *Superb*, and *Orion*, and 10 small craft for torpedo service, and about £140,000 for the other two ships. The result was that 14,608 tons of iron-clads, and 4,839 tons of unarmoured ships, being a total of 19,447 tons, were added to the Fleet under the Vote of Credit. In the Statement which he made in March last he said that the tonnage which was expected to be built up to the 31st March, 1878, was 15,598 tons; but the actual result, as shown by Parliamentary Return No. 245, was the completion of 16,563 tons, being an addition of nearly 1,000 tons to the amount which the Admiralty expected to build. That result was due to the increased number of hands employed in the Dockyards and to overtime. The gross result, therefore, of the shipbuilding in the Dockyards for the year ending 31st March last, and the purchases under the Vote of Credit was an addition to the Navy of 21,721 tons of iron-clads, and 14,289 tons of unarmoured vessels, making a total for the year of 36,010 tons. He felt that the addition of so large an amount of tonnage out of the Vote of Credit justified him in re-considering the programme he had laid down. The addition under the Vote of Credit was practically the amount of shipbuilding which could ordinarily be attained in one year. Few Administrations had been successful in adding more than 20,000 tons in all, and certainly not more than 14,000 tons, of armour-clad ships in any one year; and he might therefore state with some confidence that the effect of the special Expenditure of the year had been to add to the Navy one year's shipbuilding. And, moreover, this had been accomplished within the year. Ships which would take three or four years to build had been added to the Navy in a state ready for sea; or, at least, as forward as they would be if they had been launched from Her Majesty's Dockyards, after being three or four years under construction. He stated in March last that it was proposed to build four iron-clads, and he indicated to the House in a general way what they would be; but stated, at the same time, that at a later period he proposed to give more detailed information on the subject. He had come to the conclusion that it was reasonable to lay down three iron-clads instead of four in the present year, with a view to economy in the use of the resources they had, and still more with a view to the maintenance of the ships which existed in a perfectly complete state; so that as soon as any ship was brought to the Dockyard, and was worth repairing, it could be put into a proper condition both as regarded the hull and machinery. They proposed, therefore, instead of laying down four iron-clads, to lay down three, and they would be of a type which he would now venture to describe. Two of them would be improved *Agamemnons.* Those hon. Members who took an interest in shipbuilding would understand it better if he described it as a type of the ship known to them. The *Inflexible* was now nearly complete, or would be so, he hoped, in the course of the current financial year; but the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon* were not so far advanced, although great progress had been made with them. They would not, however, be completed within the year. It was proposed that two ships of the *Agamemnon* class should be laid down, and that they should be armed with guns of about the same weight as those of the *Dreadnought*—namely, about 38 tons, mounted in two turrets. Those guns, and the citadel within which they worked, would be protected by the same armour as the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon*—that was, a maximum of 18 inches—the maximum of the *Dreadnought* being 14 inches. The engine power would not exceed that of the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon,* but would be capable of producing a speed of 14 knots, or one knot higher than the *Agamemnon* class would have, by increasing the length of the ship to equal that of the *Dreadnought* and the *Inflexible,* and suitably arranging the form. The machinery, and all the vital parts of the ship, would be protected either by horizontal or by vertical armour. The ships would be capable of ejecting torpedoes below the water or from behind armour, and of being employed as rams. They would be much smaller and less costly than the *Dreadnought* and *Inflexible,* as the displacement tonnage would be about 9,000 tons; while the *Dreadnought* was a little under, and the *Inflexible* over, 11,000 tons, and the *Ajax* and *Agamemnon* were about 8,500. The principal alteration in the case of these new ships would be that they would have a larger supply of coal, be able to keep the sea for a longer period, and would have greater speed; but, in other respects, they would be very similar to the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon.* The third ship which it was proposed to lay down was intended to be an improved *Rupert.* Hon. and gallant Members who were acquainted with the *Rupert* had a very high opinion of her. Naval officers had described her as being a very handy and convenient vessel. It was proposed to build another vessel of the same class, with more powerful guns in her single turret—namely, guns of 38 tons instead of 18 tons. It was proposed to construct the hull of steel, and it was hoped that the experiments which had been made with steel armour would justify its use for the armour of that ship, and also the new *Agamemnons,* so that the advantage of great resistance to penetration might be secured without cracking. He was bound to say that up to the present time they had not been successful in obtaining a steel plate which had altogether answered the expectations they had formed; but he had great hopes that the ingenuity, the skill, and the determined perseverance of the manufacturers of steel plates would ultimately produce plates capable of resisting a blow without cracking. If they could do that, they would obtain a very valuable result indeed, and he hoped that they would be successful in obtaining these plates before the vessels were ready to receive them. There was no doubt about the power of a steel plate to resist shot, and that, in this respect, it was of much greater importance and value than an iron plate. It was perfectly certain that if a shot went through the iron plate into the citadel it would disable the ship, while if a shot was stopped by the steel plate, even although the steel plate cracked, those who were in the citadel would be safe, and the ship would be manageable and capable of keeping the sea. But he and those who advised him wished to reserve their judgment on this question. They had, however, reason to believe that from the advance which had been made in the manufacture of these plates, they might produce plates within a period in which these ships would be ready to receive them, which would offer a very much greater resistance to shot than iron, and make the ships very much more invulnerable than 18 inches of iron had done. He would now explain to the Committee what it was proposed to do during the coming year. In the programme which he presented to the House in March last, he stated that he hoped they would complete 9,831 tons of iron-clads in the Dockyards, and 1,717 tons by contract; 3,737 tons of unarmoured ships in the Dockyards, and 2,982 tons by contract, making a total of 11,548 tons of iron-clads, and 6,719 tons of unarmoured ships, or a gross of 18,267 tons of shipping as the product of the year. The alteration of the programme, as he had already stated to the Committee, had to some extent altered the whole of those figures. They had made the commencement of three iron-clads, and abandoned one. In the place of the one which had been abandoned they proposed to build an unarmoured ship, the design of which had not been absolutely fixed; but it would be something between the *Iris* and the *Boadicea.* The result would be that they would complete 8,578 tons of iron-clads in the Dockyards, 1,717 tons by contract, and 4,830 tons of unarmoured ships in the Dockyards, and 2,982 tons by contract; making a total of 18,107 tons. They had further completed the ships which had been mentioned as having been bought by the Vote of Credit, to the extent of 1,661 tons, being a total of 19,768 tons of shipping commenced, advanced or completed during the year, as against the gross total of 18,267 tons, which he stated in March last, the alteration being that they had substituted an unarmoured for an armoured ship. He thought he ought also to state to the Committee some of the other modes in which the Vote of Credit had been expended. His hon. and gallant Friend on his right (Captain Pim) had stated in the early part of the evening that he had no confidence in merchant ships, as ships capable of being adapted for purposes of war. Well, the Admiralty were going to try whether a merchant ship could be made useful as a ship of war; and one of the first purchases under this Vote of Credit was the purchase of a merchant ship, the *Hecla;* which would, in the first instance, be fitted as a cruiser with guns—a typical merchant ship, with small engine power, large stowage, and great conveniences in other respects. He thought it was probable that the ship would be a success in that capacity; but even if she were not, she would become a most valuable transport, and an economical ship for that purpose. But he should state to the Committee that he had thought it his duty during the period through which we had passed to provide guns, magazines, and all the fittings which were necessary for 30 fast merchant steamers in case they were adapted for cruisers. They had all been surveyed, and we could within three weeks of the present time, if it became necessary, send these ships to sea armed and equipped in all respects as fast cruisers. They would be armed with six guns on the average. The guns were in store, the fittings were in store, the magazines were prepared, everything was ready to be put on board, and even the crews were told off. [General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR: What kind of guns?] They were long range 64-lb. guns. Even the gunners to man these ships were all ready in case it should be necessary to employ them. He could only express his very great satisfaction—a satisfaction in which the Committee would share—that it had not been necessary to employ these ships at all; but there had not been a single shilling wasted in the preparations that were made. All the stores were in hand, and would be available either for the purposes of the Navy, or for this particular purpose, if at any time it should become necessary to make use of them. In the arrangements which had been provided for, no single ship had been diverted from the traffic and trade in which she was engaged; but we could within a very short time have laid our hands upon them, and thus we should have had a very large fleet which could have been increased without much difficulty or loss of time, and which would have been capable of clearing the seas of any ships of their class with which they might come in contact. [Captain PIM: How many?] Thirty. He thought he had now stated to the Committee how the programme of the year had been affected by the Vote of Credit. He had also stated what ships had been purchased under the

Vote of Credit; but he would reepat the statement now because these facts were rather apt to be forgotten. There were four iron-clads, three of which were completed—as far as they would be completed if launched in Her Majesty's Dockyards; but requiring, of course, a good deal of alteration in the hands of the Admiralty. One of them—the *Belleisle*—was in the Reserve Fleet; the *Neptune* was being got ready for sea at Portsmouth; the *Superb* was being got ready at Chatham; and the *Orion* was being completed in the Thames. The Admiralty had purchased the *Hecla*, a typical armed merchant steamer, which would also be used as a torpedo depôt. She would carry torpedo boats at her davits, have sub-marine mining stores on board, and would be armed with four or five guns. He had already mentioned her tonnage. She was built by the builders of the White Star Line of ships, and if she were not retained as a torpedo vessel, she would become a very useful and economical transport. The effect of the Supplementary Estimates now before the Committee had been to employ in the Dockyard a number of men, which, spread over the whole year, amounted to 17,565 men, as against 16,111 men originally contemplated. The result of the employment of these men had been the bringing forward ships for commission, the increase in the tonnage which he had stated, and the very large amount of additional labour in the Dockyards, which the events of the last six months had required. He thought that at that late period of the evening it would be hardly desirable that he should go into further particulars; but the Committee were aware that very considerable expenditure had been incurred for torpedo boats out of the Estimates of the year. As many as 81 torpedo boats had been acquired. These boats had been constructed by various builders, for he thought it his duty to endeavour to find as many builders as possible who were capable of producing these boats, so that, in case of emergency, we should be able to fall back upon a number of persons to supply them at short notice. The sum of £140,240 had been expended on first-class torpedo boats, 32 in number, and £80,000 on what he should call second-class torpedo boats, of which there were 81; so that they had acquired 113 of these torpedo boats at a cost of about £220,000. Other ships had been advanced, but the new ships had been delayed. It was intended to have built 3,273 tons of new armoured ships this year; but the delay which had taken place, and the postponement of one iron-clad had resulted in this—that only 1,176 tons of new ships would be built this year. That falling-off, however, was more than compensated by the advancement of the *Inflexible*, the *Ajax*, the *Agamemnon*, and other armour-plated ships; so that instead of any deficiency in the shipbuilding programme, they should have a greater quantity of shipbuilding than that previously contemplated—that was to say, instead of building on the whole 18,267 tons in the year, they should build 19,768 tons.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £1,350,140, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879."

MR. RYLANDS said, that when the Navy Estimates were before the House, now several months ago, a discussion took place in connection with the first Vote in reference to the *Inflexible*, and very grave doubts were expressed by many hon. Members on both sides of the House as to the wisdom of the construction of further vessels of the same type as the *Inflexible*. In consequence of that discussion, and in consequence also, he was bound to say, of the First Lord of the Admiralty not being able to reply satisfactorily to the grave criticisms which had been advanced in the House with regard to the *Inflexible*, an undertaking was, as he understood, given by the right hon. Gentleman that before Votes 6 and 10 were taken, there would be a further explanation as to certain modifications of the *Inflexible* type, which were to be carried out in the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon*. He saw that the First Lord shook his head, but if he was wrong in supposing that any undertaking was given, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would now give the Committee the information which he had understood was promised. It was perfectly well known that the perusal of the evidence given before the Commission and of their Report left upon the minds of many hon. Members, and of many persons outside that House, very serious doubts as to the satisfactory character of the *Inflexible.* He certainly understood from the First Lord of the Admiralty that if the Votes were passed on that occasion, the Government would take care that Votes 6 and 10 were brought under the notice of the House at a time when this discussion could be continued before they proceeded to vote large sums of money for the completion of the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon.* Well, now, in what position did they find themselves? The discussion to which he had alluded took place on the 15th of March, and from that time until the present moment, two of the most important Votes in connection with the Navy Estimates had been allowed to slumber. He thought they had very good reason to complain of the conduct of the Government in this matter. He did not know that he could blame the First Lord of the Admiralty, because he believed that if the right hon. Gentleman had his own way, he would have been glad to have brought these Votes before the Committee at an earlier period of the Session. But still they were placed in this position—that they were called upon to pass two Votes, amounting altogether to an expenditure of £3,600,000, at the very close, almost, of the Session, when it was utterly impossible for the Committee to discuss the questions involved with any prospect of a satisfactory result. They were asked to vote these large sums of money practically without any consideration. In the circumstances in which the Committee were placed, he did not intend to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice. His object in putting that Amendment down upon the Paper was, when these Votes came, to secure a discussion of the serious question as to how far it was advisable for the Government to continue to build enormous vessels of questionable construction involving a great outlay of money, and in respect of which very serious doubts were entertained by competent authorities. He complained that not only the present Board of Admiralty, but former Boards, acting under the advice of their Chief Constructor, or of some other person, had proceeded to build three or four vessels of a certain type without taking any opportunity of testing the type of vessel to see whether it was good or not. The result had been that vessels had been put upon the stocks, and pushed forward, of a type about which there had been some question, and those vessels had become obsolete before they had actually been sent to sea. To rush into the construction of vessels of a particular type, more especially of the *Inflexible* type, at a time when every year brought forth suggestions of costly change, was to incur needless and extravagant expenditure. He hoped that the First Lord of the Admiralty would be able to tell the Committee that the *Ajax* and *Agamemnon* had been so far changed in their construction that the defects which had been pointed out with reference to the *Inflexible* were not likely to be found to exist in the vessels which were now being built.

CAPTAIN PRICE had thought that the controversy respecting the *Inflexible* had been finally closed; but, as that question had been raised again, he must say that he sympathized, to a certain extent, with the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) in the doubts which he had expressed as to the desirability of going on with the building of vessels of the *Inflexible* type. But he did so for exactly the reasons which he gave when the question of the safety of the *Inflexible* was discussed. The hon. Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed) stated that ships of that class, on being subjected to heavy artillery fire, would become perfectly unsafe; and he (Captain Price) argued that the *Inflexible* was a perfectly safe ship, inasmuch as it would be impossible, under ordinary circumstances, to fire a sufficient number of shells into her to cause such a destruction of her unarmoured ends as to render her unsafe. It was for that very reason that he thought the Board of Admiralty were making a mistake in building these ships to carry a few very heavy guns. He found that that was the opinion also of many able naval officers. Quite lately this subject had been brought very prominently before the Navy. Several naval officers had competed for a prize given by the

Admiralty, with regard to the general designs of ships, and one of the points upon which they had all touched was this question of the number of guns. One officer had stated that a vessel of the *Inflexible* type, having four 80-ton guns, and firing at a similar vessel, could only be expected to hit from two to 15 times out of every 100 shots. That view had been very curiously verified in the action between the *Shah* and the *Huascar*. The total number of projectiles which was fired from the *Shah* and the *Amethyst* at the *Huascar* was no less than 430. How many of these projectiles did the Committee suppose struck the *Huascar?* Only eight—that was to say, something like 2 per cent. [Mr. D. Jenkins: At what distance?] That was the point. If they were always at Shoeburyness, and knew the range, they might put more shot into their target; but the distance was just one of the elements of uncertainty. What he wanted to argue from this was, that the Admiralty seemed to be running a-head rather too far in the matter of guns and armament. People asked, very naturally, where was all this to stop? They said that there was practically no end to it, and that civil engineers must decide for them where the end was to be. He entirely denied that. He maintained that naval officers ought to decide where the end was to be, and he thought that they could decide it. With regard to these monster guns, it was all very well to bring the greatest science of the country to bear upon their manufacture. No doubt, they produced an article which certainly was a very magnificent and beautiful weapon. They spent thousands of pounds in making it, and they spent hundreds of thousands in putting it afloat; but they did not ask themselves fairly, and by experiment, what they were to do with these guns when they had got them on board. Because, when the supreme moment came that they had to use these guns in action, they placed them under the control of a human, fallible creature, with all his imperfections visible upon him, and they could not say whether the shell which was under his control would hit the enemy or not. That must be so. They could not poise it. Therefore, what he maintained ought to be a part of their policy in building ships was that they should have a greater number of guns. The number of rounds which the *Inflexible*, with four 80-ton guns, could fire in 10 minutes was only 12, the weight of projectile thrown out in that time being nine tons. Besides considering the weight and size of the guns that were put in a ship, it was very desirable to consider what chance there was of hitting with those guns; and in future ships they ought rather, in his opinion, to have a greater number of moderate-sized guns than a diminished number of specially heavy guns.

Mr. BELL doubted whether it would be quite safe for the Government to follow the advice which had been given them by the hon. and gallant Member who had last spoken. It would be difficult to say where they should have been landed if they had only naval officers at hand to advise them during the last 50 years. But one thing was quite certain, that they had had to wait for Sir William Armstrong to devise a gun of the necessary power that was now required in order to penetrate the iron plates of their vessels. There was no question that the manufacture of iron was, at the present moment, in a state of revolution. It was difficult to say what the future might be. They talked easily and lightly of iron and steel when, in point of fact, those best acquainted with the subject had not yet determined what was iron and what was steel. He mentioned this in order that the authorities might use that caution which they had up to this time exercised. With great prudence and propriety, they had consulted the manufacturers as to the mode of procedure to be pursued; because it was quite clear that without the assistance of the manufacturers and those well acquainted with the mode of preparing the metal, and with its quality when so prepared, very little way would be made without great hazard. There was no doubt in his mind that England might claim the merit of being foremost in the manufacture of armour plates; but he would caution the First Lord of the Amiralty against believing that other countries, and notably France, were not coming to the front in this particular industry. While in France recently, in the capacity of a juror at the Paris Exhibition, he had an opportunity of examining a new form of armour-plating of cast iron, which he took the liberty of recommending to the First Lord of the Admiralty, and he believed that the right hon. Gentleman was about to send someone to examine into that system of armour-plating. The question of armour-plating was one essentially of experiment. Their own Government went to a great amount of expense in testing armour-plates with ordnance of various calibre, and the results of these experiments were very properly detailed in a Blue Book. But in this matter, he had to reproach the Government with a certain parsimony. He had been unable, except in the Library of the House, to obtain a copy of this Blue Book, which was one of the works which ought to be in the hands of every practical ironmaster who wished to promote the object they were discussing.

Mr. BRUCE said, it appeared to him to be the duty of the Admiralty, while seeking to obtain the best scientific advice available, to keep up the strength of the Navy on the best models which, for the time being, could be suggested to it for that purpose. It was perfectly true that these models were invariably subjected to very hostile criticism. There were many gentlemen, very well informed, who said that all the ships the Admiralty were building would inevitably go down, and that those which did not happen to go down would be useless for the service for which they were intended. But that was no new complaint, and he hoped that the Admiralty would continue to produce ships after the test models at their command, so as to keep their Navy at the head of the Navies of all other nations with which they might be brought into contact. It was said that certain of their great ships—such, for instance, as the *Inflexible*—might, under very extraordinary circumstances, be unsafe. He was no judge of these matters. He pretended to no knowledge on the subject; but it had always appeared to him that if they were to build a powerful ship on the understanding that after her two engines were blown up she should then be as good as at the beginning, they were proposing a problem very difficult to solve. Be that as it might, it would appear that the class of vessel of which the *Inflexible* was a type, had been very largely adopted, and there could be no doubt that under ordinary circumstances, when their two ends were not blown away, they would be very formidable fighting ships. It would not be expedient, therefore, for the Admiralty to leave this country dependent for its protection on vessels which were inferior in fighting power to those of other countries; because vessels of the type he had mentioned might possibly, at some period, become unworkable. It was the business of the Admiralty to maintain their Navy at a point which would give it superiority over the Navies of other nations, even although, in so doing, they did not obtain the ideal model which the hon. Member for Burnley had suggested. They had heard some remarks from hon. Members on both sides of the House, with regard to the construction, equipment, and plating of iron-clads, which certainly ought not to be lost sight of, and which he was sure would not be forgotten by the First Lord of the Admiralty. They had often, on former occasions, heard the opinions of hon. Members who were fully able to discuss the question; but he ventured to say that there were gentlemen other than those in the House whose opinions were worth hearing. If they went upon the information obtained within the House alone, the Admiralty would lose the advantage of external authority which it might use, and which might prove to be very valuable. He thought it to be our duty to maintain the Fleet of England in the best condition possible, both with the lights already before us, and the lights which the Admiralty could get from other sources. The question raised by the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price), as to whether a ship should have more than a small number of guns, was one of very great importance; but it could not be decided within the House. It was, in his view, necessary to trust to the Admiralty when they came forward and proposed any particular form of ship; and although that form might be open to objections, we must give them power to adopt the form which, in their judgment, appeared to be the best suited to our requirements.

Mr. CHILDERS might, perhaps, be allowed to say, speaking for himself only, with regard to the amended programme for the year, that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty had taken a very wise course, on the whole, in changing the number of iron-clads. He now proposed to complete three instead of four ships, and he (Mr. Childers) was not at all surprised that he had found this plan to be a more convenient one than that which he at first intended to carry out. But this was not the point which most concerned him at the present time. It struck him that the present was a good opportunity for the Admiralty to determine, in a greater degree than heretofore, to carry through with the utmost expedition work taken in hand, so that when a new ship was laid down, nothing should be allowed to interfere with continuous work on it. He was quite aware that it was very difficult to make a change in the system under which the Dockyards had been working for so many years, under which changes were perpetually proposed in ships after they had been laid down, and they were again and again delayed until these changes were determined upon. Of course, his remarks did not apply to the question — the most important question—of change in the character of the iron or steel armour which had to be applied to some of those new ships. There could be no doubt that the discussions which had been held on that point had been of great advantage. He had listened with great attention to the observations of the hon. Member for Hartlepool (Mr. Bell), who possessed a practical knowledge of the subject, and he quite agreed with him that the improvement of steel and iron now in progress, as well as the improvements in the character of metal which could be applied to the sides of our ships, led to the opinion that we were on the verge of some valuable reform in that respect. But whatever might be the character of the armour ultimately to be applied, it was, in his opinion, desirable to push on the framework of the ships themselves, so that there should be no delay when the armour question was ultimately settled. He desired to refer briefly to another matter. The First Lord of the Admiralty had described the *Hecla* as a ship of small engine power, and added that he thought she would be very useful as showing what we could do when it became necessary to fall back upon the Merchant Service for ships required for certain purposes, and he said that she would be otherwise useful as a cruiser or transport. Now, he would very much regret to find the statement with regard to her small engine power to be correct; because the special merit of these steamers taken from the Merchant Service was their great speed. When it was remembered that ships of 13, 14, and 15 knots were employed in the Merchant Service, he thought it would appear that we had bought what was of very little value for the purpose intended. He should, therefore, be obliged if his right hon. Friend would give some information upon that point.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, he cordially agreed with the opinion of his right hon. Friend, as to the expediency and necessity of accelerating the work when once it had been undertaken at the Dockyards. But there were conditions which his right hon. Friend himself was aware of, which pre-eminently required a certain amount of consideration, and the particular matter of armour was one that was giving Her Majesty's Government a great deal of anxiety, and which might possibly involve delay in the completion for sea of the *Inflexible*, *Ajax*, and *Agamemnon*. He would not be justified in coming to a conclusion at present upon a question which was admitted to be one of very considerable importance. Her Majesty's Government agreed most completely and thoroughly with the principle laid down by the right hon. Gentleman, that the work should be finished as quickly as possible; but it frequently happened that they were obliged to make some alteration in the work to be undertaken which was the cause of delay. He was hardly in a position, at that moment, to give an answer that would convey sufficient information on the effect which the year's expenditure would have upon the future Estimates. They were only now beginning to draw breath; but he could assure his right hon. Friend and the Committee, that there was no one more desirous than himself to bring the expenditure for the Navy to a point which would be thoroughly satisfactory to the House and the country. He had, with the assistance of his Colleagues, considered the subject; but he did not wish to be committed to any statement of opinion. With regard to the *Hecla*, her horse power was 2,000, with a tonnage of 3,400; her speed was stated to be 12½ knots. She was purchased as a transport, and would be fitted as a transport by way of experiment; and unless the ship had been bought, it would have been impossible to get hold of a merchant ship to be treated in this manner, As soon as their experiment was complete, and they had satisfied themselves that such description of ship could be used with safety for the purposes intended, she would go into the general transport service. His hon. and gallant Friend (Captain Price) had spoken of the importance of having more guns of less heavy calibre. This question had been very often under discussion, and with regard to it there existed great differences of opinion. It was to be borne in mind that a great many guns meant a great many men to work them, and that they would have to be spread along the sides of the ship in a manner that would interfere with the design of the armour. The engagement between the *Shah* and the *Huascar* had resulted, according to a good authority, in 2 per cent of the shots striking. He thought this case afforded an argument in favour of ships being armoured in their vital parts, because, had the *Shah* closed with the *Huascar*—which, being a large unarmoured ship, she could not do—at short range, a single shot from the *Huascar* would have sunk her. The hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) was a great authority on these questions, and he (Mr. W. H. Smith) would be exceedingly sorry to treat with any want of respect the remarks which the hon. Gentleman might feel it his duty to make. He believed there was probably no higher authority in the House. The Admiralty had no preference for any particular construction. They had consulted those best able to advise them, including the officers who would be called upon to go to sea in those ships, and, perhaps, fight them; and their object was to keep their eyes open to every kind of improvement, and, by setting the form of one ship against another, to arrive at last at the very best that could be obtained. They felt themselves deeply responsible, not only to the House, but to the country. Although like other men, they were liable to error, they believed that, on the whole, the form adopted was the best in itself, and one which, on the whole, would tend most to strengthen the Navy of this country. They had no favour for one plan over another, but bestowed weeks of anxious consideration in considering the plans submitted. The plan of the ships decided upon was the best result of their judgment, and he hoped the House would sanction the course which they had adopted. With regard to the *Inflexible*, and the remarks of the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) in relation to that vessel, he certainly had not undertaken to bring on the subject in any form, nor to make any alteration, as far as the *Inflexible* was concerned. It was impossible to have a perfect ship—that was to say, a ship that would keep out any shot, that would be absolutely safe under all circumstances, which would be available for every condition of warfare, and, at the same time, be capable of causing the greatest amount of damage to the enemy with the least possible risk to herself. All he could say was that if any hon. Gentleman could design a vessel uniting all those qualities, he would be deserving of the greatest possible reward. The ships now building were not perfect ships; but were the best which, under the circumstances, the Admiralty could devise.

Mr. WHITWELL wished, in looking back to the time when the subject of the Admiralty Votes were before the House, to express his great gratification at the freedom from accidents during the administration of the right hon. Gentleman. At the same time, he did not for one moment express any approval of the propriety of the movements of the war ships. He believed we had now in the Mediterranean a larger amount of tonnage than had ever been in that sea before. It had been crowded during the last 12 months, and they had not heard of any ship getting on the rocks, and being afterwards towed off. He therefore desired to express his feeling of gratification at the good management in the Fleet which had been exhibited. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to the ships which the Admiralty could at any time lay hands upon readily. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to state—and the country would hear it with gratification—that at any moment he could lay his hand on ships of greater speed than 12½ knots an hour, and that the equipment of those ships was in hand. He also understood him to say that he had not yet negotiated with the owners of those ships, and had not paid any money for the right of pre-emption. He (Mr. Whitwell) would be glad to know whether we had power to take possession in such a way as was possessed by the American Government, or whether the transference would at the time be simply a matter of purchase?

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, that the hon. Member for Kendal (Mr. Whitwell) had been good enough to attribute to him a great deal more than he deserved. If it were the case that there had been no disaster whatever in the Mediterranean Fleet during the last year, it was due to the conduct and care of the gallant officers in command of the ships. He was quite prepared to accept any credit which might fairly belong to him; but, in the present instance, no credit whatever was due to him. With regard to the merchant ships that had been surveyed by the Surveyors to the Admiralty, they could acquire a much more considerable number than 30—probably 100 vessels, when they were needed—but he had not thought it right to make any bargain whatever with the owners. If any necessity arose, there would be no difficulty whatever in acquiring these ships at prices which would be for the occasion cheap; but any bargain which he might now make would be onerous to the country. It would, moreover, disturb their multiform arrangements, which he desired should go on in regular course. If occasion arose, he should instantly obtain powers from Parliament to deal with the subject.

Captain PRICE asked, whether the right hon. Gentleman could hold out any hope that the examination referred to in the foot-note to the Estimate, relating to the clerical department in the Dockyards, would take place? The matter was one of very great anxiety for the officers, and he (Captain Price) had a strong wish that it might be taken into consideration.

Mr. W. H. SMITH replied, that the Accountant General's Department had received the necessary sanction, and would shortly proceed to consider the subject referred to.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £1,199,300, Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c.

(3.) £1,042,000, Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c.

(4.) £148,802, Greenwich Hospital and School.

(5.) £678,000, Supplementary sum in respect of Extraordinary Naval and Transport Services.

(6.) £434 7*s.* 5*d.*, Greenwich Hospital and School (Excess, 1876-7).

## CIVIL SERVICES.

### Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments.

(7.) £22,435, to complete the sum for the Public Works Office, Ireland.

Major NOLAN asked what action the Government were going to take on the Report of the Committee in relation to Public Works in Ireland?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the hon. and gallant Member would remember that the Report which had just been issued recommended a variety of changes in the Office, and pointed out certain defects. The effect of the Report would mean an entire reorganization of the Department, and a work of such magnitude could not have been decided on in a few days since the Report had been issued. He had no doubt that important changes would be made in the organization of the Department; but he did not think he could pledge himself more than that, beyond saying that a Report so valuable would be sure to be acted on in the course of next year.

Vote *agreed to.*

### Class III.—Law and Justice.

(8.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £111,253, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Expense of the Superintendence of Prisons, and of the

Maintenance of Prisoners in Prisons in Ireland, and of the Registration of Habitual Criminals."

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, he noticed that there was an item of £500 in the Vote which represented the salary of the Governor of Spike Island Convict Prison, and he would move to reduce the Vote by that sum. He would not at so late an hour have troubled the House with any observations in reference to the management of that establishment, had it not been for the fact that the public in Ireland had been startled by recent revelations made by a person who was detained there for a number of years. It had been his painful duty to call the attention of the House to the treatment of prisoners in Spike Island before, and he thought the facts now made public on the matter justified him in doing so again. The case of Robert Kelly, who was recently liberated, had attracted a great deal of attention, and he (Mr. O'Connor Power) had a good practical object in alluding to it now. A Commission was already engaged in making inquiries into the Penal Servitude Act. They had made inquiries of a very elaborate character in England, and he expressed a hope that when they entered on similar duties in Ireland, they would recognize the necessity of making thorough investigation, especially into the management of Spike Island Convict Prison. There were certain gentlemen, professional and otherwise in Ireland, who were competent to give some very valuable evidence respecting the management of these prisons. And he appealed to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and to the Attorney General for Ireland, to see that this inquiry was made. He knew very well what would be said on the first blush of the question. He should be asked where was his evidence; and he would reply from a long statement in a Dublin newspaper. After reading that Report, he considered a full investigation necessary, and an investigation made by a Commission and not by officials who, although with every desire to do their duty, had, in two cases to his knowledge, held inquiries which led to no satisfactory results. The case of Spike Island should attract the serious attention of the Government. He believed, a few years ago, there was something like a riot in the establishment, not among the political prisoners, but ordinary convicts, and from what he had read he was not surprised that there were riots and disturbances. There must be something wrong in that island home of these unfortunate men. He wished to call the attention of the Committee to a few statements made by Mr. Robert Kelly since his release from prison, and if the Session had not nearly arrived at its close, he would have taken other means to bring the matter before hon. Members. It might have been proper first to put questions to Ministers, and ask if there was any ground for the allegations which had been made public? But, knowing what official answers in that House were, knowing the extent to which Ministers had to depend upon information supplied to them by the officials inculpated, he confessed he could not look upon such a mode of procedure with unlimited confidence. Seven years ago, Kelly was sentenced to 15 years' penal servitude, and he had been liberated after serving seven years. In so far as that act of the Government represented an act of clemency towards a man who had committed a grave offence, and for which he should have been punished, he (Mr. O'Connor Power) returned his thanks. Now, it was stated that Kelly went into prison a strong, healthy man; but at the end of seven years, just as in the case of the others which had been brought before the House, he had been turned out of prison in a deplorable condition. It was stated in *The Freeman's Journal*, and other newspapers, that immediately after his release, he was induced to submit himself to an examination at the hands of Dr. Kenny, a well-known physician in the city of Dublin. The paper states—

> "Dr. Kenny found the patient almost faint with weakness. The heart's action was poor and thready, registering 100 beats per minute. His limbs displayed no muscle, and the flesh was limp and flabby. He was badly affected with angina, or severe spasms, and his digestive system was completely disorganized."

This, then, was the man who, seven years previously, went into the hands of the gaolers in a perfect state of health. Of course, it would be said that one of the effects of penal servitude was to considerably impair the health of those who were subject to it. If that was acknowledged and recognized, this country was responsible for permitting a system of prison discipline which robbed a man of what he would call the fee simple which he had in his constitution. He could not be satisfied with an answer to the effect that the system of penal servitude must materially impair the health of persons subject to it—mentally or physically. Then it might be said that Kelly had a peculiar constitution, and that seven years' penal servitude would have an extraordinary effect upon him. But what was particularly deplorable was that this shattered health generally came to men who had been imprisoned for political offences. It was a well-known fact in Ireland that prisoners convicted of murder, burglary, or the worst of offences, were better treated than those whose crimes were of a political nature. Why was this done? He did not say in every case that the action of the prison officials was the result of villainy. But he did say that sometimes when a man was recognized as a political offender, passions were excited against him, which induced the prison officials to strain their rules, if for no other reason than that it was necessary to take special precautions in the treatment of this class of prisoners. There was a record of the way in which Kelly was treated. He would spare the Committee a full recital of the facts, but he must bring some of them before it. Speaking of the severity of the prison regulations, Kelly remarked—

> "I knew one poor fellow from Ship Street, Dublin, named Branagan, to be handcuffed with his hands behind his back for eight months."

He invited the attention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland to that statement, because it had received a very full share of public attention. Of course, he would be met with the remark that these were mere allegations. Be they allegations or not, they had been made, and published to the world, and the Government now had an opportunity of making a thorough investigation of the statement. The Governor of Spike Island should feel that his conduct was open to suspicion at all events; and it would be the duty of the Commissioners, when they went to examine the Irish prisons, to see that their examination was not a sham one. Well, to continue Kelly's observations about Branagan. He said—

> "I once heard him pray aloud to the gaolers to take off the manacles, if even for a few moments. That night I saw him reclining in his cell, and he died. A coroner's jury said that death was natural."

There were only two other prisoners at the prison who had been guilty, not of a political offence, but of an offence arising out of excitement. Kelly said of one of them—Edward O'Connor—

> "The poor fellow suffered from a running abscess upon one hip, which is most painful, and for which he is under constant medical treatment; but the authorities do not deem his case sufficiently bad to remove him to the hospital. He has also been sentenced to confinement for the smallest offences; and for certain statements which this prisoner made to his sister regarding his treatment, on the occasion of her last visit, he was sent to the punishment cell for three weeks, and fed on bread and water."

Such a thing was almost incredible, and that such a thing should be allowed made him lose all confidence in the Government. The whole system of prison discipline was discussed by Parliament last year, and the Home Secretary flattered himself he had dealt a death-blow to the obnoxious features of the system, which was something to be thankful for. But what did they find? That the rules, as carried out in the Spike Island gaol, were of the worst character. Once, at Spike Island, Kelly, for a period of four days, was confined in a filthy, foul-smelling cell, without chair or table, his only seat being a low footstool or boss. His food was served to him on the floor, and he said—"When I could, I ate it like a beast—off the ground." Such an allegation was surely enough to bring the blush of shame to everyone connected with the management of the prison. The man also stated that for days he was compelled, notwithstanding that he was in very bad health, to work in the rain until his clothes were soaked through. That he was subject to a system of persecution was undeniable, seeing the condition in which he had returned to his friends. Who was responsible for all this, and by whom would a remedy be enforced? There was the case of James Dillon, brought under the notice of the House some time ago. Then the Home Secretary said an investigation was made by the Inspector, who said the report was not true. But what was wanted was an investigation by a Royal Commission—a thoroughly impartial investigation. In his opinion, if they wanted to arrive at the truth in regard to any matter involving criminal responsibility, they must have an impartial body to investigate the matter, and then the whole thing would be thoroughly sifted. He did not say that the statement of Kelly was to be accepted in preference to that of any official, nor was he going to advance the absurd proposition that a prison official, because he was such, was to be discredited. But he said it was still more absurd to ask a man who was charged with a certain thing whether it was true, and then come to the House and say it was not. There ought to be something done by which the public would become aware of the management of these prisons. It was suggested, in the discussion on the Prisons Act, that a complaint-book might be kept, where a prisoner could write his complaints every week, and that the public might be able to demand an examination of the book on payment of 1*s.* It was also suggested that facilities should be given to Members of that House to drop upon the officials when they were not expected, thereby securing something like public supervision of what was going on. All these proposals were rejected by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, who undertook to devise means by which there should be visits to prisons by impartial persons. There were the Visiting Justices before; but now, in their stead, there was a regular body of Inspectors. It was only by the greatest possible effort that anything like a candid statement of the facts of a case could be obtained, and hence he wanted an inquiry by the Royal Commission. The object he had in moving the rejection of the salary of the Governor of Spike Island was that he was the only person who appeared to be responsible. He had received letters from persons who had many opportunities of having occasional glimpses of what was going on, and there was a concurrence of testimony which satisfied him. Whatever decision might be taken now with the view of getting through Supply, he trusted hon. Gentlemen would hold their judgment in reserve, and would expect the Government to see during the Recess that there was a thorough investigation into the management of Spike Island and other prisons; so that next year the House might be able to congratulate themselves that they had done something to prevent a repetition of such deplorable occurrences.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member propose to reduce the Vote by £500?

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: £500.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £110,753, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Expense of the Superintendence of Prisons, and of the Maintenance of Prisoners in Prisons in Ireland, and of the Registration of Habitual Criminals."—(*Mr. O'Connor Power.*)

MR. MITCHELL HENRY was glad his hon. Friend had taken this opportunity of bringing under the consideration of the House, before the close of the Session, the present state of prison discipline. He quite admitted the inconvenience, and even the absurdity, of being compelled to propose the reduction of the salary of one of the Government officers, who, after all, was not the person to blame, because he was only a servant of the Government; but he believed that, at the present time, our prisons were as much in need of the exertions and investigations of a Howard as they were at the time of that distinguished philanthropist. Though the statements now being made to the House would have little weight, though they would not be reported in the public Press, and though those who were listening might wish those who troubled them at this hour—1 A.M.—would cease to address the Committee, he would not on that account be prevented from stating what he believed it was his duty to state to the House. During the last three weeks, he had had occasion frequently to trouble the House in a way very unpleasant to himself. It was his habit not to call attention in that House to public wrongs until he had first tried to have them redressed by efforts made outside the House. With regard to the new Prison Rules, he had done his best privately to get the Home Secretary to make explanations, and to enter into reasonable discussion. He was now convinced that the Government knew nothing whatever about what was going on in prisons. He could come to no other conclusion; because, if they were not ignorant, they would be wilfully deceiving the House. The answers given to the Questions he had asked had simply had the effect of deceiving the public.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I object to that statement, that the answers of the Government are given for the purpose of deceiving the public.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY explained that he never said that. It was impossible that hon. Gentlemen like the Home Secretary or the Chief Secretary for Ireland would wish to deceive the public; but he said it was because they did not know what was going on that they gave such answers. The reason why they did not know was evident. The right hon. Gentleman had so much other work that he had delegated the work of inquiry to one particular Commissioner. [MR. ASSHETON CROSS: No.] The right hon. Gentleman said "No." He was quite aware that there were associated with that Commissioner two other gentlemen who had made a Report; but there was always a master-mind, who, on this occasion, was Sir Edmund Du Cane, who, he believed, was one of the most injudicious and hard-hearted men that ever had the management of prisons. The result was that a system of torture had been introduced into our prisons. A system of torture had been introduced into this country and Ireland, which was a disgrace to civilization, and which would not be endured by the House of Commons when they fairly knew what was going on. The ordinary beds upon which, in Ireland, prisoners had been accustomed to sleep had been taken away from them, and a bare board given, on which they slept, either in their shirts or, as the Chief Secretary for Ireland said, in nightshirts. But the answer given by the Chief Secretary was deceptive. Bedding was talked of, and that expression was used in a manner calculated entirely to deceive the House, and to make them suppose that bedding was something on which prisoners lay. Covering, however, was the proper name for the kind of bedding these prisoners had. Men and women, and children, also, until this week — when the Government, having their attention called to this subject, chose to order that children should not be so treated—were compelled, under the new Rules, to lie for a month on bare planks. That was torture; for why had the plank bed been substituted for the hammocks and mattresses of former times?—to deprive men of sleep; and to deprive men of sleep was to bring them to the verge of insanity. There were numbers of prisoners who had already been driven into insanity by the discipline of our prisons. This matter of the plank-bed had been commented on in Ireland in a way that ought to produce some impression on the Government. It had been said that this prison treatment was the result of a recommendation of a Committee of the House of Lords. It was true that in the Report of that Committee there occurred this passage—

> "The Committee recommend that during short sentences, or the earlier stages of long confinement, the prisoner should be made to dispense with the use of a mattress, and to sleep upon a plank."

That Report was dated 1863. He turned to the evidence upon which the Report was based; and here was a specimen of it. The Committee asked the then Inspector of Prisons—

> "Are you aware that in military prisons they take away the soldier's bed, and when the soldier is obliged to be on duty once in three nights they do the same?—Yes. Could that be applied in prisons? Would it be desirable to take away part of the bed, and leave nothing but planks?"

The Inspector answered that he did not think this would be desirable. It would not contribute to health to do so. In reply to the Marquess of Salisbury, the witness said it would be the reverse of healthy, for it would keep men awake, and give them bad nights. This was the kind of evidence given to the Committee, and he had been unable to discover on what grounds the recommendation of the Committee had been made. No one could have believed that such treatment could have been applied to women. When he first gave attention to this subject, he supposed that it affected men exclusively, and suggested to the Home Secretary that, at any rate, a hole should be made in the plank in which the hip bone could rest; for anyone who had had occasion, in campaigning or otherwise, to lie out, knew that it was a great alleviation of pain and distress to make such a hole for the hip bone. The suggestion was not received as it ought to have been. The right hon. Gentleman did not know whether there was a hole in the plank or not; but promised to inquire, if he (Mr. Mitchell Henry) wished, and to inform him. He remonstrated gently; stating his regret that the Home Secretary should not think it necessary that he should know this for himself, and that no kind of desire should be expressed to make even a reasonable concession like that. Now, after Question upon Question had been put to the Government, and something like an angry feeling raised in the country, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland said that the suggestion would be taken notice of. At that time, however, he had no notion that anybody could be so barbarous as to put women on these bare planks; and if this were a specimen of the discipline to be enforced under the new Rules, the sooner that discipline was altered the better. With regard to diet, he had never read a book so absurd, in many respects, as the Report made to Sir Edmund Du Cane, by his direction, on the subject of dietary. The dietary was already as bad as it could possibly be, and under present regulations, no food was given between 4 o'clock in the afternoon and 8 in the morning. Here was a passage from the Report of the Committee who made the recommendations on which the dietary had been reformed—

> "In the course of our numerous visits to local gaols, we have conversed with many prisoners; we have watched them all hours of the day, and we cannot avoid the conclusion that in a large number of cases, imprisonment, as now generally conducted, is a condition more or less akin to 'physiological rest.' The struggle for survival is suspended; and the prisoner appears to feel that the prayer for daily bread is rendered unnecessary by the solicitude of his custodians. Tranquillity of mind and freedom from anxiety are leading characteristics of his life. From the moment that the prison gates close behind him, the tendency, in most cases, is to lessened waste of tissue; he lives, in fact, less rapidly than before.
>
> "'He is insensibly subdued
> To settled quiet;'
>
> and finds, in many instances, a peace and repose to which, as a law-abiding citizen, he was perchance a stranger.
>
> "We have found that the work exacted of prisoners is never excessive; and here we may remark that it is not work, bodily or mental, that kills men; it is worry; and from worry prisoners, as a rule, are free. 'Work is wholesome, but worry is like rust, which eats into the blade and destroys it.'
>
> "Most prison medical officers, when first appointed, experience a certain fluttering when called upon to see one of the inmates at night, and are oppressed with the thought of conscious criminals tossing upon troubled beds; '*Multi per somnia sæpe loquentes aut morbo delirantes peccata dedisse;*' * but they soon find that the prisoners nestle very comfortably in their hammocks, and that however guilty their consciences may be, they do not trouble them. Each prisoner seems to be able to say—
>
> "'I feel within me
> A peace above all earthly dignities,
> A still and quiet conscience.'"

This was the rubbish upon which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Assheton Cross) pinned his faith. If stern and solemn facts could not have any effect in leading to a thorough investigation into these subjects, he hoped the additional element of ridicule which, for the first time, he believed had been thrown upon a subject of this kind in a Parliamentary Paper by the pedantry and absurdity of the gentleman whom the right hon. Gentleman had called upon to assist him, would prove as potent a weapon now as it had done in the reform of past abuses.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I am only going to say a few words; but I wish to remove a wrong impression, which seems to be in the mind of the hon. Gentleman. That impression seems to me to be due to the fact that he is better acquainted with the Irish prisons than with the English prisons. As I understand, the use of plank beds has not been general in Ireland, but has only been resorted to in the case of punishment; and the hon. Gentleman seems to have fancied that England was in the same position. I want to remove that mistake from his mind. I have not yet got a complete list of all the prisons of England in which plank beds have been in use since the passing of the Prison Act of 1865. Therefore, not the slightest change has been made by the Prison Rules in that respect. [The right hon. Gentleman here read a long list of English prisons in which the plank bed had been used since 1865.] The only effect of the Prison Rules, so far as this matter is concerned, is this—that whereas there were prisons where the plank bed was in use only for three weeks, and others where a prisoner was compelled to be on the plank bed for three months, the new Rules introduced uniformity, and though, in some few cases, the period may now be a little longer in a great many prisons, the effect of the new Rules is to reduce the period during which the plank bed is in use. I am not speaking now of punishment discipline. In all the gaols which I have mentioned the plank bed is part of the ordinary discipline.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: Before the right hon. Gentleman goes further, may I ask whether I am to understand that for short sentences of a month or so prisoners in England have been compelled to lie on these planks, and that women have also before the present Rules been so treated?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: For short sentences, in many gaols, undoubtedly. I will speak of women in a moment. I have been confining my remarks to the case of men. The women are to be considered. They are to have some covering on the plank, though not an ordinary mattress. With regard to short-sentence prisoners, it may seem hard that they should be treated with the same severity in this respect as those with longer sentences. But there are many short-sentence prisoners who must be made to know that a prison is a prison. I remember going into one prison last year. There was an old woman there, to whom the magistrate who was with me said—"Are you here again? You tell the gentleman here how many times you have been in gaol." "Well," she said, "this is the 96th time." Now, a prison is not a place for a woman of that kind, who had looked upon this prison, where she had been too leniently treated, as a kind of workhouse, and who invariably in winter committed some petty theft for the purpose of being committed to gaol. Then about the food. I stated the other day that there was no difference made in the hours at which it is given in any prison in England. In any prison where 5 o'clock may have been the latest hour for the afternoon meal, the reason there has been no alteration is that a Committee has been sitting for the express purpose of inquiring into this matter, and finding out, before any alteration is made, what hours are best. They have not yet reported. As to the Report quoted by the hon. Gentleman, I do not know that the flowery language has anything to do with the Report made to me. I think it a pity that these words are there; but, putting aside the flowery language, I do not think you will find better or more experienced men than those who have drawn up the dietary. Dr. Gower is a man very well known in London. I suppose the best regulated gaol in the whole of England before the passing of the present Prisons Act and the one which was the most respected by everybody who had anything to do with it was the gaol at Salford. The doctor there was looked up to by everyone who had the slightest business connection with that prison. He was specially chosen for that Committee; and I am bound to say that if this dietary table is compared with the dietary tables of 1843 and 1864, it will be found that it is greatly advanced. Although it has only been in force for a short time, I have had favourable Reports made to me as to the weights of the prisoners; and as another test of the diet, I have learned that in many prisons where formerly the surgeons had ordered extra diet for their patients, they had been able to dispense almost entirely with extra diet when the new dietary was introduced. If more time and fuller experience verified these favourable results, there will be strong and conclusive testimony in favour of the new dietary. I can only assure the hon. Member that the working of this Act will be watched with the greatest care, not by one Member of the Commission or another, but by myself. I am bound to say that I cannot really allow the words used by the hon. Member with reference to the admirable officer, Sir Edmund Du Cane, to go unchallenged. He is not a hard-hearted man. I can say that most positively. One hon. Member has made some observations as to convict prisons. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Childers) will bear me witness that at the time the present Act passed through Committee, I was pressed very much by him to have one Board for convict prisons and local prisons, and I refused because I did not want those local prisons to be treated on the same system as convict prisons. I chose out of a Commission of four, two gentlemen who were magistrates of long standing and experience, and of high probity in their respective counties. I was thankful to get them, so that their experience as old Visiting Justices of local prisons would be advantageous in the way of counteracting the influence—if any should be felt—of convict prison management on local prisons. I think I asked the hon. Gentleman to go and see them. They would remove some of his present impressions with regard to the working of local prisons. [Mr. O'Connor Power: Would the right hon. Gentleman mention names?] Admiral Hornby, and Mr. Watlington, formerly Member for Essex. In the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who has just asked these names, he appeared to me to pass very rapidly from convict to local prisons, and he complains that there has been no system of visitation. Now, in the local prisons, the power of visitation is absolutely perfect at present. There are Visiting Committees, who visit these prisons as part of their duty, and every Justice could go into the prison at any moment he chose. Then there are Inspectors, who go round the country constantly; and there are four Commissioners, who divide the country among them, for the purpose of visiting the prisons. From the passing of the Act up to the present moment, he had never received from the Visiting Justices a single complaint of ill-usage. At the beginning of next Session I hope I shall be able to satisfy the hon. Member with positive proofs that he has no cause for complaint.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, the reason he did not go to see the gentleman named by the Home Secretary was that the right hon. Gentleman said he could not see the Chief Commissioner (Sir Edmund Du Cane) on account of his numerous engagements. His (Mr. Mitchell Henry's) experience of treatment in prisons was derived from this country much more than from Ireland. As a Middlesex magistrate he was very familiar with the discipline of several of the Metropolitan prisons. The Committee would have observed that the Home Secretary had not said that the system of laying on plank beds did not apply to women. True, the beds had been in use for men in England for many years; but Sir Edmund Du Cane knew no difference in the discipline of men and women. He believed the country would not stand such a rule, and that the planks would have to be abolished. There were a great many things on which he would not trouble the Committee; but he must allude to one—the hours during which prisoners were confined in their cells—a plan which was absolutely destructive of health. They were confined in a cell from 7 to 9 and 11 feet long and 4 feet wide, with a window at the top to admit the light. Those not sentenced to hard labour were kept in these cells, with the exception of one hour for exercise, for 24 hours. That was a thing which, if it occurred in Naples, would have excited the indignation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich; and surely the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary could not say it was a proper mode of treatment in England. It was disgraceful that a human being should be kept for 23 consecutive hours in such a place, because he had been guilty of some offence, but had not been sentenced to hard labour. Then, look how these Rules would work. People might be imprisoned in the county prisons for the non-payment of fines; a cabman might be sent to prison for loitering in the street, or for any other trivial offence; and yet these men or women or children were subjected to exactly the same discipline as the greatest offender, or the old woman who seemed to have made such an impression on the mind of the right hon. Gentleman. There was an old saying that hard cases made bad laws, and he believed this was one of the cases. There was a very melancholy side to the question of the old woman who had been imprisoned 96 times, and who was compelled to commit crime in order to get shelter. The majority of mankind, whether males or females, did not go to prison willingly, but very unwillingly, and a great number were imprisoned for the first time under circumstances which reduced their nervous system to a distressing condition. He maintained that it was wrong to punish those persons in the same way as they did habitual criminals at the suggestion of Inspectors of prisons—military men, like Sir Edmund Du Cane. He thought they should adapt their discipline to the nature of the offence they had to punish. It was wrong to treat a person sent to gaol for the non-payment of fines in the same severe manner as they would a convicted felon. It was manifestly unfair that those convicted for short periods should lay for a month on a plank the same as those who had long terms of imprisonment, the punishment in the first instance being very much harsher than in the second. In many cases of long sentences the month on the plank was taken out in instalments; whereas the unfortunate wretch who was sent to gaol for the breach of a municipal regulation, or who was unable to pay a fine, was compelled to lay for a whole month upon this plank. Such discipline could not be justified; it was not dicipline at all. It was a clumsy attempt, on the part of men who really had no knowledge of what things ought to be, to carry out Rules which never ought to have been made.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, it was not a question of rules being at fault, but of the law. He should be glad to see in the Summary Jurisdiction Bill, if passed this year, a clause providing that persons sent to prison for non-payment of fines or similar small offences should not be treated as an ordinary criminal.

THE CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that any reference to the English prisons would be more appropriately discussed on the English Vote.

THE O'CONOR DON trusted his hon. Friend would not think it necessary to divide the Committee against the Vote. His hon. Friend had pointed out complaints which were made with regard to the treatment of prisoners in Spike Island, and he had appealed to the Government to order an inquiry into these complaints. He trusted that the Royal Commission appointed at the commencement of the Session would be instructed to make such an inquiry, and knowing the character of the gentlemen upon that Commission, he believed their investigation would be above suspicion. He quite agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) that more confidence would be felt in the inquiries of an independent Commission, such as that which had been appointed, than in the results of an inquiry by any official. He had no doubt that this Commission would investigate the treatment of convicts at Spike Island; and, therefore, the object of his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo would have been secured. In England, the convict prisons and the ordinary county prisons were kept distinct, and under the new law they were not to be amalgamated. But such was not the case in Ireland. Under the new law, the governments of the two sets of prisons were to be amalgamated, and one Board was to govern the whole. Up to the present time there had been a system of Board Superintendents in each county to govern the county prisons, corresponding to the Visiting Justices; but these had been done away with. If the system was to work well, it was essential that they should give some sort of power to those visiting the gaol, or give them an opportunity of communicating with the Prison Board. He suggested that the Visiting Justices should have the power of going to the prisons and have an opportunity of meeting the members of the Prison Board.

MR. H. SAMUELSON desired that the Home Secretary should explain one passage in his statements, which, as it stood, was not clear or satisfactory. He wished to know whether, before the new Rules were initiated, women had not to sleep upon planks, and whether, since the passing of these Rules, they had so to sleep?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, they had to sleep upon these beds.

MR. DILLWYN wished the Home Secretary had said something in answer to the serious allegations made by the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power). He had stated that one man had had his hands chained behind him for eight months, and if that were true, it was nothing else but a system of torture, into which a serious investigation was necessary. Flogging had been done away with to a great extent, and this country would never allow to be substituted for it a system of slow torture.

MR. J. LOWTHER considered that the hon. Gentleman had been led away by the discussion which had taken place. After the able and moderate speech of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell

Henry), as an illustration of the adage that blood is thicker than water, abandoned the land of his adoption and rushed headlong to that of his birth, and regardless of the rules which regulated discussions in Committee of Supply, had brought up a subject which might more appropriately have been discussed upon the English Vote. He should not follow the hon. Gentleman, after the very clear statement of his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary, further than to point out a few observations he made in reply to questions upon the subject. He then stated that children in Ireland were not placed upon a plank bed. As for Robert Kelly, he had every reason to believe that he was treated with great care, in consequence of his state of health, and his condition was the subject of special inquiry. As to the various details of the treatment of prisoners mentioned by the hon. Gentleman, by facts brought to his knowledge, he had every reason to believe that they could not be supported. After the statement of certain alleged facts, the hon. Gentleman had urged that the matter should be brought before the Penal Servitude Commission. Neither he nor any other Member of Her Majesty's Government had any control over the movements of that Commission; but he should be very glad if they saw their way to conduct an inquiry into the Irish prisons, including that at Spike Island. He need scarcely say that every facility for doing so would be afforded by the Government.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON said, the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary did not answer his question. He wished to know whether women had to sleep on plank beds before the new Rules were initiated? The reason he asked this was that the right hon. Gentleman had said that the new Rules made no change in this respect.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had stated that there was no change with regard to men; but that in the case of women it was different.

Major NOLAN said, the Home Secretary had been very anxious to prove that the Rules made in 1865 were made by others than himself, and he seemed desirous of putting those Rules upon a former Government. This was in great contrast to the statements which were made when a change for the better was effected, for then every credit was taken for what had been accomplished. There was no doubt that the present Rules were very unpopular, and the right hon. Gentleman did not like his Government and Party to bear the onus of the extreme unpopularity of the system. It had been said in a former discussion that soldiers had to sleep upon these plank beds; but that was only once in six or seven nights, and then only for a portion of the night. It might be a necessity to adopt such a plan in the case of soldiers; but the whole tone of the discussion in the House had been that they were not good in every case. If they did good, no doubt the Government would say they were a necessary and useful system, and they would take the whole responsibility for their use. But that had not been done by the Government on the present occasion, and he could well understand the reason for it. These Rules as they stood must bear very heavily in some cases. For instance, under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, a respectable farmer might be imprisoned and come under these Rules, and have to sleep for a month on a plank bed. He was glad to be clear of all complicity in the passing of such Rules, and he trusted his hon. Friend would divide the House as a protest against such a system.

Mr. MELDON said, the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had not sought to defend the system of plank beds in England. He pointed out that he found it in force, and the action of Government had been to make punishment less severe. Severity of punishment had on the whole been decreased; but how did that bear on Ireland? In trying to assimilate the Prison Law in England and Ireland, the greatest indignation had been excited from one end of the country to the other. The Lord Chief Baron and Mr. Baron Dowse had stated their opinions distinctly. The Lord Chief Baron said, as far as women were concerned, he would not be a party to sentencing them to imprisonment except for crimes of violence, and Mr. Baron Dowse said he should inflict much shorter terms of imprisonment in consequence of the torture prisoners had to go through. It was perfectly indefensible that whereas a prisoner sentenced to two years' imprisonment had to sleep on a plank for a month extended over the whole period, an individual sent to prison for one month had to sleep for the whole time on a plank. He objected to the introduction of such an abominable and atrocious system of torture into Ireland, and he thought they must take a division, either then or subsequently, to mark their opinion as to the treatment which the Irish prisoners had received at the hands of the Government, by having such a species of torture inflicted upon them.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, the sentiments of the Chief Secretary for Ireland were quite out of unison with the sentiments of the humane and enlightened people he had to govern. He did not accuse the right hon. Gentleman of desiring to mislead; but he did mislead to such an extent that the placards of some of the Irish newspapers announced the abolition of the plank beds. The answers given were couched in such language that they bore a double meaning, and were understood by partizans of the Government in one way, and by those behind the scenes in another way. He wanted to know whether these questions could not be answered in a full and straightforward manner? If the Government said—"We have adopted the plank bed. We think it the right thing, and we mean to stick to it," there would be no misunderstanding. He was now in some doubt upon the whole subject; but what had been elicited had been elicited only by piecemeal, and in a way which he thought not at all satisfactory. He hoped hon. Members would make a protest by their votes.

Mr. A. MOORE did not think there was cause for the remarks made by the previous speaker as to the straightforwardness of the answers to questions. The question was not raised by the hon. Member for the first time, for before he had taken up the subject he had brought it under the attention of the House. He would now say to the Ministry that prison managers having done so long without these plank beds in Ireland, it was a pity that they were not dispensed with altogether. The way in which the extra punishment they inflicted was introduced by a side-wind, as it were, and without the Judges knowing the extent of the punishment they were inflicting, was most improper.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken was entirely mistaken in saying that he (Mr. Mitchell Henry) took up this question after him. Long before he had moved in it, he had gone to the Home Secretary on the subject. He was not, however, so easily satisfied by official answers as the hon. Member.

Mr. LEEMAN, though he did not see how this question of plank beds could rise out of the particular Vote on which the Committee was asked to express an opinion, thought the discussion would result in good, even in England. The Home Secretary had promised to give his own attention to the subject of prison treatment. He was glad of that, because anything more barbarous than Prison Rules rendering it necessary that persons who had been sent to prison for a month should be subject to the plank bed he could not conceive. In the large prisons in England a large proportion of the commitments were for one month.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. Member that, although the question of plank beds as affecting Ireland is before the Committee, the question of plank beds as affecting England is not.

Mr. LEEMAN could only say that if he were to be put down on a reference to that question which had constituted the principal feature of the debate by an objection of this kind, he would certainly avail himself of another opportunity of seeking to have the question really discussed. He said without hesitation that the largest number of committals was the number of those for one month, and many of those committals were not for felony, or anything approaching to it; but for minor offences, for which the plank bed punishment should not be put in force. He therefore thought the Committee ought to be obliged to the Members for Ireland who had brought this question under the notice of the Committee. Such cases as that of the old woman, to which the Home Secretary referred, were unusual; the commitments for short periods being generally commitments for offences of a very venial nature. He trusted that before next Session the use of the plank bed in these commitments would be abolished.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER was anxious to take the course most suitable to the Committee in reference to the Vote. In reply to the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don), the Chief Secretary for Ireland made a statement which, as far as it went, was a very fair statement. He declared, on the part of the Government, that if the Commission thought proper to investigate the management of Irish prisons, every facility would be afforded them. In fact, as he (Mr. O'Connor Power) understood him, he expressed a hope that they would see their way to make that inquiry. Now, that was a point gained. The right hon. Gentleman was not in a position to contradict the grave accusations he (Mr. O'Connor Power) brought against the the Governor of Spike Island, and there he supposed the matter must rest; and having regard to the turn the discussion had taken, he thought he would be justified in asking the leave of the Committee to withdraw the Amendment he had proposed, but with a view to its being discussed again. Against the introduction, under these Prison Rules, of the barbarous plank bed, he wished to test the feeling of the Committee; but he would withdraw his present Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY: I object to the Vote, and move that it be reduced by one shilling.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will be departing from the practice of the Committee in proposing such a Motion. I understand him to wish to raise an issue equivalent to negativing the Vote.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY: Then I will negative the Vote.

Major NOLAN: We only propose to negative the Vote as an expression of our opinion on the subject of plank beds. I should like that to be understood.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER appealed to the Home Secretary, before the Question was put, to say whether he was prepared to tell the country that he had assented to this new mode of punishment in Irish prisons without a reason for doing it. Could he not rise in his place and give some assurance that it would be stopped?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had nothing to do with the Prison Rules so far as Ireland was concerned.

The O'CONOR DON said, he believed the Rules were sent over from England to the Board in Ireland, who had to adopt them. They were not originated by the Board in Dublin. They were English Rules which came over to them in order that, for the sake of uniformity, they might be adopted in Ireland. His hon. Friend proposed to take a division on this Vote for the whole amount of the expenses of the Irish Prisons, in order to make his protest against the plank beds; but he confessed it seemed to him that this was not a very satisfactory mode of expressing an opinion. There might be a strong opinion that these beds should be discontinued, and, at the same time, there might be an indisposition to stop the supplies for the expenses of the Irish prisons. He would not be inclined to vote against the whole Vote because he objected to plank beds, and he feared a division taken against the Vote would be a bad one; whereas, if the question were raised directly, the division might be a good one.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked leave to move that the Vote be reduced. He noticed on the Treasury Bench some indication of dissent from his hon. Friend's (the O'Conor Don's) remark that the Prison Rules were sent from England to be adopted in Ireland. It was true that the Prison Rules were elaborated in England and sent over to Ireland. The Privy Council in Ireland, however, was not nearly unanimous, though a majority adopted the Rules. He would move to reduce the Vote by £100, as a protest against plank beds.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £111,153, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Expense of the Superintendence of Prisons, and of the Maintenance of Prisoners in Prisons in Ireland, and of the Registration of Habitual Criminals."—(*Mr. Mitchell Henry.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 21; Noes 51: Majority 30.—(Div. List, No. 253.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER intimated that as the happy moment of going out of Committee of Supply had now been reached, it would not now be necessary to have a Morning Sitting.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Is it intended that there shall be a Morning Sitting on Saturday?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes.

Mr. MELDON: When will Report of to-day's Supply be taken?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: To-morrow.

Mr. M. BROOKS asked, whether any opportunity would be given to hon. Members to bring forward Private Bills on Saturday?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: It is as well to be clear upon that point. I think, considering the position in which the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill stands, and considering all that has passed in relation to that Bill, it would not be right that the Session should close without our endeavouring to give the House an opportunity of considering the Bill on its third reading. I should propose, therefore, to take that Bill on Saturday.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Will there be any other Business taken?

Mr. DILLWYN: When will the Appropriation Bill be taken?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The Irish Sunday Closing Bill will be taken first on Saturday, and some other Business afterwards. The Appropriation Bill will be brought in to-morrow. Its second reading will not be taken on Saturday; but, perhaps, it will be taken on Monday.

In reply to Mr. Leeman,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the Inclosure Bill would probably be taken to-morrow.

Major NOLAN: As the Chancellor of the Exchequer is in rather a communicative mood, can he make a good guess at the date of the Prorogation?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER would not do that at present.

Dr. O'LEARY said, it had been reported that the discussion of the Irish Sunday Closing Bill would be made to extend over Saturday night, and carried on during Sunday. He was anxious to know whether it was possible that this Bill would be brought on under the auspices of the Government at such an hour that its discussion might be possibly continued for the time suggested?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: It will be brought on at 12 o'clock.

Mr. M. BROOKS wished to know whether, in that case, the Rule applicable to Wednesday Sittings would apply so that the Sitting would terminate at 6.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: There is no limit, I believe, to such a Sitting as is proposed for Saturday.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

## EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

### LEAVE. ORDERED.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [7th August], "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to continue various Expiring Laws."—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Major O'GORMAN moved that leave be not given.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 61; Noes None.—(Div. List, No. 254.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson and Sir Matthew Ridley.

## SUPPLY [15th July].

Postponed Resolution [reported 16th July], *considered.*

Resolution again read as follows:—

"That a sum, not exceeding £434,091, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland."

Resolution *agreed to.*

## SUPPLY [5th August].

Postponed Resolution [reported 6th August], *considered.*

Resolution again read as follows:—

"That a sum, not exceeding £14,672, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office for the Registration of Deeds in Ireland."

Mr. MELDON moved to reduce the Vote by £315, the salary of one of the clerks in the Office. The circumstances under which he removed the reduction had, he said, been discussed in Committee; but no division taken. In the year 1875, one of the first-class clerks in the Office for the Registration of Deeds in Ireland died, and no one had been appointed to fill the vacancy. The fact was that faith had been broken with the officers of this Department in a most unprecedented manner. In 1859, in consequence of some re-arrangement of the Office, a circular was issued to all the clerks in it, pointing out that they would be entitled to promotion from class to class according as any dropped off. That was to say, a second-class clerk would, in the event of there being a vacancy in the first grade, get it, and the third-class man would go to the ranks of the second. In 1875, one of the first-class clerks died, a second-class clerk was recommended for his place, and he applied for it. But he was informed that some re-arrangements were then being made in the Office, and the Treasury would not appoint him. The officers being exceeding sore at this, put themselves in communication with the Secretary to the Treasury, by means of Members of Parliament, and asked for the usual promotion. He said they were not entitled to the promotion, but only to an additional increment year by year to their salaries. This certainly was a peculiar view of matters, because the Act regulating the Registration of Deeds Office provided that there should be a certain number of clerks of different classes to be fixed by the Treasury Minute. The Treasury did fix that number of clerks, and they provided that there should be 10 of the first class; but now there were only nine. At first, in the Estimates, the Treasury only put down nine clerks; but on looking at the Act of Parliament and the Minute, they found they had no right to reduce the number, and, therefore, it became necessary to take a Vote for 10. But yet no additional first-class clerk had been taken on, and no one was filling the office at all. The clerks were complaining very seriously of this. It was said in 1875, as a reason for not giving the promotion, that new arrangements were about to be made whereby the Treasury would be enabled to dispense with the services of additional clerks; but up to the present no change had taken place, the result being that the Office was under-manned, and complaints on one side of delay, and on the other side of want of staff. But there was another matter on which he must ask some explanation. Since 1875, only nine first-class clerks had been paid; but the Estimates were framed for 10. Where did this £315 go? It was voted but not paid, and instead of the same amount being restored to the Treasury, £175 or £179 was accounted for. He could not understand what had become of the difference year by year, and he wanted an explanation why money not paid was not returned to the Exchequer?

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£14,672," in order to insert "14,357."—(*Mr. Meldon.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) hoped the hon. and learned Member would not think it necessary to press his Motion to a division. The re-organization of the Office of Registration of Deeds in Ireland had been under consideration for a considerable time past; and at the present moment a Royal Commission, of which the hon. and learned Member was one, and presided over by the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, was inquiring into the matter. Under those circumstances, there naturally must be considerable hesitation in making new appointments until the new arrangement was arrived at. As to the allegation that the money voted was not expended or not returned, that matter should be inquired into.

MR. M. BROOKS hoped his hon. and learned Friend would persist in his Amendment, and take the sense of the Committee upon a very unfair proceeding. The fact was that three or four years ago a change in the administration of the Registration of Deeds Office was suggested, with a view to lessening the number of clerks. Nothing had as yet been done; but he was convinced it was because of the importunity of the officers who would have suffered by the change that the promotion had been discontinued. Due allowance should be made for the feelings of the clerks in this Office. Their interest, in the eyes of highly-salaried officials, might be of small moment; but what was a small matter to heads of Departments was of great importance to the persons themselves, and who were greatly damaged by the neglect to carry out the arrangements under which they were appointed. There was no other mode of obtaining justice for them than by bringing the matter before Parliament, so as to get Parliamentary opinion to bear upon the officials.

Question put, "That £14,672 stand part of the Resolution."

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing as a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared that the Ayes had it.

### SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [7th August] *reported.*

The First Resolution being read a second time;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Question put.

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing to be a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared the Ayes had it.

Second Resolution *postponed.*

The Third Resolution being read a second time;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Question put.

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing to be a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared the Ayes had it.

The Fourth Resolution being read a second time;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Question put.

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing to be a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared the Ayes had it.

The Fifth Resolution being read a second time;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Major O'Gorman was appointed one of the Tellers for the Noes, but no Member appearing to be a second Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared the Ayes had it.

Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*

Postponed Resolution to be considered *To-morrow.*

### PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS AND FINES (IRELAND) BILL—[Bill 253.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. J. Lowther.*)

#### COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

The O'CONOR DON expressed a hope that the Bill would not be proceeded with. Notwithstanding its distinctive title, it was a sort of omnibus Bill; and, as it was only recently introduced, it ought not to be pressed at that hour —after 3 A.M.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) hoped the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) would not object to the Bill proceeding. It was really desired by those whom its passing would affect. It effected divers improvements in administrative details, and unless he could proceed with it now, he feared the Order would have to be discharged. In Committee he intended to accept Amendments, and this would necessitate a Report to be taken, and the hon. Member for Roscommon could consider in the interval whether he would desire to put any Amendment on the Paper.

Mr. MELDON said, that the Bill was obviously intended to benefit Petty Sessions clerks; but owing to its wording it might be worked against their interests. As, however, the Attorney General for Ireland was willing to accept an Amendment of his which would make the meaning of the Bill perfectly clear, he would not object to its consideration now in Committee.

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

The O'CONOR DON gave Notice, that on the Motion to consider the Bill as amended, he would move that it be considered that day three months.

## NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1876-7.

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committe.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

(1.) "That it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1877, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Navy Services for the said year amounted to the sum of £166,546 6*s.* 10*d.*

(2.) "That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of £129,508 12*s.* 3*d.*, out of the said total sum of £166,546 6*s.* 10*d.*, to provide for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Navy Services for the said year.

(3.) "That the said application be sanctioned.

(4.) "That it appears by the Army Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1877, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Army Services for the said year amounted to the sum of £370,434 10*s.* 7*d.*, and that the sum of £247,548 17*s.* 1*d.* has been realised in excess of the estimated Appropriations in aid, amounting together to the total sum of £617,983 7*s.* 8*d.* (That the sum of £2,714 10*s.* having been disallowed by a Committee of this House from the expenditure recorded in the said account, the gross surplus thereon is increased from the said sum of £617,983 7*s.* 8*d.* to £620,697 17*s.* 8*d.*)

(5.) "That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of £476,728 1*s.* 10*d.* out of the said surplus to provide for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Army Services for the said year.

(6.) "That the said application be sanctioned."

Mr. MONK asked if any Report had been laid on the Table with regard to the appropriation or misappropriation of the balances of the Votes proposed to be dealt with in the Resolution now before the Committee? Last Session a promise was made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that a Committee should be appointed to consider those cases in which the excess of Votes which ought to have been returned into the Treasury had been appropriated to other purposes. So far as he had been able to understand the Resolution read, it appeared that this was one of the excesses in point. He thought there should, therefore, be more information given before the Committee assented to the appropriation of this money.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was aware that what the hon. Member stated did happen last year; but he was only recently made aware of this. Unfortunately, on account of the Ministerial changes, the matter had been overlooked until after the Public Accounts Committee, to whom it was intended to refer the subject, had closed their business. He would take care that it should be in future referred to that Committee.

Mr. MONK asked for explanations regarding the sum mentioned in the Resolution.

Mr. W. H. SMITH explained that the Accounts themselves had been examined by the Public Accounts Committee, who had gone through the items on both sides. A less sum was sometimes paid under certain of the Army and Navy Votes than had been provided by Vote, and a larger sum had been spent on some other items than the Votes had provided for. In order to avoid the inconvenience of asking for more, in the whole, than was necessary, it was provided by Act of Parliament that the Treasury might authorize an expenditure in excess of the Vote when there were savings under another Vote in the same Department, and that the savings should be transferred to meet that excess. It was understood, however, that the subject should be taken into consideration by the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. MONK said, the principle was radically wrong, and he was astonished that the subject, "having been brought before the House last Session" and a promise having been given that it should not occur again, the Government should have recurred to the old principle.

Mr. DILLWYN condemned the principle of these transferences.

Major NOLAN believed that this mode of dealing with public accounts was one of the gravest accusations brought against Napoleon the Third's Government, and had much to do with the downfall of his dynasty.

Mr. DILLWYN remarked that the sum involved seemed larger than it had ever been. He was sorry to trouble the Committee, but he must take the opinion of the Committee on this subject. No satisfactory explanation had been given.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, however objectionable the practice might be, it was at present sanctioned by Act of Parliament. He had stated that he was prepared to bring the subject before the Public Accounts Committee next Session.

MR. COURTNEY said, if it was not necessary to pass that Resolution to-night he would move that Progress be reported. If £250,000 could be transferred in this way, the control of Parliament over the finances would be seriously diminished.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, it was necessary to pass the Resolution to-night, otherwise the introduction of the Appropriation Bill would be delayed.

MR. DILLWYN said, if the system were sanctioned by Act of Parliament, it seemed as if hon. Members were asked to vote what they had no choice of declining to vote. On the assurance that this would not occur again, he would withdraw his opposition.

Resolutions *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

### WAYS AND MEANS.

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £21,556,807 7*s.* 5*d.* be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL—[BILL 215.]

(*The O'Conor Don, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Redmond.*)

### THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read the third time upon Saturday."—(*The O'Conor Don.*)

MR. ONSLOW said, he was sorry to move an Amendment. It was quite unprecedented that the Government should give a Saturday Sitting to private Members; and from the answer of Mr. Speaker to a question put to him by me to-day, the House will have heard that the course now to be acquiesced in by the Government is most unusual. Surely it will be a bad precedent to set, when the Government of the day fixes on a Saturday in order further to facilitate the passing of a measure introduced by a private Member. In his opinion, Saturday should never be taken, except when the Government were very anxious that the Session should close, and then that Public Business only should be taken. He would move that the Bill be taken next Tuesday, when many Irish Members who would come over for the Intermediate Education Bill on Monday, might be present. For the last two or three days it had been rumoured that the supporters of the Bill were privately promised Saturday for the third reading. He hoped there was no truth in this, for the opponents of the Bill had no knowledge of it, and a mine had been sprung upon them.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "Saturday," in order to insert the words "Tuesday next."—(*Mr. Onslow.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Saturday' stand part of the Question."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: It is perfectly true, as my hon. Friend has observed, that the course now taken is somewhat unusual; but the opposition to this Bill, and what happened with regard to it, is also unusual. I must briefly remind the House of the facts. When it was introduced at the beginning of the Session, it was stated by the Government that they would be prepared to facilitate the Bill passing its second reading, and that they would, in Committee, move certain Amendments. If those Amendments were accepted, they intimated that they would give facilities, such as a Government can give, for carrying the Bill through its further stages. The Government did what they could to redeem these promises. The Bill was opposed in a manner which must be fresh in the recollection of the House, and which certainly caused great inconvenience. On every possibe occasion the Bill was discussed and divided upon; but it was carried through its different stages by large majorities. In these circumstances, it would be unbusiness-like to allow all the time so expended to be entirely thrown away; and, perhaps, to make the House seem to stultify itself. Moreover, the time has now arrived when, if the Bill is to leave the House with any chance of passing the House of Lords at all, it is necessary that it should be read a third time this week; and, under these circumstances, the Government think it necessary to redeem the pledge given at the beginning of the Session, and acknowledged since from time to time, of giving facilities for passing the Bill. It has been impossible to take it in the last week or two; but the Government have decided, before the close of the Session, to give the House another opportunity of considering the Bill on the third reading. Saturday has been fixed between those interested in the Bill and myself. It was, however, absolutely impossible to fix, until the Sitting to-day, what should be done.

Mr. M. BROOKS said, there could be no doubt that the Government had given a sort of pledge to facilitate the passing of the Bill, and there could be equally little doubt that they had honourably fulfilled that promise. But they had adopted a peculiar course in giving a private Member a Saturday at the end of the Session for passing a Bill such as this; and he hoped, remembering how much more than was necessary they had fulfilled their engagements, that the Government would abandon their intention, and not call the House together, not only for Saturday, but very probably for Sunday too. Besides, Monday would be a peculiarly fit day for the Bill to come on, as almost every Irish Member would be present that day, and a true criterion of the feeling of the Irish Members on the matter would thus be obtained.

Dr. O'LEARY thought the most extraordinary thing was that a Sunday Closing Bill should, for the first time in the history of the House of Commons, be the means of keeping that House open on a Sunday. Those most anxious for the closing of public-houses on Sunday were most anxious to keep the House of Commons open that day—atleast, he had heard it was intended to sit through it, if necessary, in order to pass the Bill. Would not such a course as that be Sunday opening? He should like to know, too, if the House sat on Sunday, whether the Members' refreshment bar would be kept open or not? Every facility had been given by the Government for passing the Bill; but owing to the persistency of Irish Members who knew the opinions of the people, it had not yet got through all its stages.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock in the morning.

* * *

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Friday, 9th August, 1878.*

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Marriages (Fiji) * (195); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. * (170); Prison (Officers' Superannuation) * (184).

*Committee—Report*—Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) (190).

*Report*—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3)* (128).

*Third Reading*—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) * (193); British Museum (Transfer of Collection) * (183); Commons Regulation (Expenses) * (181); Statute Law Revision (Ireland) * (185), and *passed.*

## CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

Commons' Amendments *considered.*

Order of the Day for the Consideration of the Commons' Amendments, read.

Earl FORTESCUE said, that as he was the Peer who last ventured, while President of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, to impress upon Her Majesty's Government the necessity of legislating for the protection of their flocks and herds from diseases imported from abroad, he must ask their Lordships' indulgence for a few moments while he made some observations before the Bill finally passed away from their Lordships' House. He might begin by thanking Her Majesty's Government, on behalf of the agriculturists, both as regarded the producer and the enlightened portion of the consumers of England, for having undertaken the laborious duty of passing this measure.

On the whole, although he did not think it would leave their Lordships' House in as satisfactory a form as it might have done, still he was of opinion that it was likely to be a very valuable measure. He had said that he must thank the Government on the behalf of the intelligent consumer, and he did so because he was quite sure that the consumers would be as much interested in the matter as the producers of meat. In his view, the production of meat would be considerably increased by the passing of this measure, because it would certainly prevent the introduction of disease; and he had very little doubt that the consumers would—most of them—be of that opinion, notwithstanding the electioneering arts to which had been used in and out of Parliament to persuade them to the contrary. He must say that he felt very indignant at the calumnies and misrepresentations of the motives and objects of this measure, when he remembered that the Central Chamber of Agriculturists, comprising the representatives of local chambers and numerous bodies throughout the Kingdom, passed a resolution which was read to their Lordships last year expressly disclaiming any design to reverse the well established Free Trade policy of the country, and stating distinctly that the protection they desired for their flocks and herds was protection from imported contagion, and not at all from foreign competition. There was no doubt that since the free introduction of foreign live stock had been permitted by law, the farmers of this country had experienced a most terrible outbreak of the cattle plague, the introduction of which had destroyed many millions' worth of property. But since that great outbreak of cattle plague, he was assured by high authorities that foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, which had been existing ever since, more or less, in various parts of this country, had entailed even a heavier than that loss caused by the cattle plague to the farmers, who naturally felt very great alarm on the subject of disease. And that had led to a considerable diminution of live stock in this country, in spite of the most undesirably high price of meat. The great loss from disease had out-weighed any benefit that might be derived from the free movement of the cattle, and many farmers and consumers had now arrived at the conclusion that the only satisfactory way to deal with the matter was to exclude the importation of all live stock from the country. His own conviction was that as one good result of the measure, the proportion of dead meat at home and abroad for the consumption of this Metropolis and other large towns would constantly increase. The introduction of a system of cold storage here would probably be productive of a very large and rapid increase in the quantity of meat daily sent to the Metropolis both from abroad and from distant counties. From information obtained from the evidence taken by the Parliamentary Committee on the subject, it appeared that a large increase had already taken place in the quantity of meat sent from Aberdeen and other parts of Scotland—as from his own knowledge he could state that it had from Devonshire and Cornwall—because experience had taught the dealers there that it was a much more satisfactory and profitable mode of disposing of their fat stock. He rejoiced heartily at it on other grounds; because, while it improved the health of man, it diminished the sufferings of the animals themselves, and he expressed his conviction that notwithstanding all that had been said about the suffering caused by vivisection, it was nothing compared with the aggregate suffering of the hundreds of animals during the passage to the Metropolitan Market, from want of food and water, pressure and suffocation, ending, in some instances, in the death of the whole cargo during their long journey. He had had it from good practical authority that every day the cattle spent in travelling they diminished in weight to the extent of eight pounds each animal, at least, on the average; consequently the loss in the aggregate quantity as well as quality of the meat was very great. A great deal of this inconvenience would be saved by the introduction of a system of cold storage into this country. By the present system of importation, the meat was brought to the seaports in ice compartments; but it was taken out immediately on its arrival into the hot streets, and had to be sold at once, because it would not keep. If, however, there were an extensive cold storage system, it would enable the supply of one day's market to be kept over for the next, and tend to equalize prices, which would be a most beneficial thing both for the consumer and for the producer. In America a very extensive system of cold storage had been established, with the best results; and it had been applied there, not only to the preservation of meat, but to that of vegetables and fruit, and he confidently looked forward to the time when a large proportion of the meat consumed in London which was brought from a distance would be killed at the place at which it had been fattened, whether at home or abroad. Regarding the various criticisms that had been indulged in upon this matter, and more especially those which had reference to the consumption of offal, he had heard from a good practical authority that the price of offal, notwithstanding the large increase in the importation of dead meat from abroad and from distant parts of the country into the Metropolis, had not risen at all relatively to the high prices at which joints were sold. It must be remembered that it was only a small proportion of offal that would bear the cost of transport from the country, although protected by the application of ice. A considerable portion of what was called offal was by no means fit for human food, there being a large quantity of slime and filth from the carcase of the animals, which would make excellent manure if they were killed in the country; but which was not only useless when they were killed in the town, but liable to become a nuisance, and even dangerous to the health of the community, unless the slaughter-houses were most carefully watched by the authorities. It was, therefore, upon sanitary as well as economical grounds that he contemplated with satisfaction the substitution of the importation of meat in the carcase to the Metropolis instead of live animals. He had heard the clap-trap cry of "Free Trade in danger" raised, and he thought that many of those who had taken part in the debates upon the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government had not scrupled to endeavour to obtain support for themselves by raising the cry of "Free Trade in danger." For his own part, he had always been a consistent Liberal and free trader from his youth upwards; but he could not help remembering that the same cry had been raised again and again by those who had been opposed to different reforms. They should remember that interference with trade was not always interference for the purposes of protection. For instance, the Members who pressed for the Factory Acts were charged with interference with the natural laws of supply and demand, and the recognized principles of political economy; and this by Sir Robert Peel, when he had just made his alterations in the Corn Laws, continuing that economical anomaly and absurdity known as the sliding scale. He remembered, also, the opposition to interference with lodging-houses, and the same cry was raised with reference to the adulteration of food, by the right hon. Member for Birmingham, who protested indignantly against having Government inspection to protect the people from the practice of adulteration. He thought the good sense of the country was sufficient to put an end to such chimeras, which were at once the offspring of ignorance and selfishness, and that it was now admitted that legislative interference with trade was in many cases the best course they could adopt, not only as regarded the interests of humanity, but also as being in conformity with the soundest and truest political economy.

Earl SPENCER said, that he had listened with attention to the address which had just been delivered by the noble Earl, and begged to join with him in congratulating Her Majesty's Government in having succeeded in passing this important measure through Parliament; and he thought that the agriculturists of the Kingdom were indebted to the Government for agreeing to the Amendment which was pressed upon them in the other House. The Act would be one of great importance, not only because it effected uniformity of action throughout the country with regard to the various interests concerned, but in other important respects, and would have great influence in diminishing disease. He must, however, protest against some of the views that had been put forward by his noble Friend. His noble Friend used some strong expressions as to the motives of the opponents of the important clause which had reference to the importation of live cattle. He alluded to them as electioneering arts, and even went so far as to say that some speakers in and out of the House had adopted those views in order to counteract the successful policy of Her Majesty's Government with regard to its foreign policy. He need hardly argue against the latter view; but whatever might be his own opinion of the original clause, he had a right to protest against the motives by which it had been stated they were actuated. In "another place" that matter was taken up by leading statesmen, and it was rather hard to charge them with electioneering arts because they opposed a measure which affected so materially and prejudicially, as they thought, the interests of their constituents. He did not think it was fair to those who entertained those views to accuse them of adopting electioneering arts, because the arguments used against the measure were of great weight and importance. They did not argue that it was a return to Protectionism—for the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Ripon), and those who spoke upon that side, carefully guarded themselves against accusing the noble Duke and his Friend opposite from entertaining Protectionist views. They said, however, that some people in the country had suppported the measure because they looked upon it as a return to Protectionism; but they did not impute any motives of that kind to the Government who introduced the measure. He thought it right to protest against this imputation upon the motives of those who were opposed to a measure upon the passing of which he heartily congratulated the Government. He wished to ask the noble Duke a question upon an important point that had been raised in the course of the discussion with reference to the Irish cattle trade to this country. Considerable stress had been laid before their Lordships' Committee upon the importance of having a proper veterinary management in Ireland, and they were unanimous in saying that the Veterinary Department in Ireland was hardly equal to this work, especially considering the great importance of the question to Ireland, where large districts depended almost entirely upon the cattle trade. He could not, therefore, help impressing upon his noble Friend the necessity of strengthening that Department which had the regulation of all the cattle traffic in Ireland, just as the Privy Council had in England. His own recollection of the Veterinary Department, when he was in Ireland, was that they had not a sufficiently large staff, and his noble Friend would see the importance of its being vigorously dealt with. He therefore ventured to ask the noble Duke, whether he could give the House some information with regard to what had been done towards strengthening the Veterinary Department in Ireland?

EARL FORTESCUE explained that he did not mean to impute any improper motive either to the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Ripon) or to the noble Lords who had opposed the Bill in that House; but it certainly was the impression that many of the speeches, both in and out of Parliament, were mere claptrap for political purposes.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON did not think it necessary for him to reply upon the latter point, and having already expressed his opinion and belief that the measure would be one of a very useful character, and for the benefit of all classes of the community, no one would be more rejoiced than he should be when it received the Royal Assent. With regard to the question put by his noble Friend (Earl Spencer), he was not able to give any details as to what had been done with regard to the Veterinary Department in Ireland. Their Lordships were aware that the Privy Council had no jurisdiction in Ireland as regarded issuing Orders or making regulations. Those matters rested entirely with the Government and the Lord Lieutenant in Dublin, and he might say that for weeks, if not months, he had been in communication with his Excellency on the subject of the Veterinary Department, and upon the form of the Orders that should be issued by the Irish Government. The two Governments desired to act as much as possible together, so as to put a stop to the progress of disease both in England and Ireland, and he had great hopes that the measures which had been referred to by his noble Friend would be found to be satisfactory. His noble Friend might rely upon it that it was the desire of the Government to make the Veterinary Department as strong as possible.

Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order); several *agreed to*, with an Amendment, and a consequential Amendment to the Bill; and one *disagreed to;* and a Committee appointed to prepare a reason to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to the said Amendment: The Committee to meet *forthwith:* Report from Committee of the reason prepared by them; read, and *agreed to;* and a message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with the Amendments and reason.

## NAVY—H.M.S. "EURYDICE."

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Viscount SIDMOUTH, seeing the noble Lord who represented the Admiralty (Lord Elphinstone) in his place, and knowing the great interest that was felt by the public in everything that related to the *Eurydice,* begged to ask, Whether the noble Lord was in a position to give the House, before Parliament separated, any information with respect to the condition of this vessel? He was induced to put the Question more especially by the unfavourable reports which had reached him of the progress of the operations. Those operations had now been going on for some time, and no doubt they would eventually be successful; but he wished to know if anything had happened which had delayed them?

Lord ELPHINSTONE said, that he was very glad the Question had been asked, because it enabled him, before the House separated, to fulfil a promise that he had made in the early part of the Session, to the effect that he should be at all times happy to give every information in his power with regard to the *Eurydice;* and he was happy to be able to inform their Lordships that she was now lying inside the Isle of Wight in a position in which she was perfectly protected from the influence either of tide or weather, and in 11 feet of water. She was being pumped out that day, and in a few days she would be cleared out, and taken into Portsmouth Harbour. When she arrived there, there would be a very searching investigation made, and a court martial would be held; although he confessed he did not for one moment think that anything would result from that investigation, or that any new light would be thrown by the court martial upon the cause of the catastrophe. The cause was, to his own mind, perfectly clear. The ship was struck by a sudden and violent squall, and received what he might term a knock-down blow. She never recovered from that blow, but sunk at once. He was the more confirmed in this opinion from having seen several bodies recovered from the upper deck of the vessel, showing that they were thrown to leeward. The ropes and other gear had been thrown on the top of them, and they had not had time to extricate themselves before the vessel sank. He stated on a former occasion that he thought that in all probability, within three or four weeks' time, the *Eurydice* would be raised and towed into Portsmouth Harbour; and from what he had since seen he did not think that, had the weather been at all favourable, he had very much understated the time. But everything had been, as their Lordships knew, against the raising of that ship. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that the ship sank in 12 fathoms of water, in a strong tide way, with a very short period of slack water, the tide running from 3 to 5 knots an hour, with a period of slackwater of only 20 minutes; and it was only during that short period of slack water that diving operations could be carried on. In the second place, the weather had been most unusually stormy, and the whole of the operations had been interrupted in consequence. The result had been that the ship gradually worked herself into a dock, or hole, nearly 12 feet deep, and out of that hole she had to be lifted. She was lifted, and she was then brought into Sandown Bay by successive lifts—a distance of about 2½ miles—where it was intended that her ports should be securely closed. She would then have been pumped out, floated, and taken into Portsmouth Harbour. Everything was nearly ready for this operation. Two tides—and two tides only—would have been sufficient to complete the operation. But the same evil fate seemed to pursue the ship. A strong easterly wind sprang up, and so damaged the upper deck that it destroyed the preparations which had been made. The idea of pumping her out had to be abandoned, and it was decided that she should again be lifted and brought inside the Isle of Wight—a distance of about six miles from her former position, and where she now was. It had often been asked why she had been taken into so exposed a position as Sandown Bay at all? The answer was that it was absolutely necessary to move her into shoal water as quickly as possible, and Sandown Bay was the nearest and most convenient place. There was no reason to anticipate a gale of wind from the east at that time of the year; and, indeed, the records of weather, for the last three years at any rate—probably for a much longer period—had not led one to anticipate the weather that was then experienced. However, he was glad to add that all cause of further apprehension had ceased, she was now in a place of safety, and no further difficulties of that nature need be apprehended. Such was briefly an account of the recovery of that ship, and he could not altogether pass from this subject without alluding to the impression he had formed of the manner in which that result had been obtained; and that impression was formed, not from any hearsay evidence, but from repeated personal observations. He was present at the attempt made to lift her on the 2nd of last month; all was then going well, the ship was off the ground, when a strong breeze set in from the east, bringing with it a nasty sea that caused the lifting vessels to pitch heavily. The consequence was that an unequal strain was brought upon the hawsers, one of the toggles broke, and the attempt had to be abandoned. He was again present a fortnight later when the tides suited, the weather proved favourable, and the ship was lifted and placed upon a new bed. That was the crucial test. It was successful, and he was perfectly satisfied that he was right in saying that had the weather been favourable for the operations, that result would have been obtained long before. He had repeatedly been present since that day; but what had struck him most—more even than the great skill, both scientific and professional, that had undoubtedly been displayed—was the wonderful amount of energy shown, not only by Admiral Foley himself, but by every officer and man under his orders. The energy which had been displayed was, in his opinion, beyond praise. Difficulties that would have daunted most men only made them the more determined to succeed. Many—indeed, most—men would have been tempted to give up in despair, as time after time they were driven from their work by bad weather. Not less than 15 times they were forced to desist. Several times the whole of the vessels had to be brought into harbour for shelter, yet they were not discouraged, and their untiring efforts had been at last crowned with success. It had been, he could assure their Lordships, no child's play. To fully estimate and appreciate the work that had to be accomplished, the wreck should have been visited during the operations. There were no instances on record of similar results having been achieved under similar circumstances; and all must, he felt sure, rejoice at the success of those who had laboured so long and so determinedly to bring about that result.

## LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 190.)

(*The Lord President.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 5, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Power to local authorities to make orders as to hours during which locomotives may pass over roads).

Lord DENMAN moved an Amendment, of which Notice was given, to omit the words "during eight consecutive hours only." He felt sure that the authorities were most anxious to give every facility to the transit of steam engines, especially in an agricultural county, and that they might safely have discretionary power.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON said, that he gave his noble Friend every credit for proposing an Amendment which he thought would be a *boná fide* improvement of the Bill; but it was necessary that the words which he proposed to deal with should remain in the clause, because, on communicating with the road authorities, it was decided that there must be a certain portion of the day during which the locomotives must work upon the roads, and therefore it was absolutely necessary that power should be given to them to do so in this clause.

Lord DENMAN said, that it had recently been the custom to propose Amendments on the third reading which had been rejected in Committee, and he hoped the noble Duke would not think him disrespectful if he again proposed his Amendment at the next stage of the Bill.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that the words were precisely the same as those in the Highways Bill they had just passed, and that it would be very unadvisable to have the two systems in reference to highways.

LORD FORBES considered that the Amendment proposed by the noble Lord should not be pressed at so late a period of the Session, and he certainly thought that it would be desirable that the periods of time during which these engines were not permitted to work on the roads should be divided. He therefore thought that the limit of time during which they should not be allowed to work should be altered from eight consecutive hours within the 24 hours, to four hours in the earlier part of the day and four hours in the later part of the day. By adopting that principle, a really useful measure would be passed.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

## EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD TRAINING SHIPS.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

EARL FORTESCUE, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, What was the estimated cost of the purchase and fitting up of the ship bought by the London School Board; and the number and salaries of the staff employed in it; and what arrangements are proposed to be made about the meals of the boys to be trained on board? said, that with respect to the last portion of the Question, it was unnecessary to put it, because he had received the information he required since he had been in the House by a note which had been sent to him, and which stated that the arrangement made with respect to meals were satisfactory, and that proper precautions had been taken for the prevention of any contagious diseases spreading among the inmates of the ship. Of course, it would be a very serious thing if any such disease did break out, and it was obvious that measures should be taken to prevent it spreading, and to have the proper remedies immediately available in such case. His Question, therefore, would be confined to the cost of the vessel and the fittings.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in reply, said, that the first part of the Question, of which Notice had been given, was to ask the Government whether such a ship had been purchased, and what was the estimated cost? The Minutes of the London School Board, which had been forwarded to him that morning for the information of the Education Department of the Privy Council, stated that the Industrial School Ship *Shaftesbury*, formerly the ship *Nubia*, had been purchased by them. The first Vote was £12,000, and there was an additional Vote of £5,000 for the purchase and equipment of the vessel, and a further sum of £1,000 for the cost of dredging a place for the ship, and £569 to the Thames Conservancy Board for the expenses attending the mooring. The cost had been larger than was at first anticipated, because it was believed that the Admiralty would have been able to have given one of Her Majesty's ships for this purpose; but, unfortunately, they were not in a position to do so. The next Question was as to the number of staff employed on board the vessel, and those particulars were not known to the Home Office. It was a matter of discretion with the London School Board as to the number of boys which were to be placed on board a vessel and trained. If he recollected rightly, it was intended that the ship should provide accommodation, in the first instance, for 500 boys; but he believed that that number had been reduced.

LORD TRURO thought that £1,000 was a very large sum of money to be given for dredging a hole for mooring purposes. He thought that the ship might have been provided with convenient moorings at much less cost than that.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that the payment had been agreed on between the two Boards; but of course he was not able to state the details or the reasons on which that Estimate was framed.

Viscount SIDMOUTH, while admitting that the cost was very large, could not help expressing his opinion that if any one thing was more valuable than another in reference to the work of the School Board, it was the establishment of school ships, by means of which boys could be trained up in a manner which would be useful both to themselves and to the country. He should, therefore, be extremely sorry to hear any attack made upon them on the part of his noble Friend, or any doubt thrown upon the proceedings of the Board, because any reflection made upon experiments of this kind could not but be detrimental to the success of the experiment. For his own part, he thought that the employment of training ships would be most valuable.

## THE METROPOLITAN POLICE.

### QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord TRURO asked the permission of their Lordships, before they adjourned, to say a few words upon a topic which had been before them upon a previous occasion. They knew that Her Majesty's Government was a Conservative Government, and that it was not desirous of interfering with any of the old institutions of the country until their defects were clearly pointed out; but if they were clearly pointed out he had no doubt that they would take steps to remedy any existing evils. He alluded to the Metropolitan Police Force, and expressed himself gratified that as soon as Her Majesty's Government were satisfied that it was absolutely necessary to institute an inquiry into the Detective Department they had appointed a Committee for that purpose. He thought that would give great satisfaction to the country.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON rose to Order, observing that the noble Lord was pursuing an extremely irregular course, and he must say an unjust one, because he was about to discuss the regulations of the Metropolitan Police without having given any Notice. If the noble Lord wished to call attention to any of the conditions under which the Force now existed he ought to give Notice, and noble Lords would then be able to come down to that House and express their views either for or against the Motion. Although there was, undoubtedly, a great deal of license allowed in their Lordships' House, he put it to his noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack, whether the course which was being pursued by the noble Lord was one that could be permitted?

Lord TRURO disclaimed any intention of forcing on a discussion upon the subject to which he had alluded; but thought it was permissible, at the close of the Session, to any noble Lord to make suggestions that should be considered by the Committee that had been appointed to inquire into the subject. That was the object with which he rose. He did not propose to raise any discussion, but wished to throw out certain suggestions for the consideration of the Committee. If, however, he could not do that without a breach of the Rules of the House, in consequence of his having omitted to give Notice, he would do so before the end of the Session.

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

* * *

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday, 9th August, 1878.*

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [August 6, August 7, August 8] *reported.*

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee—Resolution* [August 8] *reported*—Consolidated Fund (£21,556,807 7*s.* 5*d.*).

Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-7—*Resolutions* [August 8] *reported.*

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading*— Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *.

*First Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance * [296].

*Second Reading*—Telegraphs [257]; Training Schools and Ships [48], *postponed.*

*Committee*—Inclosure Provisional Orders [192], *debate adjourned;* Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) (*re-comm.*) [130], *postponed;* Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote) [71], *postponed;* Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment [176], *debate adjourned.*

*Committee—Report*— Bishoprics [197]; Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) * [295].

*Considered as amended—Third Reading*—Education (Scotland) [292]; Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland) * [253]; Metropolitan Commons * [287], and *passed.*

*Third Reading*—Statute Law Revision * [263], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn*—Habitual Drunkards (*re-comm.*) * [250].

## *QUESTIONS.*

### SOUTH AFRICA—OUTBREAK OF THE NATIVE TRIBES—THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE.—QUESTIONS.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When the additional Estimate for the expense of the Kaffir War will be submitted to the House, and a Vote taken; also, from where the money which was spent last year and has not been voted this year has been obtained, and how it will be accounted for?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he could not undertake to lay the Estimate upon the Table until the Government had the information, which would not be in the course of the present Session. Certain drafts had been made upon the military chest which had been to a certain extent repaid. He did not know until the account should have been made up how much had actually been repaid, and how much it would be necessary to make provision for, in order to keep the military chest at a proper level. They would find that out when the account was completed. The Estimate of £400,000 in this year's Supplementary Estimates was, he believed, the outside Estimate.

### PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—BANKRUPTCY ACT (1869) AMENDMENT BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether (seeing that the Order for going into Committee on the "Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill" has been discharged), he sees any objection to the further progress, this Session, of the "Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment Bill;" and, if he sees such objection, whether he will be good enough to inform the House what course Her Majesty's Government propose to take next Session in reference to the amendment of the Law respecting bankruptcy?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): Sir, I think it would be objectionable to sanction the proceeding with the Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment Bill. This Bill contains, no doubt, many desirable alterations in the law; but it does not propose to deal with the subject of bankruptcy in the complete manner in which it is dealt with by the Bill introduced by the Government, which, though abandoned for the present, will be brought forward next Session. The Government Bill contains nearly all the amendments of the law proposed by the Bill of my hon. Friend, and also several others of great importance. It would seem to be a pity to resort to partial legislation this Session, which would necessarily have to be supplemented next. It is proposed to introduce the Government measure very early next Session. If many important alterations are suggested by hon. Members in the discussion upon the second reading, the best course will be to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. It will not be difficult in such Committee to decide upon the Amendments which ought to be adopted, and get the Report upon the Bill in ample time to pass it through Parliament during the Session.

### INDIA—MAHARAJAH HOLKAR.
### QUESTION.

MR. LEITH asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is the fact, as reported, that the Government of India have transferred or agreed to transfer, by way of gift or otherwise, to the Maharajah Holkar, of Indore, territory to the extent of upwards of three hundred square miles; whether a Commission of Inquiry, composed of Captain Wise, acting on behalf of the Bombay Government, and Major Cadell, acting on behalf of the Maharajah Holkar, had not previously decided that the latter had no title to the territory in question; whether such decision was not declared final by the Government of India; and, if such transfer has been made, or agreed to be made, whether the Government can state the reasons for making such transfer, and will lay upon the Table of the House any Correspondence or Despatches relating thereto?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Yes, Sir; the Government of India has ceded to the Maharajah Holkar about 350 square miles of territory. A boundary line between the territories of the Maharajah and Khandeish was traced in 1864, and his special appeal against the decision was rejected by the Secretary of State. Since that time the frontier has been in dispute, and has become a perpetual source of grievance. It is a tract of rough, unproductive, and unhealthy country, to which, however, the Maharajah attaches the greatest possible value. As an act of grace, therefore, the Indian Government has recommended, and the Secretary of State has sanctioned, this re-adjustment of the boundary line. This concession has been a source of peculiar gratification to the Maharajah. As these Papers contain references to personal feelings and circumstances, my noble Friend thinks it very undesirable that they should be published.

## LAW AND JUSTICE—HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—TAXING MASTERS' OFFICES.

### QUESTION.

SIR **HENRY JAMES** asked Mr. Attorney General, If his attention has been called to the many great inconveniences arising from the entire closing of the offices of the Taxing Masters of the High Court of Justice during the Long Vacation; and, whether the Government contemplate taking any steps to prevent the continuance of such inconveniences?

THE **ATTORNEY GENERAL** (Sir JOHN HOLKER), in reply, said, it was incorrect to say that the Taxing Masters' Offices were entirely closed during the Vacation, because one Taxing Master was always in attendance throughout the holidays, in order to take all business of a pressing character referred to him by the Courts. Whether, however, sufficient facilities were or were not afforded he had not been informed. Neither did he know whether there was any difference between the Chancery Division and the other Divisions; but he would make inquiries into the subject, and would give the matter his best consideration during the Recess.

## POST OFFICE—THE WEST INDIA MAIL CONTRACT.—QUESTION.

MR. **ANDERSON** asked the Postmaster General, If, seeing the West India Mail Contract does not come into operation till 1880 and it cannot now lie upon the Table for the stipulated period in this Session, he will postpone moving its ratification till the beginning of next Session, so as to give the House a sufficient opportunity of considering it?

LORD **JOHN MANNERS**, in reply, said, the Question was based upon a misapprehension. Under the Regulations of the House, it was required that every contract extending over a period of years for the conveyance of mails by steamers should be submitted to the House and be approved by Resolution of the House, and it was the intention of the Secretary to the Treasury to move early next week that the contract for the West India Mails should be sanctioned by the House.

## LAW AND JUSTICE — REPORTS OF DIVORCE AND CRIMINAL CASES.

### QUESTION.

MR. **E. HUBBARD** asked Mr. Attorney General, If he would take into his consideration the best means of restraining the publication of all evidence in divorce and criminal trials beyond the simple facts necessary to prove that justice is done?

THE **ATTORNEY GENERAL** (Sir JOHN HOLKER): Sir, it is very difficult to suggest any means of accomplishing the object of my hon. Friend without unduly interfering with the freedom of the Press and the liberty of the subject. Moreover, it is obvious that, in many instances, it will be impossible to enable the public to form a judgment whether a right conclusion has been arrived at without publishing full details of the evidence; and it seems to me that you will purify newspaper reports of trials at too great an expense if you deprive the public of the means of forming a conclusion as to whether justice is properly administered or not. The subject, however, is one of considerable importance, and I will give it careful consideration in the Recess.

## METROPOLIS—THE THAMES EMBANKMENT—THE NEW OPERA HOUSE.

### QUESTION.

MR. **WHITWELL** asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether the hoarding connected with the apparently discontinued New Opera House on the Embankment will soon be removed, as it has for a long time been an obstruction to the footpath?

Sir JAMES M'GAREL HOGG: Sir, in answer to the Question of the hon. Member, I beg to inform him that the time fixed for the final completion of the New Opera House is the 29th September next. Of course, it is hopeless to expect that it will be finished by then; but until that date it does not seem expedient to the Metropolitan Board to take any steps with regard to it. I will take care that the attention of the Board is directed to the matter, and I have already had notice given to Mr. Mapleson of the hon. Member's Question.

## MERCANTILE MARINE—THE STEAMSHIP "AUSTIN FRIARS."

### QUESTION.

Mr. MACDONALD asked the President of the Board of Trade, If he has as yet received any information of the steamship "Austin Friars" of London; and, whether it be correct that the crew were placed on short allowance of food seven days after leaving the port of Carwan?

Viscount SANDON: On receiving a letter from the hon. Member conveying a complaint respecting the food supplied to the crew of the *Austin Friars*, I directed the Registrar General of Seamen to report the arrival of the ship, in order that an inquiry might be made into the circumstances complained of. The vessel has not yet arrived, so that I am not yet in a position to give any information on the subject.

## PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—QUESTIONS.

Mr. ONSLOW: I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a point of Order. It will be in the recollection of the House that this morning the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill was, during the progress of a discussion on the question of fixing a day for taking the third reading, counted out. I wish to know in what position the Bill now stands—whether it is a dropped Order, and how it is to be placed at the Sitting to-morrow, should one be held? I also desire to know what precedent, if any, there is for the Government naming Saturday for private Members' Business, when no Government Business is to be taken on that day, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer so stated; and, further, if there be a Sitting on Saturday, whether Members in charge of private Bills can place those Bills in the order of precedence in which they appear in to-day's Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: The House was counted out last night on a Motion for fixing the day when the third reading of the Bill referred to by the hon. Gentleman was to be taken, and therefore that Bill became a dropped Order. That Order, however, can be revived if the House pleases. If, at the invitation of a Minister of the Crown, the House should think proper that there should be a Sitting to-morrow, it will be open to the hon. Member in charge of the Bill—or, indeed, to any hon. Member—to move to fix that Bill for to-morrow. The order in which such Bills would be taken would depend, according to the practice of the House, upon the pleasure of the Minister of the Crown, who moves that the House do sit to-morrow.

Mr. ONSLOW asked, whether there was any precedent for the Government naming Saturday for a private Member's Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not prepared, off-hand, to say whether there is any precedent for holding a Sitting on Saturday solely for the consideration of a Bill other than a Government Bill; but I can state that it is a very unusual course to have a Morning Sitting on Saturday, except for a Bill of urgent importance. The House, however, on the Motion of a Minister of the Crown, having appointed a Bill for consideration to-morrow, it will be open, as I have already said, to hon. Members to move to fix the third reading of the Bill in question for to-morrow.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: As the House is to meet to-morrow, I wish to know if it will be considered a Government Order day? If so, hon. Members should understand that Government Orders will have precedence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Undoubtedly so. If a Bill is appointed on the Motion of the Government for to-morrow, it will be open to any hon. Member having charge of a Bill to fix it for that day, and the order in which it is to be taken will be at the pleasure of the Minister of the Crown.

MR. H. SAMUELSON asked, when the second reading of the Appropriation Bill would take place?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that no Government measure had as yet been put down for Saturday. With respect to the measures still to be considered, allowance must be made for the very great difficulties the Government had to contend with, especially when the Session began to draw to a close, and particularly when promises had been made at the early part of the Session to take certain measures as first Orders of the Day. The time had come when the Government were compelled to make appeals to those to whom the promises had been made to release them from those promises. The Inclosure Bill had been postponed, as it had been found impossible to appoint a day on which it could be taken as first Order. The Government were not able to say when the Appropriation Bill would be read a second time. He believed it would be read a second time on Monday. At all events, it would be brought in to-day. It would not be taken to-morrow. He proposed to put the Exchequer Bonds Bill down for the Saturday Sitting; but whether any other Bill would be put down for that day by the Government he could not at present say.

## TELEGRAPHS BILL.

### QUESTION.

MR. J. COWEN wished to ask the Postmaster General a Question with respect to the Telegraphs Bill. That Bill contained a clause which proposed to monopolize for the Post Office all the telegraphic inventions now existing or in prospect. He understood that an arrangement had been made with the Telephone Company at a private meeting. He wished to know, Whether the clause to which he referred would be persisted in, or whether the privilege given to the Telephone Company would be extended to other telegraphic inventions?

LORD JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, he had already given Notice of his intention to move the omission of the 3rd clause, which was the one referred to, if the second reading of the Bill was agreed to.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## BISHOPRICS BILL.—[*Lords.*]—[BILL 197.]

(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

### COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [31st July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

And which Amendment was,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable, so long as the Episcopal Church continues to be established by law, to increase the number of Bishops,"—(*Mr. Joseph Cowen,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. HUTCHINSON said, he should most decidedly oppose the Bill. In the part of the country which he represented—Halifax—there was no demand for a new Bishop, and he believed it was much the same in other parts of the country. Indeed, by many persons a Bishop was regarded as a useless functionary. By one-half of the religious Press, to which clergymen principally contributed, the Bishops were regarded in that light, while by the other half they were considered to be positively mischievous. In Yorkshire the Dissenting Bodies had made provision for the spiritual wants of those whom the Church had neglected, and in some instances had assisted in the repairs of the fabrics; but their efforts in that respect received but scant recognition, and were sometimes even ignored by the clergy and dignitaries of the Established Church. At the fag-end of the Session, when there was little time to spare for important Business, the Government were pushing forward with unnecessary and almost unbecoming vehemence that measure, which hardly anybody wanted. There were many Churchmen who did not think that an increase of the Episcopate would be useful; and if any special legislation was required for the Church they should rather begin at the other end of the scale, and redress the gross injustice which was done to a section of the clergy, who were very much harder worked and very much underpaid than the Bishops. He asked whether the four dioceses which it was sought to divide by that Bill, were the only dioceses the Bishops of which were hard-worked, or whether that Bill was to be the beginning of the creation of Bishops Session after Session, which would open up by no means a cheerful prospect. The Bill was not needed for purely spiritual purposes, and still less for the sake of political influence of the Bishops. That legislation appeared to be part of the policy of making things pleasant to every interest which had been adopted by the Government ever since they had been in Office. The Established Church was to have its turn, and that Bill was presented as a kind of compensation or antidote for the Public Worship Regulation Act, which a few years ago gave considerable umbrage to certain sections of the clergy. That was a reactionary measure, because it was a piece of legislation contrary to the general drift of of public opinion, which was moving in another direction than that of the connection between the Church and the State; and with all respect to the right hon. Gentleman opposite he ventured to think that it would not be one of those measures which the country at large would approve.

Mr. SANDERSON said, that the remark of the hon. Member that Dissenters had subscribed towards the restoration of parish churches was quite correct, and this showed that there was no antagonism to the Church on the part of Dissenters. Especially was this the case in Yorkshire, where none had been shown to the Bishopric of Wakefield, and very little to that of Halifax. The Bishop of Ripon was known to be a hard-working Prelate, and one who had given no offence to the Dissenting Bodies, and he desired simply to be relieved of a portion of his work. It was to effect that desired end that a sum of £20,000 had already been raised in the district for the formation of a fresh diocese. The money had been obtained by voluntary means, and the position of Church and State not being altered by the Bill, he should vote for going into Committee. He trusted hon. Members would not further oppose the Bill.

Mr. DILLWYN denied that there was any desire either on the part of the public generally, or Churchmen in particular, for that Bill. He himself, as a member of the Church of England, would oppose the creation of more Bishops. Of course, in all parts there were people who wanted a new Bishop, but the feeling was by no means general. There was a Low Church Party and a High Church Party, who did not love each other much, and who had each their feelings in respect of the selection of Bishops. The public prints professing to represent the different sections of the Church gave utterance to diverse views. *The Record*, representing the Low Church, said Bishops were by no means popular, and that the present Blll would introduce a sacerdotal and Romanizing element into the Church. This showed that that Party were not very anxious for more Bishops. *The Church Times*, which represented the High Church, said the Bishops were not loved in the Church, nor respected by one party in the Church. In our day, they said, the Bishops had never laboured for the good of the Church, either in or out of Parliament. On these grounds he trusted the Government would not press the Bill at this late period of the Session. He deemed it a great mistake to suppose that the desire for more Bishops was by any means general. In the present state of dissension in the Church it surely was not wise to increase the number of the higher officers of that Establishment. It was fraught with danger to the public at large, and would not be conducive to the interests of the Church itself. He trusted, therefore, that his right hon. Friend would not pursue the Bishopric question to the bitter end, and so prolong the Session, as it would undoubtedly do.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he was surprised at the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), who considered himself a Churchman, doing everything in his power to injure the Church to which he professed to belong.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he had never desired to injure the Church; but the Church itself, and the connection between Church and State, were two very different things.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he was not quite sure that a man who proceeded on the lines which the hon.

Gentleman followed was not doing what in him lay to injure the Church in the great work which it was doing in this country. As for himself, he had opposed the Bill of the hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope), because he thought that so long as there was a connection between Church and State, which he hoped would long continue, any Bill affecting the Church should be brought in by a Minister of the Crown. He was not himself in favour of a great increase of Bishops; but as to the Bill before the House, it would only carry into effect that which his right hon. Friend said he would do. It should be borne in mind that Bishops were the heads of the Church, and that, originally, only a certain number were appointed; but since then the population had increased so enormously that their work had become more than double that which it was in former days. Nobody, he might add, could fairly say that the Bishops of the present day did not to the best of their ability perform the work which they were appointed to discharge. He regretted, however, that the Bill could not have been brought forward at an earlier period of the Session. If these four additional Bishops were made, he believed no more would be required for many years to come. It was very natural that the large towns should require to have more Bishops. It had been said that throughout the country there was indifference on this subject He was bound to admit that there was apathy and indifference; and he was exceedingly sorry to say that that apathy and indifference had been largely occasioned by practices within the Church which he, for one, could not too emphatically condemn, although they were, he rejoiced to think, diminishing. He had also read with the deepest pain and regret a judgment which was given on Thursday in a Court of Law; but he had also read —and with great satisfaction—the lucid, clear, and common-sense judgment of Mr. Justice Lush on the same occasion. In conclusion, he would express his hope that his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department, while bringing in a Bill to increase the number of Bishops, would take care to introduce any Amendments which experience might show to be required for the amendment of the Public Worship Regulation Act, which had been passed a year or two ago; because everything should, he thought, be done to put a stop to practices which were undermining a Church to which we owed so many blessings in the past. If it was necessary, amendments should be made, in order that there might be no doubt that the offenders against the law would be brought to justice.

MR. HOPWOOD trusted the Opposition would be as determined as were the supporters of the Bill. Why was this unhappy Church bound to come to such a sectarian Assembly as the House of Commons, in order to appoint its officers? If he did not protest on every opportunity against a State Church, he should not be doing his duty. If it was severed from the State he believed it would receive more popular support, and would be stronger than at present. If, instead of bringing in this Bill, those who supported it had proceeded to remedy glaring defects, they would have been much more usefully employed. The Public Worship Regulation Act, for example, required much re-consideration, as was shown by the upsetting of the dictum of the Ecclesiastical Courts by the Courts of Common Law. He suggested that the best way of proceeding in favour of the Church would have been to amend the Public Worship Regulation Act and the ceremony of *congé d'élire.* He could not but contrast the zeal of the Government in passing this Bill, about which nobody cared, and their neglect in not passing the Magistrates (Summary Jurisdiction) Bill. Had the latter Bill passed—and it would not have taken a third of the time to pass it that this Bill would have taken—30,000 persons last year, and 30,000 persons this, would not have been sent to gaol, and an amount of misery and corruption would have been prevented which it was shocking to contemplate. He was very sorry to see the Bill being pressed forward as it was.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR thought the general opinion among Churchmen and Dissenters alike was that the Bill was not wanted. With regard to what his constituents would say, he knew that if the matter were discussed in the workshops of Leicester, and it was asked—"What have our Representatives been doing on that Friday afternoon, the 9th August?" and the answer was, "Making more Bishops"—the statement would be received with a roar of inextinguishable laughter. He should vote against the Bill.

Mr. COURTNEY, in opposing the Bill, said, his experience led him to believe that the proposal to create new Bishoprics did not meet with anything like unanimous approval among the lay members of the Church of England themselves. It certainly did not at Cambridge, and he felt sure that any proposal to make it the See of a Bishop would meet with universal dissatisfaction. The new Bishopric of Truro had created in that neighbourhood anything but a feeling of enthusiasm; and a Cornish clergyman had informed him that they looked with regret upon the severance of the diocese from Exeter. He could not help thinking that a morbid activity among the Bishops had created a degeneracy among the parsons, who were continually running to their Bishops, like a child ran to its nurse, and their spiritual fathers, instead of teaching them to look after their own business, encouraged them in it. He felt sure that if the Bishops would stick to their business as in former days, there would be no necessity for increasing their number. It was true that the population in the dioceses had increased; but so had the means of communication between the cathedral cities and the most remote parts of the dioceses, so that a Bishop could now place himself in communication with any of his clergy in a much more rapid manner than he could when his diocese was less populous. Bishops were now making themselves as common in England as they were in the Colonies, till by-and-bye we should have no respect for them whatever. He objected to the creation of more Bishops for precisely the same reason as operated with him in disliking the disestablishment of the Church. The more Bishops they created, the more would the influence of the Bishops be increased, and it was an influence which he could not look upon with any favour. He also objected to the Bill on the ground that it would give the Ecclesiastical element too great a preponderance in the Church in the event of its being disestablished.

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG said, that if he had been of opinion that this Bill was not a wise one, his view with regard to it would have been altogether changed by what he had seen of the earnestness and the zeal of the Bishop of Truro, which had had the effect of improving the whole spiritual life of his district. The new cathedral would be a credit to the city of Truro and to the country. He protested against those who were members of the Church raising their voices against people putting their hands in their pockets to support the Church. £50,000 had already been subscribed towards the expense of building it, but £20,000 more was required; and he should be glad if the hon. Member for Liskeard would put his hand in his pocket and give a handsome sum towards the fund. He thought the Cornish clergyman alluded to by the hon. Member as objecting to the establishment of the diocese must indeed be a unique specimen of the order.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 75; Noes 38: Majority 37.—(Div. List, No. 255.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title); and Clause 2 (Public contribution to endowment fund), *agreed to*.

Clause 3 (Contribution to endowment fund from existing Bishopric).

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, in moving the omission of the clause, said, that his Amendment was one of a series placed upon the Paper with a view to a compromise. He had not the slightest objection to the principle of the Bill, and was willing that the Church itself should have as many new Bishops as it was willing to pay for. The Government had not shown any inclination to accept his Amendment, and he had therefore voted against the Bill. He strongly objected to the application of public funds to the creation of new Bishoprics, and the money would be wanted for other purposes by the Church, whether disestablished or not. He especially objected to one argument used by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, who defended the Bill on the principle of "pity the poor Bishops," saying that they were overworked, and that, in mercy and fairness, they ought to pass the Bill. He (Sir George Campbell) was affected by hearing of the amount of work which they had to get through; but he was also much struck by the fact that while it was proposed to relieve them of a large proportion of their work, they were to continue to receive the whole of their pay, with the exception of the small amount to be contributed towards the endowment of the new Bishoprics. This seemed to him an absolutely monstrous position to assume with regard to the Bishops. He was not aware that there had been any popular excitement, or wish expressed, in favour of the Bill; and, therefore, for the reasons he had given, he begged leave to move the omission of the clause. He trusted the Government would accept that Amendment, in order to prevent, at that period of the Session, the opposition which was threatened to the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be omitted from the Bill."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, with respect to a remark that had been made, to the effect that the Bishops were not only to lose a part of their duties, but to keep the whole of their salaries, he must remind the Committee that, although it was not thought proper formally to take away by the Act, from the Bishops concerned, a portion of their income for the support of the new Sees, they had always shown themselves ready to contribute considerable sums annually for that purpose. In one case the Bishop of St. Albans gave up £500 a-year, and the Bishop of Exeter gave up £800 a-year; while the Bishop of Winchester gave up £500 a-year, besides his house in London. These facts, at all events, showed that the Bishops recently appointed had not followed the course pointed out by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy. In the present instance, the Bishop of Durham had offered to give up £1,500 a-year, but that was not accepted, and he was to give up £1,000 annually. The monies derived from the various sources were all to be invested upon trust for the particular benefit of the respective dioceses.

MR. J. COWEN said, the objection taken to the clause by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) was a most substantial one, and had not been met by any sufficient explanation on the part of the Home Secretary. He (Mr. J. Cowen) repeated the argument, that the clause was a proposal to deal with public money to a considerable amount, and as such a proper subject for discussion.

MR. CHILDERS confessed that he should have preferred to see Church reform commenced at the opposite end—that was to say, not by the creation of fresh Bishops, much as they were wanted, but by getting rid of the anomalies existing in the Church with regard to livings and the stipends of the poorer clergy. But he thought the clause was valuable, for the very reason that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had objected to it—namely, that it embodied the principle of allowing the stipends of the clergy to be increased or diminished at its will by Parliament, which might hereafter be usefully applied on a larger scale in matters of Church reform. He was, therefore, in favour of the clause, and trusted the Amendment would not be pressed.

MR. E. JENKINS thought the objection to the clause which had been raised by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) was one that could not be met; and if hon. Members on the other side felt annoyed that objection should be taken to the disposal of national funds in the manner proposed by the Bill, hon. Members who opposed it could, of course, reply that they were simply exercising a right inherent in them, and one which was admitted by the Bill itself. They had no objection whatever that the laity of the Church of England, in conjunction with the Ecclesiastical authorities and clergy, should agree to the creation of new Bishops, provided that there was no attempt in doing so to deal with the existing funds of the Church, and provided that the funds required were obtained simply and solely by voluntary contribution. He ventured to suggest, with reference to the clause, a great improvement, and one which he thought the Home Secretary would be willing to accept. The wording of the clause was—

> "There shall be transferred to the endowment of any new bishopric mentioned in the schedule to this Act such portion of the endowment or income of the existing bishopric mentioned in the schedule to this Act in connection with that new bishopric, (which existing bishopric is in this Act referred to as a contributory bishopric,) as is in the said schedule in that behalf mentioned."

He would suggest that, instead of saying that the sum mentioned "shall be transferred to the endowment of any new Bishopric," they should take the latter words of the previous clause, and say—

> "There shall be transferred to the Governors of the Bounty of Queen Anne, for the benefit of the poorer clergy, such portion of the endowment or income of the existing Bishopric mentioned in the Schedule to this Act, &c."

He judged from the smile of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Assheton Cross) that the proposal was one with which he cordially agreed, and one upon which hon. Members opposite, who entertained strong views, would be willing to forego their objections for the benefit of the poorer clergy. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether his suggestion would not be better than the proposal to deal with the funds of the Bishoprics for the purpose of creating new Bishops? He ventured to move, after line 25, page 1, to insert a new clause, worded in accordance with his suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not in Order in proposing to amend the clause after the clause has been put to the Committee.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL would be extremely happy to withdraw his Amendment in favour of the proposal of the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) if the Government were willing to accept the latter Amendment. He had no doubt that the proposal would meet both his wish and that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), who was desirous to make provision for the poor clergy. He could not take the view of the right hon. Gentleman, however, because his proposal was to do evil in order that good might come; for, in effect, he said —"Let us submit to an iniquity, because the clause establishes the principle of dealing with public funds, which may be usefully applied hereafter." He (Sir George Campbell) held that beyond all doubt Parliament could deal with the Ecclesiastical funds. Far be it from him to suggest that the Bishops were not extremely respectable men; but unless the Government were willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for Dundee, he should be compelled to persevere in his opposition to the clause.

Mr. HOPWOOD was pleased to hear from so high an authority as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract that the clause went in a direction in which many hon. Members might like to go at a future period. From the instances of distinguished men who had already shown their willingness to give up a portion of their incomes for the purpose of carrying out the objects of the Bill, he had no doubt that those who had not yet done so would be ready to testify their assent by giving up the amount required by this clause. But that was not the point of the opposition which had been raised. The clause would always remain as evidence, to be referred to in case of need, that a Conservative Government had brought in this principle of dealing with the national funds. He considered that the income might be applied very properly to the removal of scandals existing within the Church fabric; and, surely, some of the funds could be devoted to these purposes, while the new Bishoprics might be allowed to depend on what, after all, was their great strength—the affections of those who desired to contribute towards them? He could not support the clause, which, in his opinion, would have the mischievous effect of considerably increasing the number of the Bishops, who, when disestablishment arrived, would make that appeal on behalf of vested interests which had been so powerful in the case of another Church.

Mr. COURTNEY pointed out that the principle of dealing with Ecclesiastical funds had long since been sanctioned, and that the whole organization of the Ecclesiastical Commission depended upon it, the Commissioners having to take in hand the endowments of Bishoprics and distribute the funds, after paying certain stipends to the Bishops, among the inferior clergy. He would rather have to deal with six Bishops having £5,000 a year each, than with 10 Bishops having £3,000 a-year. He did not want an increased number of Bishops, but a better article; or, in other words, better work in exchange for better pay. He objected to the principle of applying a portion of the endowments of the present Bishoprics to the multiplication of Bishops, and should support the Amendment.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, as he could not at the present moment move his Amendment, he should do so on Report.

He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to strike out the clause. If all was true that they had heard from hon. Members opposite, there was in the Church of England sufficient wealth, vitality, and vigour to induce it to provide whatever money might be necessary for the endowment of the new Bishoprics. On the other hand, if the Bishops had any money to spare, if they could part with a considerable portion of their incomes without being seriously affected by so doing, one could not help feeling that the money could be applied to much more useful purposes than the creation of more Ecclesiastics. There existed in the Church a very strong feeling with regard to the manner in which the present Ecclesiastics did their duty. It had been shown, by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), that there was not a shadow of doubt that the way in which the existing Bishops discharged their duties did not meet with general approval. The truth of the matter was, that the only opportunity possessed by the laity of taking a proper part in Church matters was in such discussion as they could have through their Representatives on the floor of the House. It was in that House only that the layman could have any influence upon the affairs of the Church; and he exhorted all present to exert their influence on that part of the Bill which dealt with the Ecclesiastical funds. The opportunity of doing so was a rare one. There was in the Church of England no such thing to be met with as what was often found in other Church organizations—namely, the proper representation of the laity in Church affairs. And the truth was, that doctrines were laid down, and were being supported by laymen—who ought to have been willing to stand by the old principles for which their fathers fought —that no one should attempt to interfere with Church concerns; that the Church consisted of Bishops and clergy only; and that laymen were simply to receive from them sermons, and to become the servants of the great sacerdotal class. While such doctrines were held in the Church the Committee, he thought, ought to hesitate before creating new Bishops, who might be instrumental in promulgating them. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would agree to the omission of the clause, and throw the whole scheme back upon the offerings of the laity of the proposed dioceses. That would be the best proof of the desire of the laity for new Bishoprics. If it was true that they were so anxious to have additional Bishoprics, he would say let them ask for them and pay for them. The evidence upon all hands, however, was that the laity looked upon this Bill with suspicion. That was also the feelings of some hon. Members opposite, who had spoken to him about the Bill, and who, if he mistook not, absented themselves from the divisions upon it because they could not support it. Once more he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to consent to this clause being struck out, and so allow the Bill to pass. If the clause was retained, he should feel it his duty to oppose the Bill by every means in his power.

MR. CHILDERS said, he did not wish to continue the discussion on the point whether this was on all fours with the original substitution of fixed stipends for uncertain emoluments in the case of the Bishops. His reason for rising again was to point out to his hon. Friends that if the clause was left out *simpliciter*, the only effect would be to leave the Bishops of Chester, Lincoln, Lichfield, and Ripon in possession of their present salaries with much less work to do, which he did not suppose was the object in view. He would suggest, therefore, that the clause should not be struck out.

MR. HOPWOOD observed, that the difficulty pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman was not insuperable, as the money might be dealt with by subsequent Amendments, and be applied to the increase of stipends, the reward of meritorious services, and so forth.

Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 80; Noes 28: Majority 52.—(Div. List, No. 256.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Establishment of Bishopric on provision of sufficient endowment).

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, line 9, to leave out "three," and insert "one." The proposal of the Bill, he observed, was to fix the salary of a Bishop at a minimum—£3,500 a-year. The Government, in other words, seemed to consider a Bishop an institution of so dignified a character that he could not exist on less than £3,500 a-year. Now, that was not his (Sir George Campbell's) view at all. He thought that if they wanted to get a certain amount of Episcopal work done they ought to go into the Bishop market, and ascertain at what price they could get a man to do it efficiently and trustworthily. Why should Bishops necessarily be few and dignified? He, for his part, was in favour of having many Bishops and of getting them as cheap as possible. As a Presbyterian, he was not prepared to admit that the Apostles were Bishops at all; but admitting that they were, he was quite sure they did not receive anything like £3,500 a-year. There was no country in the world where Bishops were so highly paid as in England; yet the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church abroad were not usually supposed to be wanting in dignity. Instead of £3,500, it seemed to him that a minimum salary of £1,500 would be ample under the Bill. There were many excellent and well-qualified clergymen who would be very glad indeed to become Bishops on those terms. He begged, accordingly, to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice—that was to say, to reduce the minimum salary of the Bishops to be appointed under the Bill from £3,500 to £1,500 a-year.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 9, to leave out the word "three," in order to insert the word "one."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. HOPWOOD quite agreed with his hon. Friend (Sir George Campbell) that the virtue of a Bishop did not consist in his salary being £3,500 a-year. He believed there were many excellent Suffragan Bishops who did their work admirably for much less—perhaps only one-third of that sum. In a letter to *The Times*, many years ago, a member of the Church of England pointed out how much religion suffered from the fine linen and purple of the Prelates of the day, and suggested that Parliament should create a certain number of what he called "gig Bishops"—that was to say, Bishops who, instead of keeping carriages, would drive about in gigs like travellers on business. The proposal of the writer had this bearing on the question now under discussion—that it seemed to point to the possibility of obtaining men of capacity, of goodness, and of true religious feeling, to do the work of Bishops at a less figure than £3,500 a-year. For that reason, he felt inclined to support the Amendment of his hon. Friend.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS reminded the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) that they were living in the England of the present day, and that a great deal had to come out of the pockets of the Bishops, besides what was necessary for their own maintenance. They entertained the clergy, and contributed largely to good works in their dioceses, and had to attend in their places in the other House of Parliament. Having regard to all these circumstances, he did not think it practical to give them less than was proposed in the Bill.

Mr. E. JENKINS, having an Amendment on the Paper to reduce the minimum salary of the Bishops to £2,500 a-year, which he would probably move, in the event of his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) being defeated, explained that it would be proposed later on to relieve the new Bishops from the duty of sitting in the House of Lords—a duty which not a few very sincere members of the Church of England thought they ought not to have. There might be no objection raised to existing Bishops retaining in the House of Lords the seats which they had inherited from ancient times—at all events, no objection until the revolutionary feeling had taken greater hold of the country; but it was a very wrong thing, indeed, to invite new Bishops to leave their dioceses, where it was said there was so much work for them, and come up to spend the season in London, wasting their hours in the Athenæum Club, and worrying his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). But, said the right hon. Gentleman opposite, Bishops had to spend a great deal of money in entertaining their clergy. Well, he would ask the Committee whether they remembered a certain Bishop who, in an epistle to some people amongst whom he had been working with great success, remarked that amongst them he had received nothing, and that he had been obliged to work with his own hands to maintain himself in his diocese? He was not aware whether certain hon. Members opposite were prepared to disapprove the manner in which that great Bishop, the Apostle Paul, carried out his work; but he thought it right to point out, in passing, that the Bishops of the present day had not succeeded to the spirit, if they had succeeded to the position, of the ancient Apostles. As for the entertainment which the Bishops offered to their clergy, he begged to call the attention of the Committee to a pamphlet, written, he believed, by a clergyman, complaining that in a particular parish, not in remote parts of Cornwall or Cumberland, but between two market towns and railway stations, no Bishop or Archdeacon had been known to set his foot since the consecration of the church, sometime in the reign of William the Conqueror. From this it would appear that there were Bishops who, at all events, did not travel over the whole of their dioceses. The writer also referred to the fact that Bishops wasted their time in London. He said they ought to live amongst the clergy; and that if they did so they would discover many a gem which now sparkled unseen, while men who had no other qualification than that of going gadding about the country, speaking here and there, were promoted by their Bishop, always supposing the latter had no relative, or son, more worthy. These sentiments might offend hon. Gentlemen opposite; but he begged them to observe that they were not his, but those of earnest reformers within the Church itself, anxious to see the Church made a really spiritual institution. A Bishop ought not to be able to absent himself from work, on the plea that he had to attend Parliament. When required to take part in any particular debate, said the writer already quoted, he could easily attend in these railway days. London, it was added, was not the place for an idle man, whether priest or layman. Well, he (Mr. E. Jenkins) ventured to point out that a Bishop had no right whatever to be an idle man, and that they should not give him a salary which would tempt him to be so. He, himself, would have the greatest difficulty in spending £3,500 a-year, except by indulging in an amount of state which certainly ought not to be expected of a Bishop. Why the right hon. Gentleman should imagine it necessary for Bishops—especially when he knew that temperance was spreading in their ranks —to give luxurious entertainment to the clergy, he confessed he could not conceive. Nothing could more seriously tend to diminish the respect due to a Bishop for his spiritual functions than the idea that he was a Lord of Parliament with a large salary, driving his carriage, and living like a well-to-do Peer rather than a simple servant of Christ. £600, £800, or £1,000 a-year, was quite enough to maintain a Bishop who simply wished to do his duty, and not to make a show and take his part in the legislation of the State. He hoped the Bishops of this Bill would be model Bishops, who would help to save the Church from destruction, and with that view he trusted the Amendment of his hon. Friend would be adopted.

MR. J. COWEN, in support of the Amendment, said, that in Roman Catholic countries the Roman Catholic Church was respected and trusted by the people, although its Bishops were not paid in anything like the same proportion as those of the Church of England. Indeed, he believed that one reason why the Church of England had so small a hold on the people was, that between its high functionaries and the people there existed so great a gulf. No Church in modern times had received stronger popular support than the Free Church of Scotland, yet the ministers of that Church had only an average income of £300 a-year and their manses. With the examples of the Roman Catholic Church and the Free Church of Scotland before his eyes, he could not help thinking that the excessive payment proposed to be given to these new Bishops would tend to diminish rather than increase their influence.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 71; Noes 22: Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 257.)

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that his remaining Amendments upon this clause were consequential upon that which had just been negatived, and therefore he did not intend to press them upon the Committee.

Mr. E. JENKINS moved, in page 2, line 18, after the word "Commissioners," to insert the following words:—

> "When it shall have been certified to Her Majesty's Secretary of State by the archbishop of the province in which the intended bishopric is situated, that a majority of the clergy and parishioners, within the area comprised in either of the proposed dioceses in the Schedules of this Act respectively, have applied for separation from their existing dioceses, and are desirous of the founding of a new bishopric within and over such area."

This Amendment contained a very important principle, and he did not see why the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, after what he had said with reference to the desirability of consulting the views of the members of the Church of England upon this subject, should object to accept it. It would be seen, on looking at the terms of the Amendment, that its object was to ascertain, first of all, from those people who would be most interested in these proposed changes, whether or not they really desired them to be made. As he could not see any reason for objecting to the Amendment, he should not advance all the arguments he might use in its support, because perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary intended to adopt it. At all events, he should leave the matter where it stood for the present; and he would be content to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it would not be possible to insert in the Bill some words which would make it sure that those people who did not wish to be Bishoped upon might have an opportunity of expressing their dissent from the proposed change before it was carried into effect? He should, therefore, now merely move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, that in seconding the Amendment, he wished to say a few words in favour of the view of the hon. Member who had moved it. In Clause 3, which had just been agreed to, Her Majesty's Government had shown an anxiety to protect the rights of the property which was to be dealt with under the provisions of the Bill, and the clause was drawn so as to protect the rights of all persons interested. That was just what the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) proposed by his Amendment to do with regard to the feelings, in place of the purses, of those interested in these changes—persons having spiritual souls—which were to be dealt with under the terms of this Bill. In dealing with livings, souls were bought at so much per head. He would refer those hon. Members, who differed from him upon this point, to a series of letters touching upon this subject which had recently been published; and he had the authority of their author for saying that there was a good deal in the connection between Church and State which treated souls as a commodity which could be bought and sold. This Amendment was proposed in order to prevent souls being disposed of under the provisions of this Bill, without the individuals being consulted on the matter, and its language was intended to form some guarantee that those who, by affection and love for their diocese, and for its historical antecedents, were not desirous of being spiritually separated from it, should be enabled to express their view on the subject, and their desire to remain under the spiritual guidance and the fostering care of the Bishop who had hitherto watched over them. That such a desire on the part of those who resided in a diocese was not a mere visionary one, had been shown by what had occurred when the Bishopric of Winchester was divided. A considerable amount of feeling had been evoked on that occasion on the part of those who were transferred to the new diocese without their having been consulted on the matter. The people living on the other side of the water felt that a very heavy grievance had been inflicted upon them by the Act of Parliament. If he might judge by what had passed at public meetings about the time, and what had appeared in the public prints, a very large number of the persons so dealt with had remonstrated strongly against what had been done. He must enter his protest against this arbitrary mode of dealing with the religious attachments of people to any particular See, or to a cathedral, and he should support the Amendment with his vote if necessary.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 18, after the word "Commissioners," to insert the words—

> "When it shall have been certified to Her Majesty's Secretary of State by the archbishop

of the province in which the intended bishopric is situated, that a majority of the clergy and parishioners, within the area comprised in either of the proposed dioceses in the Schedules of this Act respectively, have applied for separation from their existing dioceses, and are desirous of the founding of a new bishopric within and over such area."—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he could not assent to the proposed Amendment, which, in his opinion, would be unworkable, there being no machinery in existence by which it could be carried into practical effect. There was no more reason for consulting parishioners on this subject than for consulting them in reference to the formation of a new parish or district. The parishioners had no vested right in their Bishop, who might be removed by the Queen without their assent. What happened at the division of the See of Winchester was that the people of Surrey manifested great anxiety to secure a Bishop for that county; but there were reasons which made it absolutely impossible to gratify the wish. He sincerely hoped the Committee would not adopt the hon. and learned Gentleman's Amendment.

MR. E. JENKINS said, that the way in which the right hon. Gentleman had answered his remarks showed how great was the necessity for adopting his Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted, and indeed had founded his main argument upon, the fact that Her Majesty had the power to appoint and to remove Bishops without the assent of the people of the diocese.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, that what he did say was that the Queen had power to remove a Bishop from a particular diocese without consulting the parishioners.

MR. E. JENKINS said, that was precisely the same thing that he had asserted—namely, that the people of a diocese had, under the existing law, no power to enforce their objection to the removal of their Bishop. In the original constitution of the Christian Church Kings and Queens had no power to remove any of the Ecclesiastical officers, and it was an extraordinary thing that the Committee should be asked to give its assent at the present day to principles so Erastian as those contained in this Bill, and which were opposed to common sense. It was true, as the right hon. Gentleman had stated, that parishes were constantly being divided without the consent of the parishioners being obtained; but that was exactly what he complained of. Were the higher clergy and the State so intimately connected that the rights of the lower clergy and the laity were to be wholly ignored? They had been told that this Bill was to be passed for the benefit of the laity; but he had yet to learn that any man had a right to force a benefit down his throat. If he were content with things as they were, why should some new Bishop be forced into the diocese in which he lived whether he liked it or not. The more hon. Members opposite explained what was the exact nature of their views in forcing this Bill through the House the more would the country see what it was intended to effect, and what were the consequences that flowed from this connection between Church and State. Hon. Members opposite had indulged in a very cheap sneer at those who opposed that Bill, and he was sorry that the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex should have resorted to it. The hon. and gallant Member seemed to hint that the hon. Member below him (Mr. Dillwyn) was not a very trustworthy member of the Church of England. The hon. Member held very Liberal opinions, and his Christianity was far purer than that which rested upon Episcopacy and Erastianism. The Church of the hon. Member was not composed of the Bishops and clergy merely, but of the laity, the Bishops and clergy being merely the ministers to the laity of God's truth. It was this distinction between the principles of the two Churches that was raised by this Amendment. The Committee were asked to consider whether they were prepared to force down the spiritual throats of the people the spiritual superintendence of an exclusively Episcopalian character. He did not think that Parliament ought to sanction such a course as that being taken. Some hon. Members knew well enough what were the spiritual aspects of this question. He did not think that this was a question which could well be discussed in that House with anything like decency or propriety; because in countenancing that discussion the Committee would be exercising a sort of spiritual jurisdiction over the affairs of the Church. It was said that the Queen, the Lords, and the Commons were going to create new dioceses; but could anything be more monstrous than that in a State like this Parliament should be asked to create new Bishoprics in the Church of Christ? Was this what hon. Members opposite, who professed to be sincere Churchmen, and upheld the strictest doctrines of the Church, and supported the authority of a sacerdotal class, and believed in the efficacy of Apostolic succession, ought to approve? Ought they to admit the right of the Queen, of a number of Lords, and of the House containing, as it did, Members of the High and of the Low Church, and Jews, Turks, and Infidels, to interfere in purely Ecclesiastical matters? ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members did not appear to assent to his view—that the House contained Jews, Turks, and Infidels; but a large number of hon. Members might well be called Turks, because they had been very anxious to carry out a Turkish policy in this country. He intended to press this Amendment to a division, because he believed that it involved a great principle. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that it would be difficult to devise adequate machinery for ascertaining the views of the parishioners on the question of the proposed sub-division of their diocese; but he did not think that that difficulty was by any means insuperable. He presumed that the first difficulty would be to ascertain who were and who were not the laity of the Church of England. That was a very important matter; because Mr. Matthew Arnold, who was a very sincere Churchman, had declared that every single citizen of this country was a member of the Church of England. If that were so, there would be no difficulty in ascertaining the feeling of the laity of any particular parish on the question whether or not another Bishop was required. On the other hand, however, it might be contended that the general body of the laity were spiritually disabled from taking part in the question, and that only those who were communicants of the Church of England were entitled to have a voice in the matter. That, no doubt, was a difficulty; but it was one that ought to be faced, because it showed the anomalous character of this Bill. But supposing even that it was admitted that only communicants of the Church of England were to be allowed to determine the question, there could be no difficulty in finding out who they were, and the clergy of each parish might hold a poll in the parish church, and make a return to the Archbishop, setting forth what the opinion of their parishioners on the subject was. No inconvenience would result from postponing this Bill until next year, to enable the right hon. Gentleman to draw up some scheme of the kind. There was no hurry in the matter, because these counties appeared to have got on very well under the existing state of things, and their spiritual condition did not seem to have deteriorated in consequence of the want of this additional Bishop. He felt that there was something almost like indecent haste in the way in which the Government were endeavouring to force forward this Bill, at the fag-end of a weary Session, and that there was something behind all this which had not come to light. In these circumstances, therefore, he should certainly press his Amendment to a division.

MR. J. COWEN supported the Amendment, because he thought that it would simply give the laity an opportunity of expressing their opinion as to which King they should wish to reign over them. That was a principle which had been generally accepted, not only in this country, but throughout Europe. They were going to allow Bulgaria to elect her own Prince, and when a Province had been annexed to France some years ago the same principle was allowed to prevail, and the consent of the people was obtained before the annexation was assented to. The House of Commons and Her Majesty's Government had also acted upon that principle, in the Session of 1875, in passing the Bill which gave to the Scotch people the power of appointing their own ministers. It would be a most wise and judicious course to pursue to give the lay members of the Church of England a voice in this matter of the division of their dioceses, and thus to apply to the Church of England the same principle which had been applied to that of Scotland. Under the Bill the spiritual connection between Northumberland and Durham would be severed, without the people of either county being asked to give their consent to that step being taken, and thus a connection would be dissolved which they had every desire to perpetuate. He submitted that the principle of the Amendment was one that had been recognized by Europe in modern politics, and by the House of Commons and the Government in the Bill about the Scotch Church, and that, therefore, it should be acted upon in the present measure.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 19; Noes 71: Majority 52. — (Div. List, No. 258.)

Mr. HOPWOOD moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, to leave out from "If," in line 33, to "And," in line 36, remarking that the Bishop's house was very often called a palace, and therefore the idea got abroad that it was necessary to have a larger establishment and a grander house than he thought should be tolerated, if Parliament was to retain any control over a State Church. He observed that the clause, as it stood, made mention of a "fitting Episcopal residence;" but no mention was made of stables. When the See of Ripon was erected, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners sanctioned an expenditure of as much as £10,000 on stables for the use of the Bishop. Without intending any disrespect to the present Ecclesiastical Commissioners, he ventured to say that that was a most extravagant expenditure. In the clause now before the Committee, those who desired the erection of the new dioceses were called upon to provide a "fitting Episcopal residence" to the satisfaction of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and a large scope was thus left to the Commissioners, who might think nothing was fitting unless it was a really grand place. The sum put down as the required value of the residence was £500 a-year, and it seemed to him that that was an enormous sum for a house in the country. As he understood it, a residence was to be provided the value of which was to be reckoned at £500 a-year. This operated in a vicious way for the Church, giving people the idea that nobody could preside over the administration of its doctrines and work without he lived in a very grand place, and was supported in very grand style.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had put a wrong construction on the words. Their object was to diminish the amount of contribution which might be necessary on the formation of the new see. A fitting house was to be provided, and the object of these words was that if it was so provided, its value should be taken at £500 a-year, even though it might not be worth so much. There was not the slightest intention of providing "palaces" or anything of the kind; and he was quite sure that, in the present mind of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the hon. and learned Member need not disturb himself on that point. It was felt that there would be some difficulty in assessing the value of the house which was provided, and therefore it had been thought best to take its value at the fixed sum of £500 a-year. As to the necessity of providing a "fitting Episcopal residence," it was thought that it was best to require that before the erection of the see, as otherwise a Bishop might find it very inconvenient to find such a house as he might require.

Mr. J. COWEN thought this was hardly a straightforward way of doing business. If the value of the house was taken at £500 a-year, the Bishop's salary would only be £3,000, and yet the house might not be worth more than £100 a-year.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was quite willing to trust the Ecclesiastical Commissioners on the point.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, it struck him that if a house could be found for £300 a-year, the Bishop would be discontented to have his salary "docked" to the extent of £500.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (The number of bishops sitting in Parliament not to be increased).

Mr. J. COWEN (for Mr. Rylands) moved, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 15, after "Act," to leave out to end of clause. The object of this Amendment, he said, was to prevent the Bishops created by the Bill from having seats in the House of Lords. He did not hope that any number of new arguments or facts adduced on his own side of the House would have the effect of converting the Government or hon. Members opposite. It was quite clear that the Government had bound themselves to pass the Bill, and that being the case at that period of the Session, there was no likelihood of its being altered, because any Amendment that might be made would go up to the House of Lords too late to admit of their re-consideration by the House of Commons. He did not hope, therefore, to induce the House to accept the Amendment; but he desired that those who agreed with him should have the opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the principle involved. After the Reformed Parliament met in 1833, a Bill was introduced year after year by the late Mr. Rippon, then Member for Gateshead, with whom it was his (Mr. Cowen's) pleasure to be acquainted, having for its object the removal of the Bishops from the House of Lords. Mr. Rippon got very little countenance from the Whigs of that day; but he (Mr. Cowen) observed that it elicited very little explanation of the reasons why they should continue to sit there, and the only justification which Lord Allthorpe could offer was that they were there for the purpose of defending and upholding the interests of the Church. He believed that was the case now, because the Bishops only attended the House of Lords when some attack was to be made on the Church; they took no special interest in the general legislation of the country, and if they did, their vote was always given for re-action, or in opposition to political, social, and commercial progress. He was not saying this in a Party sense; for he was well aware that some measures proposed by Conservatives were liberal, and others proposed by Liberals were in their effect illiberal —he spoke in the broad sense applicable to Liberal principles — and in regard to these, the Representatives of the Church of England in the upper branch of the Legislature had invariably been the defenders of taxing the bread of the people, and of refusing to grant the liberties to the people which this House had agreed should be given. They voted against Free Trade, in favour of Slavery, and against a Reformed Parliament. That had been the universal policy of their votes. They were, however, very active when the interests of the Church of England were concerned; but when the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland came under consideration, anything more cowardly than the conduct of the Archbishops of England could not well be conceived. He did not imagine that anything he could say would convince the Home Secretary, and he simply moved the Amendment of the hon. Member for Burnley for the purpose of recording the opinion on his side of the House against the continuance of this clerical legislation.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "Act," in page 3, line 15, to the end of the Clause. —(*Mr. Joseph Cowen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. CHARLEY said, the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen), was generally so fair that he felt sorry to find that whenever the Bishops were mentioned he always flew into a passion. The hon. Member had made the extraordinary statement that the Bishops were always opposed to legislation which favoured the freedom of the people; he had said they voted in favour of Slavery; but he (Mr. Charley) would remind the Committee that they had voted against White Slavery — the slavery of women and children in mines—at a time when the Radical Party were upholding that system. This was an historical fact, which could be proved by reference to *Hansard.* The hon. Gentleman had referred to the conduct of the two English Archbishops in walking out of the House when a division was called in the House of Lords on the Irish Church Bill; but it ought to be remembered that those two Archbishops were Whigs; if they had been Conservatives, he was quite certain they would not have done so. There were reasons why the Bishops should sit in the House of Lords. It was of enormous advantage both to the clergy and laity, because it made the Bishops amenable to public opinion. The Bishops exercised extensive authority. In their seats in the House of Lords they could be questioned in the same way as a Secretary of State; it was of the greatest importance that they should not be allowed to hide themselves away in their dioceses, but be made amenable to public opinion. There was strong ground for retaining the Bishops in the House of Lords, and he thought it was unfortunate that the Bill made no provision for an increase in their number. It was undesirable that the stereotyped number of 26 should be retained for all time. Before the Reformation, the number of Lords Spiritual greatly exceeded the number of Lay Peers, and he could see no reason why the number of Bishops sitting in the Upper House should not be raised to the number at which it stood before the passing of the Irish Church Act. Why should not the four seats then lost to the Church be now restored? He objected to the adoption of the principle that the number of the Bishops should not be increased. The effect of the clause as it stood was that the junior Bishops who were in the prime of life could not sit in the House of Lords; while the older members of the Episcopate, who might from age and infirmity be not so well able to perform their legislative functions, retained their places.

Mr. E. JENKINS thought the argument advanced by his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Charley) was a convincing proof that there were political dissensions among Bishops. He desired to call attention to the fact, as demonstrated by his hon. and learned Friend, that Bishops could possibly have their views operated upon by political considerations. There could be no doubt whatever that those Ecclesiastics who sat in the House of Lords guided their conduct just as they had been appointed by this or that Minister of the day. He could conceive nothing more disgraceful, or nothing more dishonouring to the Church of Christ, than such a state of things; and he protested against the House, by this Act, once more registering the degradation of the Christian Bishopric. Questions of money they might get over; questions whether these Bishops were to ride in carriages and to live in handsome palaces might be looked upon as trifling by the side of the consideration, whether or not the Church of England was entitled to stand up as a Spiritual Church, with a Head which was the Head of the State, and governed by Bishops who were appointed as the political representatives of those who happened to sit on the front Benches of that House, or of the House of Lords? This led to an organized system of Erastianism. He would ask the House whether it was any longer possible to maintain such an absolute anomaly, which was un-Christian in its conception, and which, in its working, tended to degrade the Christian Church in the eyes of the people? It was not any Party feeling or jealousy of the Church which had prompted these observations; but a conviction, on his part, that a Church which was governed by political functionaries thus appointed could not do its spiritual duty either to the State or the people. These observations had been called forth by the remarks of his hon. and learned Friend opposite, that the Archbishops walked out of the House of Lords when a division was called on the Irish Church Bill because they were Whigs. Then his hon. and learned Friend had said that one reason why the Bishops should remain in the House of Lords was in order that they might be amenable to public opinion. But hon. Members on the other side of the House objected to the introduction into this discussion of the views of men who were not members of the Church; therefore, what became of his argument? What formed public opinion? No one would admit sooner than his hon. and learned Friend that public opinion was only half formed by the Churchmen of this country; to an enormous extent it was influenced by those who were Dissenters and protesters against the Church in its political aspect. Did his hon. and learned Friend mean that the Bishops of the Church of England, who put forward large claims of sanctity and of Apostolical succession, should be made amenable to the opinions of all the Atheists and Nonconformists of the country? The position of a Bishop, then, had come to this—that he was asked to sit in the House of Lords in order that he might be made amenable to public opinion. But he wished further to point out that attendance of the Bishops in the House of Lords absolutely precluded them from doing their duty. If there was any good reason why a Bishop should sit in the House of Lords, he ought to exercise his judgment on every question which came before the House, in the same way as other Peers did, and be prepared, at the same time, to bring his influence to bear upon the legislation of the country. But he was saying that they did not do their duty, and he could show the Committee that Bishop after Bishop had failed to put in force those powers which had been placed in his hands by the Public Worship Regulation Bill. They found that in all legislation that would really go to the root of the reformation of the Church, the Bishops were afraid to touch it, because they feared they would have the Church about their ears. He could understand a Bishop saying—"Let right be done, though the Church come about our ears;" or, in the words of the Latin proverb—"*Fiat justitia; ruat cœlum.*" But it was the reverse. If one Bishop tried to lay his hands on that monstrosity, the sale of livings, none of the others were willing to help him; and with regard to those Acts which it was necessary to pass in order to stop the illegalities and want of discipline in the Church among the clergy, he was bound to say that they would have the greatest difficulty in inducing anything like a proper number of Bishops to unite in introducing and carrying that healthy legislation, and they knew that the reason of that was that they were tainted with the very principles that they were asked to excise and exclude from the Church. There were other arguments which could be used; but he preferred letting people see that they on his side of the House were simply weighed down by a mechanical majority. He preferred that the country should mark the method in which that legislation had been brought in. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to read that article in the leading journal of that morning, if he wanted to get a significant idea of what the opinion of the country was. They, taking their stand upon principles which they believed to be true and right, must leave it to posterity to judge of their actions.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he did not question the right of any hon. Member to interfere in the debates in that House in every possible way. He had not the slightest objection to it. But he did not think that, at the present moment he ought to follow the Mover of the Amendment into the question of whether the Bishops ought to have seats in the House of Lords or not. That was not the question before the House; but he promised that he would be prepared to meet the hon. Member upon the point whenever the proper opportunity should arise. The simple question now was, what was to become of these four Bishops? Were they to be admitted to the House of Lords, in addition to the number already there? To that he must confess that he did not think they should. He thought that the number of Bishops in the House of Lords ought not to be increased for some time at least. They had settled that practically in the Manchester see, and that precedent had been followed in the case of St. Alban's and Truro. They were only following the same precedent now. Well, that disposed of that part of the question. Then, on the other hand, were they to be shut out of Parliament altogether? Were they never to have seats in the House of Lords? He thought that would be a state of things that would neither be wise nor proper; for there would, undoubtedly, be a feeling raised in the country that there were two classes of Bishops, and one class might be looked upon as being in a different position from the other. Under those circumstances, why should they not follow the precedents they had established in the cases of Manchester, St. Alban's, and Truro? They were not then discussing the question of whether Bishops should have seats in the House of Lords or not. That was a question which he hoped the Committee would not be led into. He was not at all certain that it was not a good thing that the younger Bishops should not be in the House of Lords for the first year or so of their office, because they would be able to gain a most intimate knowledge of their dioceses before they went there. As to what had been said about the House of Lords taking the Bishops away from their dioceses, he did not think that was the case by any means. He hoped the Committee would not wander into the wider question; but simply consider the mode in which these four Bishops were to be dealt with.

Mr. HUTCHINSON said, he should be very much astonished if he heard any hon. Gentleman rising to charge a Dissenter with impropriety in opposing that Bill. The very name of the Church implied that every citizen born within the State was a member of it. The clergy had been called the ecclesiastical side of the Civil Service, and it was because that definition had a certain degree of propriety in it, that they had a right to discuss the question as if it affected them all, individually and separately. Now, hon. Gentlemen opposite had complained a short time ago that some personal feeling had been shown in the debate. It was impossible that a Bill of that kind should be introduced, running counter to the views and feelings of so many persons, without some acrimony being introduced into the discussion. He considered that the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) had shown great fairness and moderation in the observations he had made, and he thought they ought rather to be approved than blamed by hon. Gentlemen opposite. Now, there was a very easy way out of the difficulty with regard to the Bishops. If they were too hard worked to attend to their dioceses, and to their Parliamentary duties, surely their obvious course would be to relieve them of a portion of their duty. Let them be relieved of their political functions, and devote themselves to high ecclesiastical matters. They would have plenty to do to conduct affairs in their own dioceses, and they might leave Parliament to manage political matters which were infinitely beneath their notice. The right hon. Gentleman had mentioned the difficulty which would arise if there should be two sets of Bishops. But that difficulty was in existence at that moment. There were Prelates outside the House of Lords at that moment engaged in the not very dignified office of waiting for dead men's shoes. The Bill proposed to increase the number of those Bishops who were in that position. The speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Charley), had been a very good comment upon the observations he (Mr. Hutchinson) had made some time ago—namely, that this Bill might be the prelude to an annual batch of Bishops. They had heard the hon. and learned Gentleman say that all Bishops ought to have seats in the House of Lords, and in proportion as the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary increased the number of Bishops, he made the comparison of those outside the House with those in much greater and more offensive.

MR. HOPWOOD said, the Government seemed determined to pass the Bill. He thought that they who opposed the Bill were not doing bad service to the Government and to those hon. Gentlemen who stayed to hear the debate out, in the sense of educating them. Some home truths had been pronounced that evening, and he dared say they would not all be received with disbelief, but would sink deep into their hearer's minds. The reason he objected to the clause before them was that it formed a process of argument in a circle. A while ago, when they were discussing another clause, it was said—"You will have these Bishops in the House of Lords, and you must support them by much larger incomes." It had occurred to him that it might be well to wait till they reached the present clause, and see whether the good sense of Parliament would not determine to take away the incentive to luxurious livings and large incomes. But when the Home Secretary said that they should not wander at large into the whole question, he would ask, how could they help going into the question of the Bishops in the House of Lords? They had had an account given of them by one hon. Member, and he was sure that history would bear him out in saying that in past generations the Bishops had not been very particular as to the principle on which they gave their votes, and even some of the present generation were determined to vote according to Party instincts. He belonged to a body of men who might be demoralized in the same way. If they were to put all the Judges into the House of Lords, simply by virtue of their appointment as Judges, they would have the scandal of political connections influencing their votes. But how much greater was the scandal when it was applied to those who, by the very office they filled, were supposed to be superior to all such inferior considerations. He felt bound, on these grounds, to support his hon. Friend in his Amendment, and he did so in the fear that if the clause were carried there would be two sorts or kinds of Bishops, besides those who, as his hon. Friend had pointed out, were already waiting outside the House of Lords for admission within its doors. There were the Suffragan Bishops, and so far as their ordination was concerned, and the sanctity of their office, he supposed they stood on a footing of equality with those to whom were assigned the Parliamentary distinction. Well, if they found that such men could perform their high office to the satisfaction of those over whom they were placed, why should they fear if those Bishops were kept out of the House of Lords? They would never feel the want, which it was supposed they might feel, if the prospect were once held out to them and then taken away. He could only suppose that if a fresh batch of Bishops was to be created from time to time, they would be forced to resort to some such imitation of the *congé d'élire* as the election among the Bishops of a man to represent them in the House of Lords. That was the tendency the Bill would create.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 62; Noes 22: Majority 40.—(Div. List, No. 259.)

Clause *agreed to.*

*Supplemental Provisions.*

Clause 6 (Appointment of bishop of new bishopric).

MR. MONK, regretting the absence of the hon. Member for Clitheroe (Mr. Assheton), moved the Amendment which stood in his name, which was in page 3, lines 29 and 30, to leave out the words—

> "So long as there is not a dean and chapter of any new bishopric founded in pursuance of this Act."

The clause involved the re-enactment of the *congé d'élire.* In the case of the Bishops of St. Albans and Truro, who were appointed by Letters Patent from the Crown, the Government and Parliament had entirely given up the principle of the *congé d'élire* in this country in the same way that it had been given up in Ireland ever since the second year of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, and as the Government had acknowledged that there was no principle involved in the *congé d'élire,* he could not see why they should place in the Bill any machinery for re-enacting it. When the first of these Bills—that for creating the Bishopric of St. Albans—was before the House, he had raised this very question, and his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary had said that this was a very proper subject to bring before the House; but he thought it would be done much better in the shape of a Bill, instead of an Amendment to a clause. Well, he perfectly agreed with his right hon. Friend, and he had on three separate occasions brought in a Bill for abolishing the *congé d'élire;* but he had met with such persistent opposition from his hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Beresford Hope), that he had not been able to make way with it. He believed that if it had not been for his hon. Friend, his Bill would have become law. He should now, at all events, give the Committee the opportunity of showing their opinion of this obsolete custom called the *congé d'élire.* But what he wanted seriously to ask the Home Secretary was this—Was it worth while, when they had practically abolished a sham election—for *congé d'élire* was a sham election—to put into that Bill machinery for re-enacting that custom? What he objected to was that the Dean and Chapter should be compelled to take part in the election of a person who had been selected and appointed by the Crown. The Crown alone had the power of appointing the Bishops. The Crown appointed them by the advice of the responsible Ministers of State, and the Chapter might just as well object to the appointment of their Dean as the Dean and Chapter object to the appointment of the Bishop. In point of fact, they could not object to it. By law they were obliged to elect the person named in the letters missive; and whether they objected or not, the election was subsequently confirmed in spite of all opposition in Bow Church. If the law gave the laity the power of rejecting a Bishop, there might be something to be said in favour of such a course; but the law did not even give the laity any voice in regard to the appointment of the clergy who were placed over them. He thought it unfortunate that the hon. Member for Cambridge University had not allowed the sense of the House to be taken on the Bill which went to the extent of abolishing the *congé d'élire* in the case of the older bishoprics. He felt it his duty, however, to press this Amendment to a division.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 29, to leave out from the word "so," to the word "Act," in line 30, inclusive.—(*Mr. Monk.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment. It was easy to argue in favour of it, for a great deal was certainly to be said in support of it. But a great deal was also to be said on the other side, and a great deal as to whether some middle term could not be found that would meet all the requirements of the case. He should, therefore, be sorry to see such a principle affirmed in such a discussion as it could receive then on a mere Amendment, seeing that it would affect every existing bishopric in England and Wales. He could only give his opinion on the subject, which would not, of course, bind the Committee; but thought it would be better to await the Bill to be brought in next Session by the hon. Member. And when the hon. Member did bring in his Bill, which he promised he would do very early in the ensuing Session, he promised to give the subject every consideration, and he should be prepared to argue it fully with him.

MR. HOPWOOD was sure no one supposed the right hon. Gentleman would shirk this question when submitted fairly to the House. What he would argue upon it he was not going now to anticipate; but he did argue now that the Government position was given up. His hon. Friend was so much better informed on the point than he was that he would only now say that, as he understood it, that position was given up. It was possible, certainly, that it had only been given up, provisionally, in the same way as this point was; but if it was given up in that way, his hon. Friend argued that it should be given up until a state of things arose that should require it. The Bishopric of Truro was not yet gifted with a Dean and Chapter, and Chapters were not so plentiful as to spring up at the nod of a Minister. He thought his hon. Friend had made out a strong case for saying that this was the time for coming to a decision. The question had been very fully debated—it lay in a nutshell, and that which they were now considering was not a mere ceremony. He warned the Committee that they were dealing with something sacred; but if anyone inquired into the previous proceedings on the subject, bearing in mind that the Church was subject to a Civil Head, he could not be satisfied with its present state, and should not be content to submit to a caricature of what should be a holy and venerable right. He felt that, in this argument, his hon. Friend had right on his side. What he urged had long been needed to do away with a terrible scandal, and he should, therefore, support him.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS explained that they had followed the same precedent in this Bill as in the case of St. Albans.

MR. MONK said, he meant that the Bishop of St. Albans and the Bishop of Truro had been appointed and consecrated Bishops without the intervention of any Dean and Chapter, and without the issuing writs of *congé d'élire*, of which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University was so fond.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 63; Noes 26: Majority 37.—(Div. List, No. 260.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Scheme of Ecclesiastical Commissioners approved by Order in Council as to courts, offices of archdeaconries, and other incidental arrangements for constituting new bishopric).

MR. E. JENKINS moved to strike out Sub-section 3. The effect of his Amendment, if agreed to, he said, was to raise the question whether, since the creation of the new bishoprics, it was advisable to transfer to them the patronage of any livings within their dioceses, or, in fact, of any livings at all. He ventured to submit to the Committee that it was a most unhealthy thing that the Bishops should be allowed to exercise this patronage in the Church. Of course, it was not a pleasant thing to be obliged to give reasons for taking exception to the transfer of patronage to the Bishops of the Church, and the increase of that which they already exercised. He would point out that there might be, after all, some propriety in it, and some justification for it, if it were spiritual dignities only that were concerned, and the persons interested in having over them a suitable incumbent, those to whom he should be the spiritual guide might have something to say to it. But it was not only to the spiritual dignity, but to the beneficial interest in a certain part of the property of the State, that the appointment was made; and he was sorry to say that, looking at the manner in which the Bishops had exercised their patronage in times past, there could be nothing more dangerous than to place a temptation of this kind in their way by giving them an opportunity of appointing persons who might not be the most fitted for the duties to be performed. He held in his hand a Statement by Members of the Church of England who had looked into its clauses, and published them to the world, in order that they might be remedied. There were people who liked taxes, and did their best to maintain them, and it was in that way that the *congé d'élire*—which his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Monk) had done so much to get rid of—had been supported by his hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Beresford Hope). He had found him, also, going into the Lobby against the healthy proposal now before the Committee. Looking at the Statement to which he referred, what did he find? He found a painful statement to the effect that the Archbishop of Canterbury had, in the course of seven years, distributed among his relatives a number of livings ranging in value from £320 to £1,348 per annum, and averaging £660, with house and glebe. Yet the Archbishop, in 1866, declared in the House of Lords that he regarded all patronage as a public trust. *The Times*, in a leading article on this subject some years ago, dwelt on these and other similar facts as significant, and contended that it would be pernicious to leave appointments in the hands of the Bishops. One could not but feel that it was a most terrible thing that the temptation to exercise so much patronage should be vested in one who ought to have nothing further to do with the Church than to exercise a spiritual supervision in and over the diocese to which he was appointed. He therefore asked the Committee to act upon what he thought was a very sound principle—namely, that they should take away from, or, speaking more correctly, not grant to, these new Bishops the right of exercising patronage, but that it should be vested in the Crown. The Crown appointed the Bishops, why should it not also appoint the incumbents, and, indeed, the whole of the clergy and officials? He saw no reason why the whole machinery should not be worked as a sort of branch of the Civil Service of the country—which, in fact, it really was—instead of the patronage being delegated to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church, the patronage having originated in the somewhat remote past in the exercise of Royal right and favour. He found that the Archbishops and Bishops had the patronage of about 2,100 offices of sub-deans and other officials connected with the cathedrals of the State Church; and they, therefore, stood in a somewhat anomalous position in relation to a somewhat anomalous institution. The State Church was made up of all sorts of religions; and its Archbishops and Bishops bore the hybrid character of being, on the one hand, spiritual dignitaries and ministers of Christ; and, on the other, servants of the State, appointees of the Crown, and the political Representatives in the Church of the Government of the day under whose *régime* they were elected. ["Oh, oh!"] One of his hon. Friends opposite seemed shocked at this way of putting the case; but why should he be? There was nothing like bringing a man face to face with the naked facts of any question which he had to decide for himself. He saw no reason why they should, like ostriches, bury their heads in the sand and refuse to see the real circumstances of any case that might be laid before them. He therefore moved that certain words of the clause be struck out, in order that, at a later stage, provision might be made for vesting all Church patronage in the Crown, which alone ought to have the power, as the Head of the Church and the Defender of the Faith. His Amendment was, in page 4, line 1, to leave out all the words down to the word "situate," in line 27, inclusive.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 20, to leave out from the word "and," to the word "and," in line 33, inclusive.—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. DILLWYN appealed to the Secretary of State for the Home Department to assent to this Amendment. He was sure his right hon. Friend wished the new Bishops whom it was proposed to appoint should command the respect of the public, and should be as little liable to scandal as possible; but could he be unaware of the facts which had been stated by his hon. Friend the Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), as to the grave scandals which had been occasioned in times past by the nepotism and favouritism shown by the Bishops in the appointments of the clergy within their dioceses? It was perfectly well-known that if a clergyman wanted to get on in the Church he must marry the daughter of a Bishop, or take some step to curry favour with his Suffragan. This was perfectly well known, and it could not fail to act prejudicially as far as the influence for good which a Bishop should possess was concerned. The Bishops were continually urging that patronage ought to be regarded as a public trust, and they were just as continually using it themselves for the advantage of their own relatives and friends.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS could not assent to the proposition. He thought it much better that the patronage should, as at present, be in the hands of a variety of persons and agencies, than that it should be concentrated in the Crown. These varying systems of patronage gave a life and a variety to the work of the Church which it would not otherwise possess. He was not going to say that in some cases Bishops had not made appointments of relatives which had better not have been made; but he felt sure that the general feeling of the Bishops in the present day—and he had conversed with many of them on this very point—was in favour of the appointment of the very best men to the livings in their various dioceses. There were many cases in which he could conceive no greater good than that the Bishop should have the right of conferring preferment. Suppose the case of a clergyman who, in a poor parish, had shown extraordinary zeal and fitness for the work to which he had devoted himself. Was it not desirable, in such a case, that the Bishop should have the power of retaining the services and the influence of such a man within his diocese by giving him a suitable preferment rather than letting him be induced to remove to another and more remunerative field of labour in another and, perhaps, a distant diocese? Again, it must surely be to the advantage of the Church that Bishops should be able to introduce to their dioceses men previously unknown to them but distinguished for piety or learning, or both in combination, and able to exercise a wise and beneficial influence over the minds of the clergymen with whom they were brought in contract.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, although he admitted that many advantages, some of which had been mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, would arise from the Bishops exercising patronage, if they would only regard such power as a public trust, he could not hide from himself the fact that, owing to some psychological grounds which he could not understand, ecclesiastical people did not seem to find themselves bound by the same moral restraint as other people. The appointment of County Court Judges rested with the Lord Chancellor; but if he were to appoint a number of his sons and nephews, there would be an enormous outcry in the country, and the appointments would probably have to be revoked. Ecclesiastical personages, on the other hand, seemed to think the patronage was not a trust, but a property which they might bestow on whomsoever they pleased. There was one objection to the various forms of patronage which were suggested—namely, that, as had been said by a wise man, the possessor of a large amount of patronage was like the owner of a large lake, which must be filled for his own purposes before its overflow could benefit the outside community. At the same time, he felt that the question of patronage was one with regard to which there were enormous difficulties. In Scotland they had a system of popular election, in which all the communicants, including women, voted; but considerable difficulties had arisen in connection with the elections, and he was far from thinking this the most perfect system that could be adopted. On the other hand, the accumulation of a large amount of patronage in political hands was an element of danger; but, on the whole, the question was one of so great difficulty that he thought, as far as this Bill was concerned, it would be better left alone.

MR. E. JENKINS denied that there was any inconsistency in the course he had taken, and added that he should feel compelled to take a division on the Amendment he had proposed, as it involved a question of principle.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he had no doubt as to the desire of the Bishops to appoint as clergymen the best men they could find; but, as they all knew, the very best intentions were not always fulfilled. Human nature was weak, and when the temptation came, in the case of Bishops and patronage, it was often found impossible to resist it, owing to domestic and social influences which were brought to bear. It was said that under this Bill—and said as an excuse for it—the number of pieces of patronage in the hands of the Bishops would be small. This fact struck him as being a strong argument against this giving of patronage to the Bishops, because the temptation to nepotism would be the stronger in cases where the number of livings in the patronage of the Bishops was few. He honestly believed that the Bill would be far more satisfactory to the general body of the community if this Amendment was adopted.

Mr. J. COWEN admitted that the principle of giving a large amount of patronage to Bishops was liable to objection; but, at the same time, it must not be forgotten that in some cases—as, for instance, in that of the new Bishop of Northumberland—the preferments at the disposal of the Bishops would be few in number and small in value. It was thought by many hon. Gentlemen that he had on many occasions spoken with considerable asperity in reference to Bishops, and he therefore wished to make a brief statement as the result of personal knowledge of one of the order. The late Bishop of Durham—Dr. Villiers—appointed the Rev. Mr. Cheese, his son-in-law, to a valuable living in the diocese. The appointment happened to be a very good one, and one which had since given universal satisfaction; but an outcry was raised at the time, and one of the comic journals, embodying the popular feeling, published a cartoon, in which was depicted a Bishop pouring port wine into a cheese. The Bishop of Durham received by post in one day no less than 250 copies of the offensive cartoon, and he (Mr. Cowen) had been told that the Bishop, who was an extremely sensitive man, owed his death to the attacks which were thus made upon him. He only mentioned this circumstance, as showing that a Bishop might give preferment to his own son-in-law, and still make the best appointment that was possible. He had said so much against Bishops that he felt bound, in justice to them, to mention this fact, which was within his own knowledge. Still, although exceptional cases of this kind might occur, he thought it would be better to remove temptation out of the way of the Bishops; and he should, therefore, support the proposal of his hon. Friend.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 74; Noes 18: Majority 56.—(Div. List, No. 261.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Trusts of bishopric endowment fund).

Mr. E. JENKINS said, the Committee had, at an earlier stage of the Bill, discussed and decided the question of what should be the minimum salary to be paid to the newly-created Bishops. He now wished to raise the question of the maximum salary to be paid. While a great many of the arguments adduced in the discussion of the minimum salary would apply in the present instance, he did not think the Home Secretary would be inclined to insist that the whole question was settled by the former division; while the right hon. Gentleman insisted upon a large minimum, he would not, perhaps, be disposed to defend with equal fervour a large maximum. The maximum proposed by the Bill was £4,200 a-year of salary, and a residence equal to another £500 a-year, or £4,700 in all. This involved a question of whether it was intended to encourage the Bishops to live in luxury; whether, in short, these ecclesiastical officers were to be raised to the position and income of territorial magnates? He could not conceive this to be necessary; and therefore suggested that the maximum amount of salary to be paid should be fixed at £3,200 per annum, with a residence valued at £500 a-year more, or a gross income of close on £4,000 annually. He could not but think that it would be an advantage if the salaries of all the Bishops could be cut down. If the Committee once more sanctioned such high salaries, it would be doing that which would tend to injure itself. That evening, hardly a single Member of the Church, on the other side of the House, had risen to speak on this subject, although he knew to a certainty that some of them were discontented. It was very remarkable, and ought to be noticed outside, that the efforts to improve the Bill, and to give it a proper spiritual and political shape, had come from the Opposition side of the House, the Members belonging to the Church of England being afraid that if they expressed any opinion, they would raise questions injurious to their Church.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member propose to move an Amendment?

MR. E. JENKINS: Yes; to leave out "four," and insert "three."

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that this would not be fixing the maximum salary, as was necessary, at a figure somewhat above the minimum.

MR. E. JENKINS said, that the residence would bring up the value of the salary to £3,700, whereas the minimum was £3,200. Those who took the view he did with regard to Establishments were endeavouring to mould the Bill into something like a shape consistent with the relations between Church and State.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, that £4,300 was thought the lowest sum that it was wise to give to any see. He hoped the Committee would allow the clause to pass. It proposed merely to bring the new bishoprics up to the level of the existing ones, and he did not see that this could reasonably be objected to.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

On Question, "That the Schedules be agreed to?"

MR. J. COWEN said, that the name, Bishop of Newcastle, might lead to some confusion, there being already a Bishopric of Newcastle in Australia. It would be better to give this Bishopric some other name—say, Northumberland or Lindisfarne. The strength of the Bishopric would not be very great if it had only 12 livings. He would not repeat his assurance that the people of the North of England did not want a bishopric; but he would urge the change of name.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS did not think it desirable at that stage of the Bill to alter the name of the bishopric, and he did not think there would be any practical inconvenience if the name were left unchanged.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

On Question, "That the Bill be reported without Amendment to the House?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he might now state that it had been amply shown, by the contributions offered towards the new bishoprics, whether the Bill was wanted. A considerable sum had been bequeathed for the see of Newcastle, besides what the Bishop of Durham had intended to give. £20,000 had been raised for the see of Wakefield, in addition to sums raised by the Bishop of Lincoln and the late Bishop of Lichfield, which were likely to be increased by a Memorial to the late Bishop, in the See of Southwell. As to the see for the county he represented —Lancashire—he was told by one of the hon. Members for Liverpool the other day that he would place £50,000 in his hands to-morrow if he wished, as an earnest that that sum would be collected.

MR. J. COWEN said, he knew the circumstances under which the money referred to by the Home Secretary was left in Newcastle. He thought the Home Secretary should not calculate upon it with too much certainty. It was likely he would get it, but not certain; for it was given under conditions which might not be found desirable.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Monday* next.

## INCLOSURE PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 192.]

(*Sir Matthew Ridley.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. DILLWYN said, the Government had publicly promised that the

Bill would only be taken as a First Order, and several hon. Gentlemen who were interested in it had left. Under these circumstances, he personally objected to proceeding with the Bill on the present occasion, and would, therefore, move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he quite agreed with the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), that a promise publicly given ought to be publicly redeemed; and as an objection had been made to proceeding with the Bill at present, he would assent to the adjournment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

## SUPPLY.—REPORT.

SUPPLY [6th August],—Postponed Resolution [reported 7th August], *considered.*

Resolution again read, as followeth:—

> "That a sum, not exceeding £88,245, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved to reduce the sum by £500, being the cost of the proposed new storehouses in Hyde Park. Last year an amount was taken for the erection of a new superintendent's lodge in that part of Hyde Park; but it was paid back by Baron Grant. However, a very ugly building was erected, a portion of the Park taken off, and a hedge planted, by which the public were still further excluded. The present proposal would add to the "built-over" character of that part of the Park; they were making a small town of it, and entirely destroying its suburban beauty.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR seconded the Amendment, because he deemed that the course pursued tended to deprive the people of their rights by gradually filching from the people's recreation grounds portions of these parks so much needed in the neighbourhood of London. He regretted that the Government were pursuing that course which must excite passionate feelings in the minds of the people that might prove troublesome.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£88,245," in order to insert "£87,745," — (*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*) — instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That '£88,245' stand part of the Resolution."

MR. GERARD NOEL said, that the new brick storehouse stood in exactly the same place as the old one, which, having been built of wood, was tumbling to pieces. It was therefore necessary to build a new one of stone. The only difference was that it would be somewhat higher. With regard to the superintendent's lodge, Mr. Grant undertook to build a new one, provided the old lodge, which stood in front of his house, was removed, and for that purpose he paid £1,500 into the Exchequer. Of that sum, £1,300 was spent on the new lodge, and £200 was paid for lodgings for the superintendent while the new lodge was building. When he (Mr. Noel) entered on his present Office, he looked around the Park to find a suitable place for the lodge, and many sites were pointed out to him; but he could not approve of any of them, as they would disfigure the Park, and he selected the present site as it was in proximity to the police lodge, the Guards' lodge, and other buildings. Though a slight encroachment had been made on the Park, yet half as much had not been taken away from the public as had been given to them in Kensington Gardens when the old lodge was taken down. If the new lodge had been built on the edge of the Park, it must have stood in front of some house, and no doubt the owner would have objected.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL thought the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman was satisfactory as regarded the lodge, but not as regarded the stores.

MR. HERSCHELL said, that the lodge ought to have been left in front of a house, whether the owner objected or not, unless on public grounds some other site was desirable.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 82; Noes 29: Majority 53.—(Div. List, No. 262.)

MR. DILLWYN complained of the charge for the preservation of game in Richmond Park, which, he submitted, interfered with the right of the public to the use of the Park. When the public paid for the maintenance of the Park, the public rights ought not to be interfered with on account of the preservation of game. He must express his regret that, a division having already been taken, he could not move an Amendment to reduce the amount by the salaries of the gatekeepers. The Park was maintained by the public, and the public ought to benefit by it.

MR. GERARD NOEL, in reply, said, that no one was more anxious than himself not to interfere with the enjoyment of persons frequenting the Park; but he could not think that the preservation of the game there was in any way hurtful to the public. The game was, for the most part, given to the London hospitals or the poor of Richmond. Not only that, but hundreds and thousands of people who visited the Park derived the greatest pleasure and amusement from seeing the game running about. It was all very well for the hon. Member, who could shoot game every day in the year, to object to this; but to the poor people who went there from the East-end of London it was a very different thing. As for the plantations, they were not intended for preserving game; but were necessary in order to beautify the Park and to replace the trees, which, in the course of time, withered and decayed, and out of the total acreage of the Park only 240 acres were planted. Besides, during the last five years, more land had been thrown into the Park than had been planted; and the public could not complain if, while five acres were planted in one part, 14 were thrown in in another.

Resolution *agreed to.*

SUPPLY [7th August], — Postponed Resolution [reported 8th August], *considered.*

Resolution again read, as followeth:—

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £5,520, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Maintenance and Repair of Royal Palaces."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE complained of the actual destruction that took place in consequence of the so-called restoration of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, which, in his opinion, was mere Vandalism. He moved that the Vote be reduced by £500.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£5,520," in order to insert "£5,020,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*) — instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That '£5,520' stand part of the Resolution."

MR. GERARD NOEL explained that the Dean and Chapter had already spent £23,000 on the work of restoration all the funds at their disposal, and Her Majesty's Government had, in response to an application made to them, agreed to provide £5,000 of the £9,000 odd which were still necessary to complete the work. St. George's Chapel was attached to the Royal Palace, and, therefore, it was only right that Parliament should contribute to the expenses of its restoration.

MR. COURTNEY protested against the transformation of ancient buildings of this kind. He was favourable to restoration, but not to ruin. They might as well try to make an old lady young, by dressing her eyebrows, putting salve on her lips, and painting her cheeks, as to restore an ancient building by the method adopted in this case.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 93; Noes 31: Majority 62.—(Div. List, No. 263.)

Resolution *agreed to.*

SUPPLY [8th August.]—Resolutions *reported.*

First Four Resolutions *agreed to.*

Fifth Resolution read a second time.

MR. J. COWEN called attention to the hours of labour of the men working in the Dockyards at Malta. He said, their work had recently greatly increased, consequently they stood in a difficult and worse position than that of the workmen in the Dockyards of this country. What these men at Malta wished to be done was to be placed in the same position as other of Her Majesty's servants. He did not desire to trouble the House at any length; but wished to state it had been promised that something should be done in the matter. No change, however, had taken place; but he hoped during the coming year that something would be done to place the men at Malta upon an equal footing with the workmen of other naval yards.

Mr. W. H. SMITH undertook to look into the matter, which had not before been brought under his attention.

Mr. D. JENKINS drew attention to the high rates which had been agreed to be paid for ships chartered at Bombay for the conveyance to Malta of the Indian contingent. The price paid—£130,000—was, in his opinion, excessive; and, as he thought that the Indian officials had acted recklessly in the matter, in order to mark his sense of the disregard of the interests of the taxpayers, he would move to reduce the Vote by £20,000. He grounded his proposal on the fact that the freight market at Bombay was at the time so low, that vessels might have been chartered at a rate per ton so much cheaper as to have saved the amount which he wished to strike off the Vote.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£678,000," in order to insert "£658,000,"—(*Mr. David Jenkins,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That '£678,000' stand part of the Resolution."

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, while not agreeing in the sweeping condemnation of the Indian officials, admitted that, in the present instance, undue liberality had been displayed. He should like to understand whether the item of £130,000 was for taking back the troops to India? He was under the impression that the original Estimate of £750,000 was to cover the whole expense of the troops. If it was not, the whole cost would be brought up to something like £1,000,000. The question, however, was—were these freights extravagant or not? In his opinion, the tonnage rate was not by any means excessive, considering the Government wished to carry out the *coup* like a flash of lightning. He did not think the Indian officials had much regard for the British taxpayer; and Sir Richard Temple was willing to pay these high freights at Bombay rather than send round to Calcutta, where there was abundance of shipping waiting for employment.

Mr. ONSLOW also opposed the Amendment, which would be a reflection upon Sir Richard Temple and the other officials at Bombay. If there was one man who knew how to save a sixpence, it was Sir Richard Temple, who was responsible for this matter. He appealed to hon. Members not to pass what would be tantamount to a vote of censure on that most worthy public servant.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR contended that there must be some misapprehension on the part of his hon. Friend the Member for Falmouth (Mr. D. Jenkins), as to the costly rate at which the sailing vessels had been engaged as transports; for, although Sir Richard Temple was not the most economical man in India, the freight of the ships in question had been managed at a far more economical rate than they would have been had they been sent out from this country. In fact, the freights, which averaged about £1 per ton, were exceedingly reasonable; indeed, most of these sailing vessels were, according to the abstract laid before the House, engaged at less than 10 rupees a-ton. As regard the steamers, the hon. Gentleman might be correct, because he (General Sir George Balfour) was quite unable to speak thereon.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he should have been sorry to have joined in any sweeping condemnation of our Indian officials, like that of the hon. Member for Falmouth (Mr. D. Jenkins), because they had chartered vessels at Bombay instead of at Calcutta. He would admit that if Sir Richard Temple had sent round to Calcutta he would have found there plenty of vessels; but he would have had to pay additional rates, on account of the nearness of the monsoon, and it was doubtful if they could have been got round Cape Comorin and have arrived in Bombay in sufficient time for the urgent service which they were required to perform. The emergency was so pressing as to allow of no delay. The charge before the House included the return of the troops, so that no additional demand in respect of this particular would come before them.

Mr. D. JENKINS said, that after that explanation, he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Resolution *agreed to.*

Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*

## NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1876-77.—REPORT.

Resolutions [August 8th] *reported.*

MR. MONK complained that so large a sum as £600,000 had been diverted from the purposes for which it had been voted, and expended on the Army and Navy in a manner not only unsanctioned by, but without the knowledge of, Parliament, under the cover and licence of the Appropriation Act. The House knew nothing of what had been done till last night, or rather early that morning. The Appropriation Act provided that no transfers of Votes should take place, except in cases of exigency; and it could not be contended that the appropriation of £500,000 or £600,000 for purposes other than those sanctioned last year by Parliament was a case of that sort. There was nothing to show that so large a sum ought to have been diverted from the Exchequer, to which it would in the ordinary course have been surrendered. He had called attention to this matter on former occasions, and had moved Amendments to the effect that the decision of the Treasury in all cases of the transfer of Army and Navy Votes should be laid upon the Table of this House within a certain time; but he had refrained from pressing them on the distinct promise of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that something should be done; but nothing had been done. The system was one which had been condemned by the Committee on Public Accounts. Parliament ought to know earlier what was proposed to be done with respect to unexpended balances. He would suggest that the Committee on Public Accounts should be increased by four Members—two to be selected from each side of the House—and that greater attention should be paid by the Committee to this most important subject.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would acknowledge that he had promised that that matter should be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts, and that it had never been taken up by that Committee. He could only urge, in excuse for that oversight, that when one had many things to carry in his memory, he found it difficult to retain everything, and through some accident that subject had not been brought before the Committee on Public Accounts. If, however, the hon. Gentleman would put a Notice down in his own name next Session, that he would move that the matter be referred to the Committee, there would then be no risk of its being forgotten. At the same time, after what had been said on the subject, he thought the Committee might properly have taken up the subject themselves. He admitted the obligation they were under to refer to the Public Accounts Committee the question, whether that practice ought to be amended, and, if so, in what respect? What was now done, however, was the same thing as had been done for the last 13 years. Under the Appropriation Act, applications were made to the Treasury for their authority to defray temporarily, out of any surplus which might be effected by savings on the Votes for a particular Department, any expenditure found to be necessary for that same Department, but which had not been provided for. He admitted that was a practice which, although convenient, was, to a certain extent, liable to abuse; because it would be possible for a Government, if it wished to do so, to take a large amount on a popular Vote and a small amount on an unpopular Vote, and then to apply the excess taken on the one to the deficiency on the other. The question was one worthy of the attention of the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. MONK asked, whether the Government would not undertake to lay Papers, explanatory of the diversion of any sums voted for those Services, on the Table of the House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER thought it would be better to have that subject considered by the Committee.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR thought there were more of these diversions of public monies from the purposes for which they were voted than the Chancellor of the Exchequer supposed. The promise given by that right hon. Gentleman was given in two different years. He had promised that if the propositions made by himself (General Sir George Balfour) were formulated, the subject would be taken up and thoroughly investigated. But though this condition was complied with, and the heads of the inquiry duly put down on the last day's Notices of the Session, yet no notice had been taken thereof. But he would give the right hon. Gentleman a reminder of the formulated propositions during the Recess, in the hope that the inquiry might be instituted by an independent Committee, and not by the Select Committee on Public Accounts.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

### TELEGRAPHS BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 257.]

(*Lord John Manners.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER *moved*—"That the Second Reading be fixed for Twelve of the clock on Saturday."

LORD JOHN MANNERS hoped that his right hon. Friend would not press the Motion, and that the House would now consent to give the Bill a second reading. The opposition was mainly directed to the 3rd clause, and referred to the definition of the term "telegraphs" contained in it; but, as he had given Notice of his intention to move its omission, he hoped that the second reading would now be passed. The Bill would then be nearly exclusively a measure in which were collected together the protective clauses formerly inserted in Private Bills on behalf of the Postal Telegraph Department; but which it was thought ought to be consolidated in a general measure. The noble Lord concluded by moving the second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Lord John Manners.*)

THE O'DONOGHUE said, there seemed to exist some confusion on the Treasury Bench which he should like to see cleared up, if it were possible to do so. The Chancellor of the Exchequer moved that the second reading of the Telegraphs Bill be fixed for to-morrow at 12. No sooner had he done so, than the noble Lord the Postmaster General proceeded to ask the House to read it a second time. Now, he (the O'Donoghue) desired to know which course the House should adopt.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE complained that a Bill of so much importance, affecting all the corporations in the country, should be brought forward at a time when the Session had virtually terminated. He objected to stipendiary magistrates being the persons to arbitrate between public Bodies and the Post Office; because, in some instances, these stipendiaries were the servants of the corporations, who were their paymasters; and in others they were under the direct influence of the Crown. The Bill, by its 9th and 10th clauses, gave enormous powers to the Postmaster General against every corporation in the country, enabling him to fine them heavily for anything that might be called obstruction or interference with respect to telegraphic communication, and he believed that the attention of those Bodies throughout the country had not been sufficiently directed to the provisions of the Bill, as otherwise there would be great opposition to the passing of the Bill at that period of the Session.

THE O'CONOR DON thought it was time the question of his hon. Friend the Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) was answered. It would be in the recollection of the House that the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the Exchequer Bonds Bill would be taken to-morrow. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The Question is, the second reading of the Telegraphs Bill, and the observations the hon. Member is now making do not seem to be relevant to that Question.

THE O'CONOR DON: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn, in order to put myself in Order. [*Cries of* "Oh!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will not put himself in Order by taking that course.

MR. SULLIVAN: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sullivan.*)

MR. SPEAKER: The Question is, that the debate be now adjourned.

THE O'CONOR DON: I think, at all events, I will be in Order in asking for an explanation of the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer a little while ago, that the second reading of this Bill was to be taken to-morrow——

Mr. SPEAKER: Any observations that the hon. Member may think proper to make relative to the subject-matter of the Telegraphs Bill will be in Order.

The O'CONOR DON: The observations I was about making were with regard to the Telegraphs Bill. We were told that the Order for the Second Reading of this Bill was to be taken to-morrow, and immediately after the noble Lord the Postmaster General gets up and proposes to take it now. My hon. Friend the Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) very naturally asks for an explanation of these extraordinary discrepancies in the statements from the Government Bench; and I certainly think, considering the circumstances of the other Bill to which I will not further refer, that we are entitled to know what is the meaning of this extraordinary difference of opinion.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The explanation is very simple. It is intended to take a Morning Sitting to-morrow, and it was proposed to take the Telegraphs Bill; but as the Bill has been reached, my noble Friend the Postmaster General thought it would save time if we took the second reading now. We propose to fix the next stage for to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The O'DONOGHUE complained that there had been contradictory statements as to the Morning Sitting on Saturday. He intended to oppose the putting down of the Bill for that day.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: So you can.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. HOPWOOD entirely concurred in what had been said by his hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke). He opposed the Bill, as placing in the hands of the Telegraph Department an arbitrary control of public Bodies.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the whole of the questions in connection with this Bill had been considered before a Select Committee in "another place." The matters at issue were so thoroughly thrashed out that it was hardly likely the corporations had not been made thoroughly acquainted with the way in which the Bill affected them. At the same time, he would admit that the point as to stipendiaries was a proper one for consideration in Committee. He hoped the House would allow the second reading to be taken now.

Mr. BRISTOWE said, he entirely objected to the reference to the railway companies provided for in the Bill, and also to the very vague language used in, and the stringent character of, the 10th clause.

Mr. BIRLEY was in favour of giving that power to the Post Office, and thought the public would have confidence in that body.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS said, this was a Bill to increase the central power, under pains and penalties, and although he had great confidence in the noble Lord at the head of the Post Office, he strongly objected to the multiplication of penalties which the Bill enacted, and which were so many traps and gins for the unwary. They were most objectionable.

The O'DONOGHUE wanted to know whether the Motion of the noble Lord the Postmaster General was an Amendment on that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was entitled, he thought, to ask that question.

Dr. CAMERON said, that as the 3rd clause was to be withdrawn, he had no objection to the rest of the Bill.

Mr. J. COWEN also explained that the 3rd clause of the Bill having been withdrawn by the noble Lord the Postmaster General, he should offer no further opposition to the measure.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

Lord JOHN MANNERS proposed that the House should go into Committee on the Bill to-morrow (Saturday).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee on the Bill."—(*Lord John Manners.*)

Mr. ONSLOW: Sir, I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask, Whether, if this should be agreed to, and the Committee on the Bill be fixed for to-morrow, that would be tantamount to saying that the House agrees to a Morning Sitting to-morrow without a definite Motion being put that the House at its rising do meet to-morrow?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the House decides to take the Committee to-morrow, the House will sit to-morrow.

Mr. ONSLOW: Then, Sir, I have an Amendment to the Motion. I move that the Bill be considered on Tuesday. I hope I shall not be out of Order in the remarks I am about to make. Now, in the first place, what the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes is a most unusual course, as I believe you, Sir, said to-night. The House is asked to meet to-morrow, when the palpable reason for it is that a private Member's Bill should be considered—the Sunday Closing Bill. I shall not be saying anything wrong when I tell the House that the reason why the Chancellor of the Exchequer has moved that this Committee be taken to-morrow is in order to bring in a Bill which is not even on the Paper to-day. There is no doubt that many of us have had a long and arduous Session, and especially during the last few weeks, many of us have been working day and night. I would really appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is quite fair upon us to ask us to come down here on Saturday, which is almost the only holiday we have had for many a week past, to consider a Bill which will not be so violently opposed as that will be to which I refer. But we should not only consider ourselves. We should also have some consideration for you, Sir, who have had to remain in the Chair for many nights past and far into the morning. To ask us to sit to-morrow, under such circumstances, is, in my judgment, not fair when the only Business to be taken is that of a private Member. I would ask the House to consider whether there is really that urgency; whether the Bill is of such vital importance as to necessitate the creation of such a precedent?

Mr. SULLIVAN rose to Order. An hon. Member had already been called to Order on precisely the same point as the House was now invited to discuss.

Mr. ONSLOW considered that he was alluding to matters material to the Question. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that the consideration of the Exchequer Bills and Bonds Bill would be taken to-morrow (Saturday). Then, when the Telegraphs Bill was called on, the right hon. Gentleman said it was to be taken to-morrow. He hoped he was saying nothing improper when he added that, in his opinion, the right hon. Gentleman hardly knew his own mind about the Sunday Closing Bill. As regarded facilities for the passage of this Bill during the present Session, he thought no one who had watched its course would hesitate to admit that no private Member had ever before received such facilities for the passing of any measure. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER said, that so long as the hon. Member was referring to the Business before the House at that time he was in Order; but he was now referring to a Bill not before the House. It was the Telegraphs Bill that was really before the House.

Mr. E. JENKINS remarked that the Question before the House was that the Telegraphs Bill be considered to-morrow; but they had reached to-morrow. The hon. Member had talked the Motion out.

Mr. ONSLOW bowed to the ruling of the Speaker, and begged to move as an Amendment, that the Committee upon the Telegraphs Bill be fixed for Tuesday.

Mr. STACPOOLE seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to insert the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Mr. Onslow*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE had no objection to a Morning Sitting; but he would vote with the hon. Member (Mr. Onslow), because there would not be time for hon. Members to put down Amendments on the Bill, if it were taken to-morrow.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 87; Noes 30: Majority 57.—(Div. List, No. 264.)

Main Question put.

*Resolved*, That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee.

## EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL—[*Lords.*]

(*The Lord Advocate.*)

[BILL 292.] CONSIDERATION, AS AMENDED.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

**MR. M'LAREN** complained that Scotch Members had not had an opportunity of discussing the Bill. It had been read a second time without discussion, on the understanding that there would be ample opportunity given on going into Committee. But the Committee was taken a few minutes before 3 o'clock on Saturday morning, after the division on the Eastern Question, when many hon. Members, of whom he was one, had left the House, not knowing the Bill was to come on. He did not think it signified much whether the Bill was lost or carried, for many points which had been put forward by school boards as requiring amendment had been ignored; while matters which were not questions of education at all, but questions of police, had been included. Such as the Bill was, however, he was willing to accept of it with a single Amendment. When the Bill was sent down from the Lords, there was in it a clause providing that the expenses of repairing higher-class school buildings might be paid out of the rates. But in Committee in this House the clause was altered to include every kind of school expenses which the school boards might think fit, provided they were sanctioned by the Scotch Education Department. There were only about 16 higher schools in Scotland which would be affected by this clause. He thought it a preposterous thing that the expenses of such schools should be placed on the rates. In the City he represented there was one of these high schools. It had an income exceeding £4,000 a-year. He never heard that any of the citizens demanded that this school should be aided from the rates in the manner here proposed. He was not aware that the townspeople of any other town had made such a demand for their school. He was told that the schoolmasters wanted it; but this was not a consideration that could weigh with the public, or with Parliament. Why should a great school, with an income like that he had mentioned, and charging fees of about £13 or £14 a-year from each of its pupils—and thus entirely excluding the poor—be placed as a burden on the rates? Why should they give support for the teaching of the higher branches in these 16 higher class schools, when they did not give it for the teaching of the same branches in the 2,900 Board and other elementary schools receiving Privy Council grants? The Board schools were said to be under a disadvantage now as compared with the old parish schools. In the old parish schools, it was said, a boy could be prepared for the University. On the other hand, it was contended that more was now done for higher education in the Board schools than was ever done in the old parish schools; but, be that as it might, it was through the Board schools, and not through these 16 secondary schools that they could hope to do anything effectual in the way of promoting higher education amongst the poorer classes of Scotland. This must have been the opinion of Her Majesty's Government last week, when, in connection with the Endowed Hospitals and Schools Bill, they appointed a Commission to inquire, amongst other things, into the instruction in the higher branches given in the State-aided schools, and in what way the Privy Council grants could be so arranged as to contribute to that end. He believed his hon. Friends the Members for Kirkcaldy and Glasgow had supported the clause, to which he (Mr. M'Laren) objected, in the belief that it would enable Board schools to acquire those benefits, and not that it was intended for the purpose of benefiting higher schools. Well, then, there remained only two other Scotch Members who supported the clause, and those hon. Gentlemen were the Members for the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews, and the Wigtown Burghs. Neither of those hon. Members, however, represented a burgh constituency having a higher class school. Nor was it to be forgotten that the clause was opposed by the Representative of the Falkirk Burghs—a Gentleman who knew all about the old parish schools of Scotland, who was a Member of the Endowed Schools Commission, and also of the Education Board in Scotland, which had been just extinguished, and who possessed the confidence of the Government so far that he had been appointed a member of the new Board to be formed under the Act to which he referred. He (Mr. M'Laren) thought the Government had inadvertently allowed the provision to which he had alluded to be placed in the Bill. He did not blame them very much for it; but he begged to give Notice of his intention to move that the clause should be restored to the shape in which it came down to this House from the Upper Chamber.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL could not admit that there was a conspiracy on the part of a clique of Scotch Members to carry a particular part of the Bill which had been referred to. He was one of the culprits under whose eyes the Bill was recently brought on at an early hour of the morning. He supported the clause entirely unsolicited, and was no hand to any Party move whatever. No one was more opposed, as a general rule, than he was to the transaction of Scotch Business at late hours of the morning; but Scotch affairs had had comparatively a larger share of attention this Session than before, and on the occasion alluded to the circumstances were somewhat peculiar. A large number of Scotch Members were assembled at the great division on Eastern matters, and a wish having been expressed that advantage should be taken of the opportunity of proceeding with the Bill, he, for one, had given his voice in favour of going on with it. He should have hesitated in the course he took, if he had known that his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh had inadvertently left the House. He was extremely sorry that was the case; but what was done was done in entire good faith, and the decision was not arrived at until the question had been deliberately discussed. He therefore thought that hon. Member had acted judiciously in not opposing this branch of the Bill on the present occasion; and he saw no reason why the only other clause, concerning which there was any serious dispute, should not be settled in the course of the present Sitting.

Mr. W. HOLMS said, he was under the impression that the fact of going on with the Bill on the previous Saturday morning showed great unanimity on the part of the Scotch Members. The Amendments were of such a nature as for the most part not to be hostile to the Bill, and altogether he thought the measure had received sufficient consideration at the hands of Scotch Members. Although there might be some difference of opinion as to the principle embodied in the 18th clause, to which his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) had referred, he (Mr. W. Holms), for one, held the principle to be a sound one. It was extremely desirable that the school boards should provide a part of the funds necessary for the higher education of poorer pupils in Board schools who showed a peculiar aptitude for such studies. The clause for this purpose clearly defined that its operation should be tentative in its character.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause (Union of school board,)—(*Mr. James Stewart,*)—*added.*

Clause (Removal of doubt as to right of certain schoolmasters to the franchise,)—(*Mr. Mark Stewart,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time; amended, and *added.*

Clause (Examination of higher class schools under management of school boards,—(*Mr. William Holms,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time; amended, and *added.*

Clause (Procedure where parochial board refuse to pay school fees,)—(*Mr. William Holms,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time; amended, and *added.*

Amendments made.

Mr. M'LAREN moved, in Clause A, page 5, line 15, after the word "management" to leave out—

> "And shall be empowered to pay from the school fund such other expenses for the promotion of efficient education in the said school as are not provided for by the revenues stated in section sixty-two of the principal Act: Provided That no expenditure under this section shall be incurred without the consent of the Scotch Education Department."

His desire was that the clause should be left as it originally went from the House of Commons.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 15, to leave out from the word "management," to the word "Act," in line 23, inclusive.—(*Mr. M'Laren.*)

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that the terms of the Bill were perfectly well known in Scotland, not only to Scotch Members and to Scotch boards, but to every person who took any interest in education in Scotland before the Bill was introduced into that House. The various provisions of the Bill were not the result of practical suggestions which had been communicated by Scotch school boards to the Government, and which had been considered and approved by the Government. He did not in the least dispute the importance of the question raised by the Amendment; but he certainly could not admit that the subject with which it dealt had not been fully and fairly considered by the Scotch burgh constituencies, which were mainly interested in it, and by the hon. Members of the House who represented those constituencies. The hon. Members for the Wigtown Burghs and the Ayr Burghs, who sat on the Ministerial side of the House, had supported the clause at the instance of their constituents, and also in pursuance of their own individual opinions; and some 15 hon. Members who sat in Opposition as the Representatives of much of the industry and intelligence of Scotland also supported the proposition contained in the clause. The only expressions of dissent—and they were of a hesitating character—came from the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) and the hon. Member for the Falkirk Burghs (Mr. Ramsay). As far as the Members for burghs were concerned, they gave a general approval, which was not to be wondered at in face of the fact that the clause was drawn mainly in the interest of education in the burghs. In Scotland it was not only within the power, but was also the duty of school boards administering the education rates to provide for secondary, as well as elementary education—wherever it was in their power so to do—for the same class of children as those who were receiving elementary education. It was important, in cases where secondary as well as elementary education was given, that the different branches should be taught in separate departments of the school, in order that the grants in aid from Government might be secured. If the clause under consideration was rejected, great difficulties would be put in the way of educational bodies desirous of affording instruction in the higher branches of learning, exercising the powers at present intrusted to them by the Act of 1872, of providing for the secondary education of children in Scottish schools. Sufficient provision was not made in the Act of 1872 to enable them to keep their secondary schools efficient, and it was stated from the opposite Bench by his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair)—than whom no man better knew the circumstances of Scotland in that respect—that these schools were not flourishing simply from the want of a little pecuniary aid. It was perfectly easy for the school board to teach such a class of studies; but if they taught them in an elementary school, they would do so at a higher expense, and they would lose the Government subsidy. The only proposal of the Bill was that where school boards were in the administration of a secondary school which was not efficient, they should, with the consent of the Education Department, devote so much of the rates as was necessary to render the school efficient. He contended that in this there were two most efficient checks. In the first place, the school board was essentially representative. There was nothing to bind one board to continue the administration of another, and if they thought the existing board had done wrong, the ratepayers had nothing to do but to elect representatives who would carry their views into execution, and administer the rates according to the ideas of the majority of the community. But there was also this check, that even the declared intention of the school board could not be carried into effect until they had got the consent of the Education Department. It was entirely out of the question to say that that Department, being directly amenable to both Houses of Parliament, would consent, without the wish of the ratepayers of a district, to a system of secondary education for the children of the rich at the expense of the poor. It seemed to him that what was desired was most reasonable. In an ordinary parish or district, to establish a secondary school as well as a primary school was out of the question. If school boards were sincerely desirous of administering the functions committed to them, they had ample power to teach secondary education; but instead of through the parish school, they might do so through the high class school which already existed.

Mr. LEITH regarded the arguments of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate as most convincing. He would draw the attention of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) to Subsection 4 of Section 62, which provided that school boards might relieve schools which taught elementary and higher education of the elementary branch, and establish schools for the purpose of carrying on the elementary work.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he had stated that three or four schools had availed themselves of the advantages of that clause.

Mr. LEITH said, the object of the present clause was to give power to the school boards to apply a portion of the rates to schools which required assistance, and as this was to be done under the sanction of the Education Office, he should certainly support the new clause.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL was sorry to say that the right hon. and learned Lord was exceedingly clear on everything except the point on which he desired to be enlightened, and which he wanted to understand. He could understand what was the position of elementary and secondary schools; but he could not see what would happen to an intermediate class of schools in which he was especially interested. He was quite aware that under the Act secondary education might be given in elementary schools; but he thought it was undesirable to attempt to give secondary education in an ordinary rural school. He wanted to have some information on a class of intermediate schools, and as an instance he might mention that of Kirkcaldy. A flourishing burgh school existed there, and the Kirkcaldy people had taken a course which the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate had said was a very prudent one—they had divided the burgh school into two parts, a higher school and an elementary school. The latter came under the Act, and obtained the grant in the usual way; the former was kept entirely separate, and received no grant from Government or the rates, except a certain allowance. What he wanted to know was, could the ratepayers, if they chose, supplement the educational funds of the higher branch of the burgh school of Kirkcaldy? He held a very strong opinion that if not allowed to do so they ought to be, and for this reason—if it was inexpedient to afford secondary education in rural schools of the country, on the other hand, it was desirable that secondary education should be afforded in burgh centres, such as Kirkcaldy was. The school there was a very excellent one. No less a man than Thomas Carlyle commenced his career in it as a teacher. In his opinion, it was but fair that inasmuch as the more wealthy classes paid the large proportion of rates for elementary schools some assistance should be given to higher class schools where not only the children of the better classes, but of the poor might be received. And it was highly desirable that the ratepayers, if they chose, might be enabled to assist these schools. Therefore he wished to know whether there was power for them under the present law to do so. He thought this would have been the case; but he now found that the new clause referred only to 14 superior schools.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, perhaps he might be allowed to make this explanation. By Section 62 of the Act of 1872, certain schools were recognized by statute as being high-class schools, and, therefore, falling under the regulations of the section. These schools were enumerated; but it was also contemplated by the Act that school boards should, in dealing with a similar class of schools, put them in precisely the same position as those which were enumerated. The first part of the clause dealt with the schools enumerated in the Schedule, and it then provided for specified schools being deemed high-class public schools; the school board being, with the consent of the Education Department, able to take them under its management, and they were to be deemed high-class public schools, and whenever a school board found it necessary to separate the higher education from the lower they had only to pass a resolution to that effect. This, he had no doubt, had been done in the case of Kirkcaldy, and to all intents and purposes their school became a higher class school within the meaning of the 62nd section.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL was very much obliged to the right hon. and learned Lord; but—[*Cries of* "Order" *and* "Spoke!"]—He had not finished his speech when the Lord Advocate made his explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood the hon. Member had concluded his speech; but, with the indulgence of the House, he may make an explanation, if he thinks proper. Of course, he cannot deliver a second speech.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, it was in the way of explanation that he desired to address the House. What he wanted to know was, could the school board of Kirkcaldy make theirs a high school, which it was not at present?

SIR WILLIAM CUNINGHAME regarded the words of the proposal as indistinct; but, so far as he understood it, he thought it was a move in the right direction.

DR. CAMERON pointed out that if they simply subsidized schools where high fees were charged, they did no good to the cause or to the spread of general education. He had understood that the clause was to be introduced for the purpose of enabling secondary education to be promoted in elementary schools; but it now turned out to be exactly the reverse. There was a very serious defect in the present arrangements for public education in Scotland, because of the change for the worse which had taken place in the character of the old parochial schools. More than one agricultural society had complained that, whereas the children of farmers were formerly able to receive the education they desired in parochial schools, now they were unable to obtain any but the most elementary instruction. The consequence was that although heavily taxed to keep up the elementary schools, these farmers were compelled to send their children elsewhere to be educated. That being so, he was disappointed at the aims of the right hon. and learned Lord's new clause, which would leave untouched a very serious blot on the present educational system of Scotland.

MR. C. S. PARKER said, he thought the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had too much in view high schools, such as those of Edinburgh and Glasgow, where the fees were high. His (Mr. C. S. Parker's) impression was that in smaller burghs, this clause, which afforded some means of providing from the rates some of the expenses of a higher education, would be found to be of considerable advantage. Where the population was sufficient, it was well to have the higher class education separated from the elementary, at the same time keeping down the cost, so that children of any class might avail themselves of either system of teaching. He regretted that the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) had not been in the House when this subject was discussed previously, as he had an erroneous impression of what was done. The Amendment had the approval of the great majority of Scotch Members, and the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Mr. Lyon Playfair) was conclusive as to the need for some such provision. The whole effect of the clause was to turn over a new leaf in Scotch education. He hoped the hon. Member for Edinburgh would withdraw his Amendment, as the clause would be sure to do good to the cause of higher education. The Education Act, as it stood, had transferred the management of higher schools to the school boards; but the difficulty was to get funds to carry on the schools. A small sum would put the whole thing right, and he hoped it might be secured by the clause. After all, the Bill was entirely permissive, and if the ratepayers did not choose to allow the school boards to spend their money in this way, they need not do so.

MR. M'LAREN said, he would consent to his own Amendment being negatived without a division. At the same time, he must be allowed to say that after hearing the discussion which had just taken place, he adhered to the views which he had originally expressed.

Question, "That the words 'and shall be empowered to pay' stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. WILLIAM HOLMS, Amendments made, in Clause 19, in page 5, line 24, to leave out "a school board or other authority," and insert "an authority other than a school board;" and in page 5, line 38, after "purpose," leave out to end of clause.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

On the Motion of the LORD ADVOCATE, Amendment made, in Clause 21, in page 6, line 5, leave out "under this Act shall," and insert "or other proceedings under the principal Act or this Act may."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he had an Amendment in Clause 32, line 29, which was to give that which had never been given before—free access to the valuation rolls to persons desiring information. Therefore, he would after the word "roll" move to insert these words—

> "Reasonable access to such roll either in his official chambers, or where no such chambers are provided, in such public place as the sheriff shall appoint."

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, as there were no further Amendments to the Bill, he would ask leave of the House, seeing the period of the Session, and the fact that it had to be printed and sent to "another place," to have the Bill read a third time at that Sitting.

MR. M'LAREN said, he had no objection to that being done.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

## TRAINING SCHOOLS AND SHIPS BILL.

(*Captain Pim, Mr. Wheelhouse.*)

[BILL. 48.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read a second time this day."—(*Captain Pim.*)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved that the second reading be postponed to the following Tuesday, on the ground that there could be no use in putting on the Order for a Saturday Sitting a Bill which could not possibly be passed.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to add the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 39; Noes 42: Majority 3.—(Div. List, No. 265.)

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

*Resolved,* That the Bill be read a second time upon Tuesday next.

## BLIND AND DEAF MUTE CHILDREN (EDUCATION) (*re-committed*) BILL.

[BILL 130.]

(*Mr. Wheelhouse, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Isaac.*)

COMMITTEE (ON RE-COMMITMENT).

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Mr. Wheelhouse.*)

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to insert the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof.

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, his vote on this question would depend very much upon the answer he received from the hon. and learned Gentleman who had charge of the Bill (Mr. Wheelhouse). He thought the Bill might be made a very good one with certain Amendments, and he had himself placed several upon the Notice Paper. If the hon. and learned Gentleman was prepared to receive his proposals with favour, he would support the Motion to take the next stage at the earliest possible moment. He knew that the Amendments he proposed to introduce were regarded with favour by other hon. Members whose names appeared on the back of the Bill.

MR. WHEELHOUSE, in reply, said, he could not accept the Amendments which had been put upon the Paper by the hon. Member for Frome (Mr. Samuelson).

MR. DILLWYN supported the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), on the ground that it would be unfair to put upon the Paper for a Saturday Sitting a Bill which had been set down for almost every night since the commencement of the Session.

Question put, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 40; Noes 40.

And the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker stated that the House seemed to be in doubt regarding the day on which this Bill should be proceeded with; but as, in the case of the prior Order of the Day, the House decided upon its postponement to Tuesday next, he should follow a similar course, and accordingly declared his vote with the Noes.—(Div. List, No. 266.)

Words *inserted.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

*Resolved,* That this House will, upon Tuesday next, resolve itself into the said Committee.

### ELECTION OF ALDERMEN (CUMULATIVE VOTE) BILL.—[Bill 71.]

(*Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Tennant.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will this day resolve itself into the said Committee."—(*Mr. Wheelhouse.*)

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE moved, as an Amendment, that the stage be taken on Thursday (August 15.)

Mr. COURTNEY seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to insert the words "upon Thursday next,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE said, he could not assent to the Amendment. The Bill had been on the Paper for several months, and he had wished to be able to pass it; but its progress had been met with most persistent opposition. He saw no chance of making progress, unless he was allowed to put it down for the Saturday Sitting, and therefore he must persist with his Motion. As far as the general principle was concerned, he did not think the Bill of any private Member should be put down for a Saturday Sitting; but as he understood that a private Member's Bill was to take first place among the Orders of the Day, he saw no reason for giving up the privilege—right he should prefer to call it—of putting his own Bill upon the Paper. He should therefore persist in his right not only to put his Bill among the Orders of the Day, but to take the precedence which was his due in accordance with the Rules which regulated the conduct of Business.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER thought the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) had himself given a strong reason for not putting his Bill on the Orders for a Saturday Sitting, by stating that through several months its progress had been persistently opposed. It must be obvious to the hon. and learned Gentleman that under the circumstances he had himself mentioned, there was no chance of his being able to pass the Bill in the course of the few remaining days of the present Session.

Mr. ONSLOW hoped his hon. and learned Friend would not divide. There was little or no chance of his passing his Bill that Session, and he thought it highly desirable that no private Member's Bill should be taken at a Saturday Sitting so close to the end of the Session.

Question put, "That the words 'this day' stand part of Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 33; Noes 48: Majority 15.—(Div. List, No. 267.)

Words *inserted.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

*Resolved,* That this House will, upon Thursday next, resolve itself into the said Committee.

### CONSECRATION OF CHURCHYARDS ACT (1867) AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Monk, Mr. Forsyth.*)

[BILL 176.] COMMITTEE.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [26th June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. MONK proposed that the Committee on the Bill be taken at the Sitting on that day (Saturday). He could give good reasons why his request should be acceded to. The Bill was read a second time without any opposition, and if hon. Members looked at the Notice Paper, they would see there was not a single Amendment to it. The measure was one which was very much needed, and he had in his possession letters from high dignitaries of the Church, asking him to persevere with it. Therefore, he hoped the House would permit him to take the Committee that day.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be further adjourned till this day."—(*Mr. Monk.*)

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to add the words "upon Thursday next,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words 'this day' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 32; Noes 48: Majority 16.—(Div. List, No. 268.)

MR. MONK then moved that the Order be discharged, and gave Notice that he would re-introduce the Bill early next Session.

MR. SPEAKER: Having already decided that this House, on Thursday next, will resolve itself into the said Committee, the House cannot consider the Motion of the hon. Member to discharge the Order until Thursday next.

MR. MONK asked permission to rise to Order. He understood the Question put to the House was, that it resolve itself into Committee on the Bill that day. That had been decided in the negative, and now the Speaker would have to put from the Chair the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), that the House would resolve itself into Committee on Thursday. That being the substantive Motion, he merely put it to the Speaker, whether he was not in Order in moving, as an Amendment to that substantive Motion, that the Order be discharged.

MR. SPEAKER: The House has already decided that certain words should stand part of the Question, and the hon. Member now proposes to move that the Order be discharged. It would be inconsistent with what the House has already decided to put the Amendment of the hon. Member for Gloucester; and, therefore, the Question I have to put is that this House, on Thursday next, will resolve itself into Committee on the Bill.

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

*Ordered,* That the Debate be further adjourned till Thursday next.

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The O'Conor Don, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Redmond.*)

[BILL 215.] THIRD READING.

MR. O'SULLIVAN moved that the House do not meet on Saturday to read the Bill a third time.

MR. SULLIVAN said, the Notice of this Motion was only given the previous night, and therefore he objected to it.

MR. SPEAKER: This Notice of Motion having been only given yesterday for this day, and an objection being raised, the hon. Member cannot proceed with it consistently with the Resolution relating to opposed Business.

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, there was no Amendment to his Motion on the Paper.

MR. SPEAKER said, the Resolution in reference to opposed Business provided that no Notice of Motion given one day should be taken on the next, if objection be taken to it; and objection had been taken in this case.

THE O'CONOR DON moved, that the Order for the Third Reading of the Bill be taken that day.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read the third time this day."—(*The O'Conor Don.*)

MR. O'SULLIVAN opposed the Motion, on the ground that Notice had not been given.

MR. SPEAKER said, this was a dropped Order, and, according to the practice of the House, the hon. Member having charge of it could move to fix a day for its third reading without Notice.

MR. O'SULLIVAN thought it a very unreasonable thing that the House should be asked to sit on Saturday, to entertain a Bill to which there was very strong opposition in Ireland. He would admit that the supporters of the Bill included a large number of the wealthy classes.

MR. MONK rose to Order. Was the hon. Member in Order in discussing the merits of the Bill on the Motion that it be put down for that day?

MR. SPEAKER: The Motion before the House relates to the time at which this Bill is to be taken, and any observations on that Motion should be limited to the question of time. It would be quite irregular now to enter into the merits of the Bill.

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, the Bill having been so strongly opposed both in that House and in Ireland, he thought it was unfair that the House should meet that day to discuss the Bill. The measure of his hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk), which was not even opposed, had been postponed by the House until Thursday, and yet this Sunday Closing Bill, which had been opposed at every stage, was to come on. The House had sat late during the whole week—they would not rise that morning until between 3 and 4, and were hon. Members to be brought there again at 12 o'clock, to pass a Bill which had been so strongly opposed? It was most inconsistent after the decision of the House as to the other Bills, that that one should come on and be taken before any Government Business. He believed up to the present time there had been no precedent for taking a private Member's Bill on a Saturday; but this would create a very bad one. Considering the time the House and its officers had sat, he thought it unfair to take a Bill on Saturday, which he should oppose in every way he could.

THE O'DONOGHUE did not think it was treating the opponents of the Bill fairly to take it that day. Of course, they could not discuss the merits of the measure; but he quite agreed with what had fallen from his hon. Friend (Mr. O'Sullivan) that the people of Ireland were opposed to it, and that they had never yet expressed an opinion upon it. The opponents of the Bill availed themselves of all the recognized means for opposing the Bill, and yet the Government, in what they had done, had gone out of their way, and taken a most exceptional course to suit the desires of his hon. Friend who had charge of the Bill (the O'Conor Don).

MR. STACPOOLE said, in consenting to the Bill being taken on Saturday, the Government were going against the interests of those who had put them in office, because it was well known that the publicans secured for them their majority in the House.

DR. O'LEARY wished to know, why the Government should take the very exceptional course of giving a Saturday Sitting to a private Member? No doubt, he heard on the previous night from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that a sort of promise had been given at an early period of the Session to facilitate the passing of this Sunday Closing Bill. He thought there was no hon. Member in the House who could for a moment accuse either the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or any Member of the Government, of having broken faith upon this question. But a most extraordinary cause had been taken by the Government to facilitate the passing of the Bill. He believed—and if he was wrong he should be glad to be corrected—that the Government, to help on this Bill, had absolutely dropped the Order of Supply for three days. If that were true, surely the Government had fulfilled their promise—he considered, more than fulfilled their promise—to the promoters of the Bill. He would not then go into the reasons which had induced the Government to give a Saturday Sitting for the discussion of the Bill, as to do so would detain the House too long, and he did not forget that they were to meet on Saturday, and to sit all through Sunday as the promoters of the Bill had expressed their readiness to do so, and he believed there was no Rule to the contrary. That being so, of course, the bar of the House of Commons would be kept open, and at the instigation of Sunday closers. Why should the Government give such facilities? They had undoubtedly been told that there was a large preponderance of public feeling in Ireland in favour of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member must not go into the merits of the Bill.

DR. O'LEARY bowed to the decision of the Chair; but although he thought he touched the margin very closely, he did not actually go into the merits of the Bill. He maintained that the Government had no justification for giving a special day to a private Member. The reason they had done so was that it was said there was a large preponderance of feeling in favour of the Bill; and, believing that to be true, they gave facilities for passing the Bill. But what were the facts? He would only touch the margin closely; but he remembered that two years since, the justification of the Government in helping on the Bill was that the people of Ireland were in favour of it, and that 170,000 petitioned in favour of it. But what was the case now? Look at the Petitions which had been presented to the House this year.

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member was going beyond the Question, which was the time at which the Bill should be taken. He must ask him to keep to the Question.

DR. O'LEARY said, he had sought through the authorities for precedents and could find none. It must be perfectly well known to the House that ever since the year 1874, the Government had given a *quasi*-opposition to the principle of the Bill which they were now assisting, and he thought the onus laid upon the Government of showing good reason for the course they now proposed to take. The Government had entirely changed their ground, and, without giving either Notice or reason therefore, had given unprecedented facilities for the passing of a Bill which they for several years opposed. Irish Members who were opposed to the Bill were determined to use every means in their power to give effect to their opposition. They were prepared, if necessary, to carry on the discussion during the whole of Saturday and Sunday; and he asked the Government whether they were prepared to accept so awful a responsibility? A good deal had been said about obstruction in that House. He knew nothing about that point; but he should certainly protest against any course which might have the effect of curtailing the rights of minorities either inside Parliament, or beyond its walls. If the Government persisted in the course upon which they had entered, they would run the risk of causing a fearful scandal by compelling the House of Parliament to sit on a Sunday, in order to pass a Bill whose object was to close all public-houses in Ireland on all corresponding days during the period through which the Act had to run. As far as the Sitting on Saturday was concerned, he would point out to the House that such a Sitting would be unjust to those Members of the House who held the Jewish faith.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out to the hon. Member that he was travelling beyond the Question before the House, which was simply as to when the Bill should proceed to its next stage.

Dr. O'LEARY said, he only wished, in conclusion, to express his opinion that the conduct of the Government in giving a Saturday to the third reading of the Bill was such as to bring discredit not only upon the Government, but upon the House.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he did not rise for the purpose of saying anything as to the conduct of the Government in this matter. That must be judged by the House. What he rose for was to make an appeal to the good feeling of the House, and to ask hon. Members to consider whether they were not inflicting needless cruelty upon the Speaker—an official whom they all honoured—by keeping him in the Chair up to so late (or early) an hour, with the almost absolute certainty that he would have to resume his seat at noon?

Mr. MURPHY said, he regretted that the Government had so far furthered this Bill as to facilitate its passing before the people of Ireland had really been able to pronounce an opinion upon it.

Mr. ONSLOW asked, whether the Bill would be put upon the Paper as the First Order of the Day at the Saturday Sitting.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER replied in the affirmative.

Captain PIM moved that the third reading be taken on the following Tuesday, the 13th instant.

Mr. STACPOOLE seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "this day," in order to add the words "upon Tuesday next,"—(*Captain Pim,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words 'this day," stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*— Ayes 61; Noes 18: Majority 43. —(Div. List, No. 269.)

Main Question put.

*Ordered*, That the Bill be read the third time this day.

---

### WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolution [August 8] *reported;*

"That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £21,556,807 7*s.* 5*d.* be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution *agreed to.*

### CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Raikes, Bill to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time.

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Saturday, 10th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Territorial Waters Jurisdiction * [137].

*Considered as amended — Third Reading* — Foreign Jurisdiction [267], and *passed.*

*Third Reading*—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) [215], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn*—Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment * [176].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL.—[Bill 215.]

(*The O'Conor Don, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Redmond.*)

### THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*The O' Conor Don.*)

Mr. P. J. SMYTH, in rising to move the re-committal of the Bill, said, that a glance at the Order Paper would explain to hon. Members why they were brought there at an unusual hour, on an unusual day, and for an unusual purpose. It was to ratify a certain memorandum of agreement between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his hon. Friend the Schouvaloff of Sunday Closing in charge of the Bill. Hitherto, the Bill had been opposed on principle as needlessly and unwisely restrictive of personal liberty. On that ground the House of Commons, aided by a policy of facilities foreign to the usages of Parliament, had decided against them. He was now obliged to take another ground, and ask the House to view this Bill in relation to a great national industry. He assumed that both the supporters and the opponents of the Bill were equally animated by respect for vested interests. His object, his sole object, therefore, in moving the re-committal of the measure was that in Committee an agreement might be arrived at consonant with justice, whereby vested interests should be protected. An injury directly inflicted upon any class affected indirectly the whole body of the people. He did no more than claim, on behalf of a numerous and influential body of his fellow-countrymen, the benefit of an admitted principle of the Constitution. He would not strain the principle of compensation. It should only apply, in his opinion, where the interests affected were *bonâ fide* vested interests, and where the damage inflicted was direct, palpable, and immediate, and not where it was indirect, vague, or remote. The licence in Ireland was on the same footing as in England. The police regulations differed somewhat; but in both countries the same right of transfer existed, and in both the holder of a seven-day licence had a vested interest in the house to which it was attached. He might forfeit his licence by misconduct; but so long as he fulfilled the conditions of the contract, he might dispose of his licensed house for a valuable consideration; he might bequeath it by will; if he died intestate, it passed to his legal representative; it was, to all intents and purposes, property recognized and protected by the law. The late Sir Frederick Shaw, who, as Member for the Dublin University, held at one time a distinguished position in that House, filled afterwards for a long series of years and with distinction the office of Recorder of the City of Dublin. He invariably ruled that the licence attached to the house and constituted a *bonâ fide* vested interest. His successor, Mr. Falkiner, the present Recorder, attempted to do that which the House of Commons was then doing, or attempting to do, by this Bill—that was, changing the seven-day licence into a six-day licence, and what happened? Mr. Falkiner's ruling was reversed by the unanimous judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench. This occurred only last year. The case of the publicans was argued by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick City (Mr. Butt). He (Mr. P. J. Smyth) now asked the earnest attention of the House to these emphatic words of the Lord Chief Justice—

> "I do not think the Court should be influenced by any opinion that the number of public-houses in this city is an evil which should be diminished. If the fact be so, the authorities may most properly refuse to add to the number. But existing vested interests should not be extinguished, even with a legitimate object, without compensation."

Surely that was conclusive. There they had the clear and distinct declaration of the highest legal tribunal that the seven-day licence was an existing vested interest, that to change that licence into a six-day licence would be the extinction of that vested interest, and that it ought not to be done, even with a legitimate object, without compensation. Would the House of Commons assume the grave responsibility of rejecting that solemn decision by legislating in defiance of it? Would it, for the sake of a wretched experiment, run the risk of bringing into disrepute in Ireland and elsewhere, and shaking confidence in the dicta of the constituted exponents of the law? Assuredly it would fare ill with law and order if the day should ever arrive when the judgments and decisions of the Superior Courts in matters relating to the construction of Acts of Parliament and the administration of the law should cease to be regarded as conclusive by Parliament and the nation. Parliament had from time to time altered the hours of opening and closing. Those changes, doubtless, might have caused a momentary inconvenience to the seller and consumer; but the right to sell and consume on every day of the week remained intact, the seven-day licence remained intact, and the vested interest was undisturbed. They might regulate, but they could not destroy. They might take one hour off every day of the week; but they could not wholly obliterate any one day of every seven for which the licence was given. To do so would be to annul the contract and to extinguish a vested interest, and they could not annul and extinguish any vested interest without compensation. Parliament had regulated the hours of factory working. But such regulation inflicted no special wrong. Had it ever entered the brain of any man that Parliament could or would close all the factories in the Kingdom on one working day of every week throughout the year? It could do that, perhaps; but compensation would follow, as a matter of course. Parliament might decree a Bank holiday or two.

The O'CONOR DON: It could several.

Mr. P. J. SMYTH: Name them.

The O'CONOR DON: Good Friday. It has done so.

Mr. P. J. SMYTH: His hon. Friend mentioned Good Friday, and he was quite welcome to the exception which proved the rule. In that case, the loss or the advantage, whichever it might be, was shared by the whole community, and there was no special damage suffered by any one particular class. In fact, the principle of compensation did not there arise. An hon. Member had just reminded him that compensation was not awarded to the Scotch publicans. But if, at the time of the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, a Scotch Member had been able to point to a decision such as that of the Court of Queen's Bench, which he had quoted, declaring that the Scotch licence, like the English and the Irish licences, was a vested interest which could not be extinguished without compensation, was it not a moral certainty that a claim for compensation would have been unhesitatingly admitted by this House? The licences, however, in Scotland were not on the same footing as the English or the Irish licence, for licences in Scotland had always been, and were now, under the control of the magistrates to a degree not required in either England or Ireland. He felt sorry that the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) was not in the House. The hon. Member had made a remarkable statement on this subject of compensation. The quotation he was about reading he took from *The Alliance News*, whose authenticity, he presumed, would not be questioned. Well, the hon. Baronet observed—

> "I have heard it said that 18,000 Irish publicans will be ruined if the Sunday Closing Bill passes, but nobody proposes compensation should be given to them."

Now, he (Mr. P. J. Smyth) did not pretend to be anybody; but somebody had actually proposed that compensation be given to them—Irish publicans though they were—and he would show that somebody—even the hon. Baronet himself—was bound to support the Motion before the House. In the same speech, the hon. Baronet proceeded—

> "I do not say that compensation ought not to be given, but I will wait until we get into Committee to hear what the arguments are before I agree to grant compensation. But if you explain the matter to me satisfactorily I shall not object to compensation. You must, however, make out a good case."

These words were uttered with reference to the Permissive Bill; but they applied with a hundred-fold greater force to the Sunday Closing Bill. In the Permissive

Bill the probable injury was indirect, uncertain, and remote. In the Sunday Closing Bill, the injury was direct, certain, and immediate, proceeding from the direct action of the law. Now, if he were justified in claiming the support for this Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle, he was justified in claiming more than support—he claimed "facilities"—from Her Majesty's Government. The hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, speaking on behalf of the Government, said that the question of compensation should be settled before a Bill of a permissive character could be considered. Why, then, must Sunday closing be considered and facilitated, and no word about compensation uttered from the Treasury Bench? Was it because the victims were Irish traders only? That would be a narrow and mistaken view, for if the Motion now before the House were rejected, it would be found hereafter that a wrong principle embodied in legislation might have wider consequences than were at first contemplated. He had no desire to detain the House further. He ventured to believe that he had established his case. Let the House pass this Bill if it so pleased—this—he could not avoid calling it so—indefensible Bill. But as they valued justice, as they cherished the principle of property, as they respected the legal tribunals of the land, he asked them to look to it at least that legitimate vested interests were protected, and he asked no more. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the re-committal of the Bill.

MR. W. SHAW seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the word "re-committed,"—(*Mr. P. J. Smyth,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE O'CONOR DON said, he hardly thought that his hon. Friend could be serious in proposing the Motion which he had made, considering that this Bill had gone into Committee in January last, and this was the 10th of August, and there had been unexampled opportunities for discussing every imaginable Amendment in Committee. He thought the mere fact that this proposal for compensation was put off till this date proved that it could not be intended, even by its proposers, to be seriously entertained. As to the proposal itself, he was bound to say that, even if introduced legitimately, and at the proper time, he could not entertain it. His hon. Friend had himself most distinctly proved in his speech that the claim for compensation was of the most technical character. He admitted that the Legislature might reduce the number of hours of sale on any day in the week; that it might fix the particular hours in the day in which sales were to be permitted; and so long as any time was permitted on every day in the week no claims for compensation could be made. For instance, the House might reduce the hours of sale on Sundays to the limit of half-an-hour, and it might fix that half-hour at half-past 2 in the morning, and, according to the argument of his hon. Friend, no claim for compensation could be made; but let that half-hour, which would be practically useless, be abolished, and then the claim arose. He put it to the House and to his hon. Friend, whether he was not right in arguing that a claim of this sort was of the most technical character? And was the Legislature to be bound by such technicalities? A Court of Law might be bound by them. A Court had only to administer the law as it found it. It was bound to confine itself to the exact limits of the letter of the law. But the Legislature was not so bound. And when his hon. Friend told them that Parliament might reduce the hours of sale on any and every day in the week, and to any extent except total closing, and that, under such circumstances, no right to claim compensation existed on the part of the traders, he destroyed his whole case; for he reduced the claim to one of the purest technicality, which, however proper it might be for discussion in a Law Court, was wholly out of place before a Legislative Assembly. Parliament had over and over again interfered with and reduced the hours of sale. In doing so, it had probably, he might say certainly, interfered with the profits of the traders. No compensation was given in these cases. No compensation was even asked for, and, according to the doctrine laid down by his hon. Friend, no compensation could be claimed. Spirit traders took licences under the special condition and knowledge that Parliament could and would interfere with and regulate the hours of sale as it thought proper; and it was the merest special pleading to argue that although the Legislature could justly and, without granting compensation, close the houses on every day in the week with the exception of half-an-hour, and could fix that half-hour at a time when most people would be in bed, yet it could not close the houses for that half-hour without a justifiable claim for compensation arising. His hon. Friend's own admission proved that he could not be really in earnest in making this proposal. If the opponents of the Bill really believed there was any case for compensation, would they not have brought it forward at an earlier stage of the measure, instead of some of the Amendments, which he was going to say were of a very trumpery character, or, at all events, which were of minor importance, as compared with that which the hon. Member had how submitted? Under these circumstances, it would be impossible to accede to the proposal of the hon. Member for Westmeath, a proposal which, if the House were in Committee, they would not think of sanctioning.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said, he should support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. P. J. Smyth), because he considered it was a reasonable proposition. There were plenty of precedents to show that this was a case in which compensation should be given. It was true that the Forbes-Mackenzie Act was an instance to the contrary. He did not see how, as the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) had done, they could draw a parallel between shortening the hours of sale and stopping the sale altogether. The argument that, if the houses were allowed to open for half-an-hour in the middle of the night, it would meet the objection, was childish. That would not compensate the trader for his loss. There were many precedents for compensation being given in a case of this kind, and he did not see why the House should deviate from it in this instance. His hon. Friend had complained because this proposition was not brought forward earlier; but the fact was, the hon. Member for Westmeath did bring it forward, and the Speaker ruled that he was out of Order. With regard to precedents, he would take the House back to the period of the abolition of Slavery. That was a trade abhorred by every Englishman; but notwithstanding that, when the planters were being deprived of only one-fourth of the labour which they got from their slaves, they were awarded £20,000,000 compensation. And yet it was now proposed to deprive 17,000 or 18,000 men in Ireland, who were legally licensed to carry on a certain business, and from which a large portion of the Revenue of this country was derived, of one-seventh of their trade, and they were to be refused compensation. In some of the country places, a mile or two away from the towns, nearly one-half of the business was done on Sundays, and in these cases it was altogether wrong to say that the retailers of drink were being deprived of one-seventh of their trade. They would probably be deprived of one-half their trade if this Bill passed. As to the abolition of Slavery, Sir Robert Peel, in supporting the measure for compensation, said, that they were depriving the planters of one-fourth of the labour of their slaves, and—

> "Should the House turn round upon them, with a view of defeating their claim to compensation, it might, indeed, be empowered to do so; but we should incur an imputation upon our good faith such as had never been previously equalled."

Parliament was, in his opinion, bound to make the planter full compensation. Mr. Stanley, in making the proposal on behalf of the Government, said, the object was—

> "To advance to the planters a loan of £15,000,000 sterling, in consideration of the sacrifice on their part of the fourth of the labour of their slaves."

The proposal of a loan was afterwards abandoned, and a grant of £20,000,000 was voted by Parliament as compensation. Then, again, he would refer to the railway system. When land was taken for the purpose of a railway, it was incumbent upon the promoters of the line to pay not only for the value of the land absolutely required, but to give compensation for injury which might be caused to property adjacent to the railway. Then there was the Army Regulation Act. It was declared illegal by the Act of *Geo.* III., for any officer to give one single shilling over the regulated price for his commission; and yet, when the Army Regulation Act was passed, they were allowed the full price paid for their commissions. Then, when the

Irish Church Act was passed full compensation was given to every person, down to the youngest juniors, for the loss sustained by the passing of that Act. And, again, in the case of the Irish Land Act, the right of compensation was admitted to such an extent as to include even compensation for improvements. There was nothing which could be brought forward in which that House had not for centuries given compensation when any person was being deprived of his right, and yet it was now proposed to abolish one-seventh part, and in some cases much more, of the trade of 17,000 or 18,000 persons in Ireland, without giving them any compensation whatever. Would the House sanction such an injustice? Hon. Gentlemen from the North of Ireland might be anxious to pass this Bill; but they should, at least, be just, and not pass it at the expense of those who were getting their living by this trade. His hon. Friend the Member for Roscommon appeared to think more of this Sabbatarian measure than he did of the Irish Education Bill, respecting which he refused to give way when his own Bill was brought up on Report. It might be as well to remind the House of the working of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act in Scotland; and he would quote from *The Scotsman*, one of the highest authorities on the subject. An hon. Member from Scotland, whose name he would not mention, had told the House of Commons that "No one in the North now questioned the value of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act," whereupon *The Scotsman* said—

> "There are a great many people here who question its 'value,' and there are none whose statements with regard to the general condition of the country do more to put the 'value' of that piece of legislation in a questionable light than those who support the attempt to coerce the population into sobriety. They never open their mouths to speak upon this subject without deploring the enormous increase that is taking place in the drunkenness of the country, and producing statistics to prove that such is the case. So many more gallons of whisky are being consumed per head of the population, so many more arrests for drunkenness are being made by the police, such and such an increase per cent is taking place in female intemperance, &c. We are all only too familiar here with the thrilling and three times thrice-told tale. But then, all the time that this frightful development of national debauchery has been proceeding, the Forbes-Mackenzie Act has been hard at work restricting the hours of daily drinking, and extinguishing entirely the sale of drink during the seventh part of the year, that seventh part, moreover, being the very part during which it is supposed drinkers would be most at leisure and disposed to indulge their propensity. English and Irish Members of Parliament point to this fact, and contend that if Scotland, with the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, is, on the showing of its most ardent temperance reformers, outstripping in drunkenness the respective countries which have no Forbes-Mackenzie Act, the evidence is not in favour of that Act."

He maintained that similarly, after a very short trial, the evidence would not be in favour of the Act in Ireland either. The people would be driven to drink in private and shebeen houses, over which the police had no control, and the consequence would be greater demoralization and increased drunkenness. *The Scotsman* proceeded—

> "How was this argument met? By quoting from the Edinburgh Police Returns to show that fewer people are found drunk in the streets on Sunday since the Forbes-Mackenzie Act closed the public-houses. That may be true; but it does not meet the allegation that since the Forbes-Mackenzie Act shut the public-houses on Sundays, the Scotch people have taken to drinking more than ever, and much more than the Irish or English, on other days of the week."

He maintained, without fear of contradiction, that the same result would obtain in Ireland if this Bill passed. He could assert as a positive fact that in those parts of Ireland where the Sunday closing of public-houses was carried out voluntarily, there was a larger amount of drunkenness than in places where the voluntary closing system was not adopted.

> "If," continued the article, "an advocate will insist upon being guided by the statistics, he ought to be of opinion that if the Forbes-Mackenzie Act protects the Sundays, it abuses the other days, and if it is good for Sabbatarian purposes, it is not good for real temperance purposes."

So this Bill might be good for promoting Sabbatarian ideas; but it would not further the cause of temperance. If the intention of the promoters of the Bill was to promote temperance, they would have proposed to close public-houses on some other day in the week in which there was more drunkenness, for it had been shown, over and over again, that in Ireland Sunday was the one day in the week on which there was less drunkenness than on any other day. The Government had exempted from the operation of the Bill the five large towns where there was the largest amount of drunkenness. They said, in effect—"We know you want to get drunk in the large towns, and we will leave you to do it; but in the country places, where you don't want to get drunk, we will close the public-houses, and not allow you to get drunk." So much for the consistency of the Government.

> "If it is good for Sabbatarian purposes, it is not good for real temperance purposes. May there not be some connection of cause and effect between these two inferences? If a nation is drilled into the superstition that temperance is simply a sort of 'Sabbath' propriety, may they not be disposed to put it off with their Sunday clothes? The Forbes-Mackenzie Act virtually says—'Six days shalt thou drink,' and it seems to be taken at its word."

What rational argument could be given for the view that people should be more sober on the Sabbath than at other times? The eloquence of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) and of the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) had not shown that temperance would increase if this Bill passed. The House had never heard what the Bill was really intended for. They suspected it was a Sabbatarian measure, and not one in the interests of temperance; because if it were in the interests of temperance it would propose the closing of public-houses, not on the most sober day of the week, but on the most drunken days, and at fairs, markets, and so forth.

> "And yet," concluded the article in *The Scotsman*, "what else is the meaning of Sunday closing? Legislation based on Pharisaism will never make a people better or morally stronger. All that it does is to foster the common enough tendency to believe that sham solemnity, skin-deep virtue, and moral whitewash, in some way or other make up for the want of that simplicity, veracity, and seriousness of character which are indispensable to self-control or any other genuine excellence. Forbes-Mackenzieism has every appearance of being more decorous than wholesome."

He hoped the House would have too much respect for itself to allow such a tyrannical and unjust Bill as that now before them to be run through the House of Lords in three or four days at the end of the Session. At any rate, he hoped the House of Lords would have too much respect for itself to allow it to pass in that way. In Newcastle West, in his own county, 11,059 persons, chiefly working men, had petitioned against this Bill, while the Petition in its favour was signed by only 450 names, notwithstanding the fact that the paid agents of the Alliance were there for two days canvassing for signatures. He did not see that many Petitions in favour of the Bill had been presented, either by the hon. Member for Roscommon (The O'Conor Don), or the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan), and yet those hon. Members thought they had a right to force this Bill upon the people. He admitted that there were a large number in Ireland who were in favour of this Bill, but they were, for the most part, those who would not be affected by it. They were men who never had to resort to public-houses at any time, having well-stocked cellars of their own. A good deal had been said about the Petitions in favour of this Bill. These were got up by pious old ladies of the Moody and Sankey type, and by Sunday school teachers, who got little boys and girls to sign their names without their knowing in the least what they were signing. He challenged the promoters of the Bill to produce a single Petition on their side signed by *bonâ fide* working men and women, who would be inconvenienced by the passing of this Bill. Out of 24 Petitions presented during one week in favour of this measure 13 came from places in England; and out of 11 similar Petitions presented in another week, 10 came from England and Scotland. If the promoters of the Bill would consent to drop it for the present Session, he would challenge them to hold public meetings on the question during the Recess, to have a disinterested person appointed as umpire, and the votes of the people taken, and he promised that if the promoters of Sunday closing had a majority in their favour he would not next Session raise his voice in opposition to the Bill. But he felt that he was not representing a class in that House. He did not belong to either Whigs or Tories, but was a representative of the people, and quite as much of non-electors as of electors; and he felt that he should not be discharging his duty honestly and fairly to those non-electors if he allowed this Coercion Bill to pass without, not merely protesting against it, but without using every means in his power to defeat it; because, view it as they would, it was as much a Coercion Bill as the Crimes and Outrages Bill. The position of the Government was most inconsistent. They would not admit that the Bill was theirs, and yet they gave greater facilities for passing it than he ever remembered to have been given to any other private Bill. They had given to its promoters three clear days, and only on the preceding day they were led to suppose that the Government intended to proceed with Business of their own that day, but when the House met they found this private Member's Bill first on the Paper. It was entirely unprecedented for the House to be discussing such a measure on a Saturday. He gave every credit to the temperance party, because they were sincere and zealous in trying to convert the people from drunkenness; but he gave no credit to the Sabbatarian element, which was the backbone of this Bill. He believed they cared very little about the temperance party or about the demoralization of the people of Ireland. Their idea was to introduce the Scotch Sabbatarian system into Ireland. In many of the country districts in Ireland the sale of intoxicating liquors formed only a small portion of the trade of the shopkeepers. They sold all sorts of things—tea and sugar, bread and butter, powder and spades, and almost everything that could be mentioned. Under this Bill these people would be obliged to close their shops altogether, even against the sale of groceries; because if a policeman found any customer on licensed premises during prohibited hours, he could proceed against him and secure a conviction. He would only say, in conclusion, that he hoped the House of Lords would not so far stultify itself as to hustle this Bill through at this late period of the Session.

MR. WHEELHOUSE deeply regretted, for the sake of the Speaker and also of the officers of the House, that they should have been called upon to sit on Saturday for any purpose whatever, and more especially for that upon which they were now assembled, and for that reason he would endeavour to shorten any observations he had intended to make as much as possible. So far as the question of compensation was concerned, he did not propose to add one word to the arguments which had been advanced, and which he thought were both convincing and conclusive. He would deal with the third reading of this Bill, and with its antecedents and concomitants. This measure was about as undesirable as any that could be presented to a Legislature; and he ventured to assert that there was no body of a governmental character in Europe, with the exception of that of Great Britain, which would for a moment have entertained it. Personally, it did not matter to him what became of this Bill. Not one of its promoters would be affected by its passing, and probably that was the case also with nearly everyone who had the honour of a seat in that House. They were not going to shut up their own cellars or deprive themselves of a single glass of wine. They were not going to allow the Legislature to deal with them and their tastes, to say nothing of their interests. The object of the promoters of this Bill was to deal with a class infinitely below them—a class that could not speak for itself in that House to the same extent as the promoters could. To pass a measure of this kind was to deal with one class as if they were different beings from those occupying another station in life. He did not believe in class legislation, or in interfering with a man's domestic relations and habits in any way so long as he did not bring himself within the restraint of the criminal law. To tell a man that such legislation as this was not intended to coerce him and would be no interference with his rights, was to tell him what was at variance with the truth. He did not agree with teetotalers or their principles, and in that disagreement he was supported by nineteen-twentieths of the world at large. Under those circumstances was he to give up his views, was he to be coerced in his action by a body of people for whose views he had not the slightest approximation to respect, and who sought, at all times and under all circumstances, to force what they called their principles—what they meant by their principles he scarcely knew—absolutely down the throat of everyone who differed from them? What had been the conduct of the Government with regard to this Bill? In the first instance, the House was told that certain facilities would be afforded for passing it. Then the Government said that perhaps a day might be given. That day was given. Then after that, another day was appropriated to it; and now, at the last moment, when the opposition—which had been most legitimately conducted on principle from beginning to end—seemed in the ordinary course about to be successful, an opposition which would have given further time to see whether this Bill really was or was not desired in Ireland, the Government of the country—no, not the Government of the country, but certain Members of the Government, it being doubtful whether even a majority on the Treasury Bench—by a course of action as unprecedented as it was possible to conceive, caused the House to assemble on a Saturday morning at the close of the Session for the express and sole purpose of forcing this measure through the House if possible. It was only now that the House had learned from the Treasury Bench—the Members of which were at this moment conspicuous by their absence—that this Bill, which was originally a private Member's Bill, had been taken up by the Government. Surely, in all fairness, the Government ought to have given an earlier intimation of their policy. If the opponents of the Bill had been told that, at whatever cost and under whatever circumstances, the Treasury Bench was determined, after the principle of the Bill had been sold to the Government, to pass the wasted remnant of the measure, they could have understood such conduct, since, at all events, it would have been fair, open, and above-board. But what were the facts with regard to this Saturday Sitting? Last night the inference drawn from the statements of the Government was that to-day's Sitting was required for the Telegraphs Bill, and this morning hon. Members were astonished to find that this Bill had been postponed for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill, in order that the latter might be forced through the House. That was not just, it was not right, and, what was more, the means by which this had been effected would recoil on the heads of those who used them. They were told that the measure had been practically accepted by the House, and in reply he would call attention to the state of the Benches on both sides at the present moment. This Bill, if it passed at all, would pass by a scratch vote, and the Government would have done more to estrange and alienate its own supporters than any Government ever did before. They were told that this measure in some way or other was for the good of the people. ["Hear, hear!"] That sentiment was cheered by the only occupant at the present moment of the Government Bench. But in what way, and under what circumstances, would it benefit the people? It might be an intention to carry out certain principles in given ways; but to tell him that it was for the good of the people, to say that no single human being keeping within the law should have the opportunity of taking that which he thought reasonable, that which he thought necessary, at reasonable times and under reasonable circumstances, Sunday though it be, was to tell him what a child might be induced to believe, but what no man of full age would credit for one moment. Good of the people! [Mr. C. S. PARKER: Hear, hear!] Why should the House legislate for the alleged good of the people in matters in which the people could legislate very much better for themselves than the hon. Member for Perth, or anybody else? Then it was said that there had been a large number of Petitions presented in favour of the Bill; but it was one of the abuses of the right to petition to cover the floor of the House with Petitions got up by organizations — teetotal, Sabbatarian, or otherwise. He repeated, that the floor of the House had been deluged with Petitions signed by children in Sunday schools, who could not know anything about the merits of the question, and whose signature was strongly requested, if not absolutely demanded, of them. He maintained that this Bill did a substantial injustice to all publicans who had seven-day licences. No one doubted the power of the Government to do anything it pleased, to confiscate pretty nearly every vested interest, and to deal with any individual or right by Statute; but it was a wholly different matter to say that the Government was justified in so acting; and he was thankful to say there was an outside public which judged of the acts of the Government always carefully, sometimes partially, but, at the same time, with a knowledge, perhaps better than those in the House, as to who were the wire-pullers on occasions such as these. Could anyone doubt that this was a wire-pulling business from beginning to end—that there were people outside who were trying to force this Sabbatarian legislation upon Ireland? If they were right in trying to do so, who should deny that it was equally right to force precisely similar legislation on England? Why did not the Government give the teetotal organization facilities for introducing and passing similar legislation for England? If the teetotal organizations themselves had a particle of principle left, let them attempt to carry a similar Bill for England! Why deal with the matter piecemeal? The answer was clear—that no Government dare accept the proposition for Sunday closing in England. But the laws of the two countries were based upon the same principle, and, therefore, what was good for Ireland must also be good for England. This Bill was called a Sunday Closing Bill, but it was no such thing. It was a measure which, in the first instance, was emasculated, then it was eviscerated, and now it only remained a skeleton of dry bones. He would tell the House why the five large towns were excluded from the operation of the Bill. It was because it was perfectly well known that any attempt at Sunday closing in those towns would have caused such a *furore* throughout Ireland, that through the instrumentality of those cities an agitation fatal to the success of the Bill would have taken place. Why should the man of Belfast not be treated like the man of Armagh? Why should not the man in county Antrim be treated similarly to the inhabitant of county Clare? The standard of the Bill was deserted, the principle cut adrift, and the Bill now simply sought to coerce the peasant population in places where there was no need of a measure of this description; while the large towns, which, if any, were the places that needed restrictive legislation most, were left out of the operation of it altogether. The consequence of this Bill would be the result that had followed the Forbes-Mackenzie Act in Scotland. There would be secret, illicit, and constant consumption of intoxicants, and the shebeen houses would largely increase. Could anyone doubt for a moment that there would be illicit distilleries multiplied without end, and all over Ireland a man with a keg of spirits moving about here, there, and everywhere over the vast moorlands and mountain sides and, he regretted to add, uncultivated wastes of Ireland? That such would be the consequence was as palpable as that the sun shone on a cloudless midsummer morning. In conclusion, the hon. and learned Member denounced the Bill as class legislation, and characterized it as devoid of all fairness, equity, and justice.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he did not mean to enter into a discussion of the general question, as he understood the question was now narrowed to this point—should compensation be given to the publicans because of this Bill? The hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. P. J. Smyth) had noticed the fact that no compensation had been given to the Scotch publicans when the Forbes-Mackenzie Act was passed, and he got rid of that difficulty by saying the systems of licensing in the two countries were not analogous. He, as a Scotch Member who knew something of the English and Irish system of licensing, asserted that they were analogous, and that, in so far as they differed, the claim of the Scotch publican for compensation was much stronger than that of the Irish publican. Before the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, the Scotch publican was able, if he liked, to keep his house open for 20 out of the 24 hours of Sunday, the only hours during which he was bound to close being the hours of public worship—from 11 to 1 and 2 to 4. Now, he understood the publicans in Ireland could only keep their houses open for seven hours on Sunday at present. The hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Sullivan) was pleased, in support of his argument, to make certain statements in reference to Scotland. But one part of the hon. Member's statement completely upset the other, for while he contended that drunkenness had increased since the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, he forgot that drunkenness could not be produced without whisky or some other intoxicating drink. If, then, there was more whisky consumed now than before the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, where was the grievance of the publican? People could not get whisky by dipping a pitcher into a running stream. They must go to the dealers and buy it. If, therefore, it had been a consequence of the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act that more trade was now done in the six days than was formerly done in seven, Parliament, instead of having done the publicans any harm, had been their benefactor by liberating them, and their families and servants, from labour one day in seven, and yet letting them enjoy the same income as before the change took place. The hon. Member had quoted, from a newspaper published in the city he (Mr. M'Laren) represented, an assertion that drunkenness and the consumption of spirits had greatly increased in Scotland since the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act. It might be true—and he (Mr. M'Laren) believed it was true—that on other days of the week than Sunday there were more police cases than there were before the passing of that Act; and, for anything he knew, it might also be the fact that there was more whisky consumed than before the passing of the Act. But account must be taken of the increase of population. The population of Edinburgh before the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act was about 161,000, and now it was about 217,000. Thus, while there had been an increase of more than 50,000 in the population, there had been comparatively little increase in the amount of drink consumed, and not a great increase in the number of police cases arising from it. But the question was not a comparison of the absolute number of cases with a small population and with a large population, but the proportion which the cases bore to the population at the different periods; and if they took that test, they would probably find that there had been rather a diminution in the amount of drinking in Scotland since the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act. There was a more striking example in the case of Glasgow. It was said there were more cases of drunkenness in Glasgow now than before the passing of that Act; but the population of Glasgow had within that time increased by 200,000. Did those 200,000 persons drink no whisky, produce no police cases, and was profligacy unknown amongst them? They must make it a question of proportion, and if they did this they would probably find that there was less drunkenness and fewer police cases now than before the public-houses were closed on Sundays in Scotland. The more they examined into the subject, the more manifest would they find the benefits of the Act. There was another qualification which the hon. Members left out of sight altogether, and which it was indispensable to include in any fair compromise. It was well known that the workmen, having had exceptionally prosperous times and high wages within the last few years, had spent a great proportion of those wages in drink; whereas, in times prior to the recent commercial prosperity, the wages were lower, and they were not able to spend so much as they had recently done in that way. This was proved by the fact that the Excise Returns had been falling off during the present year, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) was consequently alarmed at the extent of the decrease in the Revenue. Had this arisen from the spread of temperance principles? By no means; it had arisen from the fact that the workmen had not now so much money to buy drink with as they had in recent years. This point was one of great importance in arriving at a safe conclusion on this class of questions. He would not enter further into the subject, as he sympathized with the Speaker, who had been in the Chair so long, and he (Mr. M'Laren) would not be a party to prolonging that cruelty towards him by continuing the discussion.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY believed that the time for opposition to the Bill had passed away. He had himself been an opponent of the Bill; but those who opposed it had lost opportunities in the earlier phases of its introduction and discussion in this House for opposing it more effectually than was possible now. He had lately regarded the passing of this Bill as a foregone conclusion, and consequently had avoided occupying the time of the House to no purpose. The hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. P. J. Smyth) had raised a very important question in the right of the sellers of drink to be recompensed for the loss of a portion of their trade, which was a question affecting not only the sellers, but also those engaged in the production of the drink. It was, however, a question which could not be fully discussed on the third reading of this Bill, as it would require far more time than was likely now to be devoted to its consideration. It had, too, been neglected when the Bill was before the House earlier in the Session, and at this late period was only now presented in its full light. If a division were taken on the question now, it could not well be re-opened at a future time. He suggested to the hon. Member for Westmeath that he would better serve the purposes of justice, and better carry into effect any claim which might underlie his Motion, by not now proposing to take a division on the point. The Bill ought to be allowed to be read a third time, and next Session a Committee might be moved for to inquire into the foundation of this claim, which was made on behalf of the people whose trade was proposed to be diminished by the Bill.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN: I have no desire to resume this moribund discussion. I believe it to be impossible to carry out successfully any opposition to this Bill. A large number of Members of this House owe their places to a trade agitation, and it seems to me that a large number of them who have felt galled at being returned to Parliament by such an influence have taken the first opportunity of showing a kind of mock independence of all trade interests; and that, caring little for Irish peasants and Irish citizens, they have rushed forward with the highly moral sentiments that have so much distinguished them in the course of this Bill, but which were not exhibited by them at the hustings during the elections of 1874, to assist in ensuring its passing. I should have thought that in a question of such great social import they would have examined it a little, and that they would have exhibited the true qualities of statesmanship by extending their views to England as well as to Ireland. They have not done this; but, the Bill being an Irish Bill, they have, perhaps, proceeded on the safe maxim, *Fiat experimentum in corpore vile.* They have determined to try their nostrum in Ireland—but with what intention? First, they asked a number of enthusiasts in that country, whose honesty I have never impugned, their views on this subject; but, instead of asking the people who were to be affected by it, they said—"No, there is an hon. Gentleman at the head of the temperance society in such and such a place; there is another gentleman who presides over the Sabbath arrangements in such and such another place in the North of Ireland; and another gentleman who directs the movements of the Presbyterian body in another place. These are the gentlemen we will inquire of, and we will disregard the humble man, in whose name we profess to act." I have ventured before to express this opinion in the House. I have said that a time would come when hon. Gentlemen would regret the course they are now taking with this Bill. The whole question seems, at this stage, however, to have practically resolved itself into a pure question of trade; and, that being so, the House did surely feel that if it interferes with any vested interest, it should have a fair regard for that interest. Instead of that, what do we see, however? The hon. Gentlemen who represent in England the publican's interest are conspicuous by their absence. There is not a borough in Yorkshire, or in London, or in the South of England, interested in the present Bill, that would not look around in vain for its supporters of the interests of the trade. My hon. Friend who has just spoken has advised the adjournment of the question he has raised to the limbo of a coming Session for investigation by an impossible Committee. I would say to my hon. Friend the Member for Westmeath, however, if he means business, that if he can find only three Members to follow him into the Lobby, to insist upon a division upon the equitable principles he wishes to assert. He should do so, if only to protest against the principle of this Bill in that respect. Many times have I known the same demand made when the Land Question has been under consideration. We had the demands for compensation from owners of land. They said—"Is the British Parliament not going to pay us what we gave for our properties? Remember what we did for maintaining British interests and British opinion. Give us something for our interest, which is of great value." Well, my hon. Friend near me has made that appeal for a much smaller interest, and he is told to pass it by as something not worth discussion. It may not be worth discussion—probably it is not—but it is worth a division, and if my hon. Friend goes to a division I shall heartily support him.

Mr. SHAW: Sir, I have felt it my duty to protest against this Bill at every stage, and I protest against it now, at its final one in this House—against its principle, and against its conception. I agree with the hon. Gentleman who has last spoken in advising the hon. Mover of the Amendment to go to a division upon it. I advise him to do so, because it will show that in persisting in their intention of putting their hands into the poor man's pocket the promoters of this Bill will not listen to reason or justice. This Bill, instead of bearing the title it does, should be entitled "A Bill for Promoting the Domestic Consumption of Liquor in Ireland." In Scotland, the effect of the very same measure has been to increase private drinking in the homes of the people. I know Ireland well, and whisky is an expensive article for the common people, who can only use it on exceptional occasions. On ordinary days I have found it impossible to get it in country public-houses; but the effect of this Bill would be to drive the people into the habit of whisky drinking, and to check the use of beer as an article of growing consumption in the South of Ireland. If the Government had told us that they meant to take up this Bill, we should have known where we were, and we might have fought it out. They did not do that, but said they would "give facilities" for it. We now see, however, that if only the requisite pressure can be brought to bear on the Treasury Bench they will do anything. I never remember so much time wasted on any Bill before, and all for the want of decision on the part of those who conduct Public Business in this House. I have myself a right to complain. The Local Courts of Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill has been thrown overboard for this wretched bit of sentimentality, which the Irish people have not asked for, and which they will fling from themselves with disgust as soon as they come to understand it. There is also the Grand Juries Bill, a Bill of the greatest importance to Ireland, which has been lost for the hours and the days which have been wasted upon this abortion of a Bill. I strongly advise my hon. Friend to go to a division upon his Motion, though I shall not attach much importance to the mere numerical result.

Mr. MURPHY: Sir, it is not my intention to detain the House with any lengthened observations in relation to the Motion now before it, the more so as the part I have taken in this Bill is already well known, and, perhaps, too well known, to many hon. Members. I do not think, indeed, that I could say very much in reference to it without stating again many things which I have already said on the subject; but I cannot help saying that I think, as regards the whole course of this Bill, and in relation to the conduct of it during the last two years, Her Majesty's Government should have given some certain indication as to what that conduct would have been. If, in 1876, without any facts before them, or anything from the promoters to induce them to affirm the principle of the Bill, Her Majesty's Government, who voted against it at that time, had said they objected to it, and would continue to object to it, that would have been all very well that Session. But it would be in the recollection of the House that when, at the end of that Session, the hon. Member in charge of the Bill got up and asked the Government for facilities for passing its second reading, the right hon. Baronet the then Chief Secretary for Ireland said emphatically—

> "We cannot see, at this period of the Session, that it is possible to do anything of the kind. All I can say is, that if between this and the next Session of Parliament the Government do consider this matter, they will consider the whole subject *de novo*."

In 1877, when the Bill was again brought in, we saw how the Government had re-considered the Bill. It was referred to a Committee to consider the propriety of exempting five principal towns from its operation, although the Chief Secretary had previously intimated that all towns exceeding 10,000 inhabitants should be exempted. Without any inquiry, without entering into any possible investigation as to how the rest of the country was to be treated, the Committee confined the inquiry altogether to these five towns, and the Government then said—"If our Amendments are accepted, we shall give facilities for the passing of the Bill." I do not think that the course adopted has been consistent or logical. If the exemption was good, it was good for all; if it was bad, it was bad for all. I will not trouble the House further on this subject. Let me now say that what I rise for principally is to enter my protest against the passing of this Bill in any shape. I wish to renew my protest against the principle enunciated by this Bill, which has not been asked for by those whom it affects. The Bill notoriously proceeds from an organized confederacy, not belonging to the Irish people, but apart from, and separated from them. This is a measure begotten, I believe, under a combination of self-interest, misinformation, and misdirected zeal, brought forth in an atmosphere of self-complacency, and nurtured and fed and swollen into preposterous dimensions by an artificial *pabulum* miscalled "public opinion;" created, manufactured, and manipulated by the well-paid zeal of officials, and of the peripatetic stipendiary Apostles of an organized confederacy. It is not a measure emanating from the Irish people, or asked for by them. It is a measure, on the contrary, that is certain to be received by them with soreness and indignation, a measure that will be evaded, a measure that is not defended even by its own promoters, and which the House is not asked to pass as an ordinary measure in the ordinary way, but a measure which has been pressed forward on the one single representation that it was called for by the people of Ireland. I shall not now go into the proofs I have given over and over again that Sunday is the day on which there is least intemperance in Ireland; next, that this Bill would not, even if Sunday was the day of the greatest intemperance, attain the ends it has in view; and, thirdly, that so far from the mass of the Irish people desiring the Bill, it is notorious that the very contrary is the fact. Not the least attempt has been made to answer the objections I have urged against this Bill. The only argument I have heard on the part of those who support it is—"Why should a minority dare to defeat and control a majority?" An observation has been made by the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) with regard to the working of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act in Scotland, and I am sorry the hon. Member is not now in his place to hear my reply to him. Everyone knows that the advocates of Sunday closing passed that measure, not so much with the hope of restraining Sunday drunkenness, but professedly with a view of lessening the drinking habits of the people by making a break in the week during which drink would not be accessible. That desire, of course, was quite apart from the traditional respect of the Scottish people for Sunday. Now, an increase had taken place in the amount of drink in Scotland since the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, and the hon. Member for Edinburgh excused it by arguing that though the amount of drinking has increased, it has increased in a smaller ratio than the population. But I have in my hand the Report of the Grocers' Licensing (Scotland) Committee, laid before the House on the 26th of March last, and that Report states that there has been an increase of drunkenness throughout Scotland; and though that increase may be to some extent explained by the increase of population, as it has not increased in proportion to the increase of population, yet it has increased in certain places where the population has decreased. Now, I want to know how, with statistics picked out of one place and out of another place, it can be contended against such an authority that, notwithstanding the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, drunkenness has not increased in Scotland? What, indeed, are we to argue from these authorities, but that Sunday closing has not in any way tended to lessen the evil against which it was aimed? But I have figures here for the City of Glasgow which are absolutely startling. In the year 1854 the population of Glasgow was 360,000, and the number of persons arrested for drunkenness was 13,616. In the year 1874 the population had increased to 550,000, and the number of persons arrested to 30,606. Thus, while the population had not nearly doubled in the interval, the number of arrests for drunkenness had far more than doubled. I protest against this Bill, because I do not think that a Bill brought in by a private Member, and originated by means which I shall not refer to, has not received the consideration which it ought to do from Her Majesty's Government before they gave such extraordinary facilities for its passing, and also because they have not been made aware of the feelings of the Irish people on the subject. I agree that in the North of Ireland the people of the upper and middle classes are in favour of it. The Presbyterian and Scotch Sabbatarian element is also a powerful element of the support it has received, and the bulk of the educated classes of the North are anxious for the outward observance of the Sabbath. But that is no reason to justify the passing of a sumptuary law like this, which is not suited to the habits of the people—a law which cannot and will not be observed by them, and against which they have protested over and over again. I have only further to say that the opposition to this Bill has been founded on a deep sense of its unjust and arbitrary character, and that so small a number of hon. Members as constitute the minority would not have dared to raise such an opposition to it had they not felt themselves backed by the feelings of the people. What the effect of this Bill will be time will show; and if, as I apprehend, its consequences will be unfortunate, that it will increase rather than decrease drunkenness among the people, I cannot conceive that its present promoters and supporters will resist the demand for its repeal.

Mr. ONSLOW: Sir, the opponents of this Bill have now raised as strong a protest against its passing as, in my own judgment, I think is right; and, having done so, I would urge on those hon. Gentlemen who, like myself, are opposing it, to allow a division to be come to at once, and though, of course, we shall be beaten, yet it will be an indication that to the very last we had not changed our views. It is very hard that we should have to come here to-day, and we must all feel that the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair has been subjected to very great inconvenience. It is impossible for us, however, consistently with the views we hold with regard to this Bill, to give even an implied sanction to it. Her Majesty's Government have taken a very unusual course in allowing it to be taken to-day at all. We discussed that question last night, however, and I am not going to resume it now. I have not opposed the Bill in view of the interests of any particular class of the community. I wish once more to state that most distinctly. I have not taken up the cudgels merely on behalf of the publican interest, though I know that has been the reason alleged, and no doubt will be alleged, outside this House. I have opposed it on the higher ground of its being a coercive and restrictive measure, affecting exclusively the middle and lower classes of society; and as long as I have a seat in this House I shall oppose to the utmost of my powers a Bill which I consider so pernicious in its character. I think it is as bad a Bill as I have ever known introduced; but, at the same time, it is due to the dignity of the House and of the Chair that this debate should not be further protracted; and I would, therefore, earnestly ask hon. Gentlemen not to go on fighting the Bill any longer, but, having made the strongest protest against it in their power, to allow a division to be taken on the question at once.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 63; Noes 22: Majority 41.—(Div. List, No. 270.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

House adjourned at Three o'clock till Monday next.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Monday*, 12*th August*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Second Report*—Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod [No. 201].

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Municipal Corporations* (198); Metropolitan Commons* (199); Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland)* (200); Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland)* (197).

*Second Reading* — Arranmore Polling District (Ireland)* (189).

*Committee — Report* — Marriages (Fiji)* (195); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (170); Prison (Officers' Superannuation)* (184).

*Third Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland)* (168); Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) (190); Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3)* (128), and *passed.*

### ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE HAMPSHIRE RIFLE VOLUNTEERS.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Viscount BURY said, that he had to ask their Lordships' indulgence while he made an explanation in regard to something that occurred the other night. It would be in their Lordships' recollection that a noble Lord, who was not then in his place (Lord Truro), asked him a Question in regard to the conduct of the commanding officer of a battalion of the Hampshire Volunteers towards the adjutant of that regiment, Captain

Cope. Their Lordships would always treat with indulgence any noble Lord when he addressed them upon a subject that involved the honour of one of Her Majesty's officers, and, therefore, there was no necessity to vindicate the conduct of the noble Lord who had brought this subject before them, and who, he was glad to see, had now entered the House. In the course of his remarks the other night, in answer to the noble Lord, who accused the War Office of having acted with undue harshness towards Adjutant Cope, he made use of the following words, which would be in the recollection of their Lordships. He said—"He was bound to add that if any error in judgment had been committed, it was not in the direction of undue severity towards Captain Cope. If Captain Cope had been an adjutant of a Regular regiment instead of a Volunteer corps, he would decidedly have been brought to a court martial, and in all probability cashiered." By using those words, "he would have been brought to a court martial, and in all probability would have been cashiered," he (Viscount Bury) had, he regretted to say, wounded the feelings of Sir William Cope, the father of Adjutant Cope, who was himself a distinguished soldier, and whose feelings he would be the last man to wish to wound. He begged, therefore, if their Lordships would allow him, to recall those words; and he did so the more readily because he was giving the substance, as he believed, although not the exact words of the Report of the General Officer commanding the district (General Garvock), who had investigated the circumstances of the case. He had found, on subsequent reference, that those words, "tried by court martial and cashiered," did not appear in the General Officer's Report. He might have contented himself—and he regretted that he did not—with quoting the exact words which the commanding officer used. Those words were—

> "Were Captain Cope in the position of an ordinary adjutant of a Regular regiment there would be, as it seems to me, no difficulty in coming to a decision. He would, I think, merit the severest punishment for disobedience to orders and contempt of his commanding officer; but I understand an adjutant of Volunteers holds a different position."

He (Viscount Bury) made no comment on the last branch of the sentence, with which he could not say he altogether agreed, nor did the officers whom he had the honour to represent; but as regards the words which he desired to recall, he would, if their Lordships permitted him, substitute the words used by the General Officer commanding the district, and he regretted very much that he should have given pain to Sir William Cope by the use of those words which he had employed.

LORD TRURO said, he was quite certain Sir William Cope would appreciate the course that had been taken by the noble Viscount. He thought it but due to the War Department to say that if he had been informed of the real circumstances of the case he should have certainly dealt with it in a different manner to that in which he had. He had received a letter from Sir William Cope upon the subject, and he thought it but right to reply to it, stating that, in his humble judgment, the War Office had no alternative but to adopt the course they had pursued, and he was obliged to add that he thought, on the whole, his son was entirely in the wrong.

## LOCOMOTIVES ON HIGHWAYS (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 271.)

(*The Lord President.*)

### THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE presented a numerously-signed Petition from the Magistrates and Commissioners of Police of the Burgh of Govan, pointing out that in the English Act there was a clause the object of which was to secure the consumption of smoke by the locomotive engines travelling on the roads. In other respects he believed that the same provision was applicable, so far as Scotland was concerned, but the words were not inserted in this Bill. He should, therefore, with the permission of their Lordships, propose to insert them after the Bill had been read a third time.

Bill read $3^a$ (according to Order).

THE EARL OF REDESDALE then moved the insertion of words in Clause 5 rendering it compulsory the use of engines that would, as far as practicable, consume their own smoke, and imposing penalties for breach of the enactment. The noble Earl stated that the Amendment was in accordance with the prayer of the Petition that he had just presented to the House.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Lord DENMAN, in moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice, and which was the same as that which had been rejected in the Committee, pointed out that it might be necessary to stop the locomotives for a longer period of time during the summer and autumn than in the spring or winter, and stated that it would not do any injury whatever to the owners of locomotives. He hoped the noble Duke would be able to give a more favourable answer to this question; because, from the much greater number of locomotives in parts of Scotland than in any county of England, there was no necessity for dealing with the Scotch roads in the same manner as the English.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON said, that he could not accept the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived.*

Bill *passed;* and sent to the Commons.

## THE METROPOLITAN POLICE.

### OBSERVATIONS.

Lord TRURO rose, pursuant to Notice, to make some observations in regard to the Metropolitan Police Force. He begged to remind the House that when, upon a former occasion, he was about to do so, he was met by an objection from the noble Duke opposite that he was committing a breach of the Rules of the House by introducing the subject without having given Notice. Knowing the great latitude that was permitted in their Lordships' House, he did not think he was much in the wrong, because, in his view, irregularity was rather the rule of the House than otherwise; but finding that he was he had now given Notice, in order to set himself right with the House. In bringing forward this question, he should commence with the same words that he used on the former occasion—namely, that Her Majesty's Government being a Conservative Government, and following the traditions of all Conservative Governments, had exercised its natural instincts by never moving in the direction of the reform of any institution until it was thoroughly convinced that it absolutely required it. The reason that he made that very common-place observation was that when a Conservative Government did move he thought they might be well assured that there were very good grounds for that movement, and that with respect to the Metropolitan Police they might be well assured that any steps that might be taken towards its reform would not be taken without a thorough and searching inquiry. This matter of the Metropolitan Police had been before their Lordships once or twice during the last Session, and he did not propose to trouble them at any length; but he must apologize for the somewhat desultory nature of the remarks which he should venture to offer. Inasmuch as Her Majesty's Government had considered it proper to appoint a Committee to inquire into the reorganization of the Metropolitan Police Force, he thought it would be expedient to draw their attention to one or two general remarks previous to that Committee commencing its labours. Now, if there was one thing more important than another in relation to that Department it was that the heads of the Office should be men of vigour and energy, of experience, and of sound discretion; but, above all, what was absolutely essential for the management and control of such a Department was vigour and energy. It was a somewhat remarkable circumstance that in the Metropolitan Police Department there was no arrangement for compulsory retirement similar to that which was provided, always to the great advantage of the public, in other public Departments. In this there was no provision for men to retire at all, and, he believed, no pension. He could not help thinking that in these days, when in the whole of our great Public Departments they looked to the age of 60 years as being that at which, in the interest of the public service, men should retire from active service, it did seem extraordinary that the Metropolitan Police Department should be without that most reasonable provision. Taking all the Departments of the State there was, perhaps, not one which so much necessitated the possession in their full activity of the mental and bodily powers. Yet he believed that two out of the three gentlemen at the head of that Department were now verging on the age of 70. What the age of the other distinguished officer might be he did not undertake to say; but it must be obvious to their Lordships that the age of 70 was one but little suited to the requirements of such an office as the control of the Metropolitan Police Department. He would remind their Lordships that that Department had much more to do than the mere control of the police of the Metropolis, it being in constant connection, or if not constant, to a very great extent in connection with, similar Departments all over the country; and when their Lordships remembered that it involved constant correspondence with the police authorities of such cities as Bristol, Birmingham, Liverpool, and the like, they must confess the amount of labour that was thrown upon the Department must be immense. He, therefore, threw out for the consideration of the Committee on the re-organization of the Department, whether it was not desirable to take this matter into consideration; and, first of all, whether the gentlemen who were at the head of the Department were still endowed with the energy that was necessary to enable them to discharge the duties of the office, and, if not, whether it was not desirable in the interests of the public, as well as in the interests of the present heads themselves, who had served the public honestly and faithfully for many years, and were therefore entitled to, and no doubt would receive, the most liberal consideration on the part of the Government, should not retire, and make room for men who, being younger, must necessarily possess more bodily vigour? He now wished to make one observation in reference to the Departments themselves. They very often heard men talk about "time-honoured Departments;" but if there were time-honoured Departments, he must remind their Lordships that very frequently they were time-worn Departments, and time-worn Departments were often very proper objects of attack on the part of those who wished to see reforms carried into effect. Departing from that portion of the subject, he would call the attention of their Lordships to the fact that within the last few weeks there had been rumours of the existence of great discontent among the members of the Police Force themselves. The Committee which had been appointed would, no doubt, use their discretion in judging of the reasonableness of those complaints. They were three in number, two of which had been brought prominently before the public; but the third, which had not been mentioned, was, perhaps, the greatest grievance of the three. The one that was most prominent was the question of increased pay. Now, that was not so easy to deal with as they might imagine, for this reason. The ground on which the demand for increased pay was put forward was, that lodgings were so expensive. Now, as their Lordships knew, the area over which the police operated was very extensive, and it would be absurd to suppose that it was so expensive to live in the suburban districts as in those which he called the inner circle. Apart from that, he knew, as a fact, that in the inner districts of the Metropolis care was taken to have the most experienced, the most able, and the most energetic men; and, that being so, he considered the demands made by policemen in that district were entitled to greater weight than those which were made by the suburban police. But, on behalf of the public, it seemed to him that great discrimination should be used in dealing with this matter. They all knew that in public companies and large institutions, where there were a considerable number of men justly entitled by their superior ability and the circumstances in which they were placed to ask for a larger salary, yet it was the constant practice of the most incompetent to make a demand for higher payment. In some cases such a demand was complied with; but when the head of the firm or the manager of the company was a man of firmness as well as discretion, the first application was invariably refused, and it was only after repeated applications that the demand, in other cases, was granted when it was considered that the persons who made it were worthy of it. He could not help thinking that the public would be very unwise if they were led away by the notion that the men were underpaid, except in particular districts, and especially in what he had termed the inner circle of London. He reminded their Lordships that the expenses necessarily incurred by the Police Force were infinitely less in the suburbs than they were in the central parts of the Metropolis; while, at the same time, the men employed were, as a rule, of a superior character, and possessed of more ability. On that ground he did not object to their application for an increase of pay being carefully considered. Leaving for a moment the question of increased pay to the Police Force, he would just touch upon another point —namely, that which he might term the lodging question. As their Lordships were aware, there was recently an Act of Parliament passed, entitled the "Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Act," the object of which was that when large areas were cleared for Metropolitan improvements, provision should be made by the surveyors and architects who laid out the improvement schemes, to build houses sufficient for the accommodation of the population which had been displaced. He was aware that this Act had no direct bearing upon the question of the accommodation of the police; but he would suggest to their Lordships what had been suggested to him by men of great experience — namely, whether it would not be expedient to make use of the powers of this Act of Parliament to provide lodgings for the police in the shape of police barracks in those large areas in which it was proposed to build houses for the accommodation of the people who were displaced? He put it to them, whether it did not appear to be a most impolitic thing to mass together from 3,000 to 5,000, perhaps, of the class of persons who would be removed from their dwellings under this Act in one spot, without having some place provided for the police? Surely, it was not for the safety of the community at large that such bodies of people of this class should be massed together without any police control, merely because the existing sites upon which they lived had become more valuable and obtained higher rents than formerly? In his opinion, wherever the Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Act was brought into operation, police barracks for the accommodation of a certain number of both the single and married policemen should be erected. Even if this were not done, care might be taken to provide lodgings for the police in these districts at a small rent, and in some degree proportionate to their pay. There was another question which he thought was well deserving of the consideration of the Committee which had been appointed, and that was a re-adjustment of the night labour. At present, a policeman went on duty at 9 o'clock every night for a week together for 9 hours; and he could not help thinking that such continuous night work was injurious to the men, although he had heard it alleged that going on duty for three days and three nights alternately would affect the health of the policeman still more detrimentally than their going on night duty for a whole week. At all events, the Committee might inquire whether this was one of the causes of their discontent. The substantial grievance he looked upon with most concern was the fact that there was neither any pension or fixed period of retirement for the men; the result of which was, that they might serve the country most efficiently and faithfully for 25, 30, or even 40 years, and then, when they became old and unfit for further service, they might be turned adrift without any retiring pension whatever. His own view was in accordance with the practice which prevailed in the public Departments generally, that an officer should retire with a pension at 60. Leaving that portion of the subject, he would refer to another, which would, perhaps, interest the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and that was the necessity for altering the law with a view to give the police more protection than it at present gave them. It would, perhaps, rather surprise their Lordships when he told them that last year there were no less than 2,941 assaults on the Metropolitan Police Force; and he had it on good authority that in the previous year the assaults on the police numbered 2,894, some of them being of a very severe character. He, therefore, thought it but reasonable that some further protection should be afforded to them than they at present possessed. He need hardly mention any individual cases; but he thought that when medical students, coming out of a dancing saloon, considered it good fun to half knock the eye out of a policeman, it was time to give them some increased protection. There was very little punishment awarded to those who considered it good fun to strike a policeman, but who would regard it as the reverse of fun if a policeman struck them. He could not help thinking that stringent regulations were necessary to protect those whose duty it was to protect the public. He knew very well that many persons were apt to discredit the reports of the assaults made on the police, and it was on that account that he had stated the number of them; but, if the truth were known, that number was very much understated. He thought the best remedy for this evil was altogether to abolish fines, and substitute imprisonment for the offence of assaulting the police. With regard to the complaints of the police, he would like to say one or two words more with relation to the disadvantages under which they laboured in respect to the detection of crime. He did not think that their Lordships could be aware how extremely loose and defective the Metropolitan Police Act was with reference to pawnbrokers; and in looking into this subject he had obtained a copy of the Glasgow Police Act; and the perusal of that had convinced him that their Scotch neighbours had been more far-seeing than themselves, and they had taken care to introduce into their Police Act powers not only for the detection of crime and the arrest of suspected persons, but with reference to pawnbrokers, marine store dealers, and dealers in metals. In London, pawnbrokers were almost able to defy the law, and gave the police more trouble than any other class. He did not know whether their Lordships were aware of the fact, but there were a great many respectable pawnbrokers who were in the habit of keeping a melting-pot ready for the purpose of defacing and destroying plate, so as to prevent its identification, and not long ago he heard of an officer who wished to sell a gold epaulet, who was told by his tailor that if he would only wait two or three minutes he would go to a pawnbroker, get it melted, tell him the exact value, and give him the money. He thought it most discreditable that pawnbrokers should keep melting-pots ready to melt down stolen goods. He had even heard of a melting-pot being kept in a cab, and things being stolen at one end of the street being melted and defaced at the other in the cab. He was, therefore, of opinion that the whole of the law relating to the disposition of goods in the hands of pawnbrokers should be narrowly scrutinized. By the Glasgow Police Act power was given to enter dwellings on suspicion, but no such power existed in the Metropolitan Police Act. He thought it extremely desirable that there should be; and he heartily commended the subject to the attention of the Committee, being quite convinced that it would be for the advantage of the community if the police had power to enter houses from which any disorderly noises issued, or where they suspected any person who had committed a penal offence was harboured, and he assured their Lordships that those provisions had been found to be extremely effective in Glasgow. There was also a clause in the Police Act of 1866 which affected the pawnbrokers to the same extent, but he would not trouble their Lordships by reading it. While he sincerely congratulated the Government on the step which they had taken in the appointment of the Committee, he hoped it was only the prelude to the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole question of the Metropolitan Police, and see by what means they could be placed upon a more satisfactory and permanent basis. If the Government did not move for the issue of this Commission, he should do so himself. He desired inquiry particularly as regarded the relations between the city and borough and the county police. The jealousy which now existed between those bodies rendered it most difficult to discharge the duties efficiently; and, unless the police power could be concentrated in such a way as to act upon the whole country, they would not have such a force as they were entitled to. The relations at present existing were such as to prevent the detection of crime.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in the first place, acknowledged the compliment which the noble Lord in the outset of his remarks was good enough to pay to Her Majesty's Government, when he said that being a Conservative Government they were not in the habit of meddling with matters merely for the sake of interference, but that when real grievances were proved to exist they were both willing and desirous to inquire into them, and if possible provide a remedy. He apologized to the noble Lord if he thought that on a former occasion he acted with any want of courtesy in requesting him to postpone the remarks he was then commencing to make as being of an irregular character. He made that request because he considered it desirable that their Lordships should have some notice that the noble Lord intended to make observations on a subject which was of the very greatest importance to every person in the country. Therefore, he had looked at to-day's Notice Paper, to see what line of argument the noble Lord was about to enter upon; but he found only the very modest statement that the noble Lord would make some "observations" about the Metropolitan Police Force. He confessed reading that Notice did not prepare him for the very vast and wide subject upon which the noble Lord had entered. He would not, however, quarrel with the noble Lord, for perhaps, to a certain extent, his observations came within the terms of the Notice he had placed upon the Paper. His reply to those observations might be postponed until next Session; because the noble Lord had told them that he intended to re-open the whole subject next year by moving for the appointment of a Royal Commission. Now, the remarks of the noble Lord might be divided into two heads. First of all those which affected the Police Force itself, and those which referred to its organization and the gentlemen who were connected with the head Department. With regard to what had been said respecting the dwellings of the constables, and the Artizans Dwellings Act, that was, no doubt, a subject which would be considered by the Committee which had recently been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. They would be certain to enter upon an inquiry of that kind. And, again, as to the number of assaults committed upon members of the Police Force, no one could look upon them without expressing his horror at what the men were subject to, and it was worthy of consideration whether the law required to be further strengthened on that point. He guarded himself from saying that it would be possible to carry out anything of that kind; what he wished to say was, that it was a matter which could not altogether escape observation. Then, if the powers of search possessed by the police were not sufficient to enable them to properly discharge their arduous duties—duties which, in his opinion, they performed in a highly creditable manner—it might be desirable to increase those powers. The noble Lord had made some remarks about the pawnbrokers and marine store dealers, and he could not agree in his account of what he called a "respectable" pawnbroker, who had a smelting-pot always ready. He should have thought there were pawnbrokers in this city who would be above anything of that kind; and if they were guilty of such a thing they certainly would not come under the category of "respectable." And now as to the constitution of the head Department of the Police. The noble Lord found fault that the gentlemen who were connected with that Department—Sir Edmund Henderson, Captain Harris, and Colonel Labalmondiere — were men verging on 60 years of age.

LORD TRURO said, he never mentioned the name of Sir Edmund Henderson, and he stated that it had not been considered desirable to retain gentlemen in public Departments when they were near 70 years of age.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, if the noble Lord had not alluded to Sir Edmund Henderson, he must have referred to the two other gentlemen, and his argument respecting them was scarcely borne out by the facts in this and other cases. The eyes of the country had recently been directed to the Conference which had been going on in Germany, and he thought both Prince Gortchakoff and Prince Bismarck were nearer 70 than 60. The noble Lord would probably know the age of Mr. Gladstone, and he (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) was aware of the age of his noble Friend (the Earl of Beaconsfield), and none of those gentlemen, certainly not his noble Friend, showed any want of vigour or energy in the performance of the arduous duties imposed upon them; and if gentlemen of their age could carry out what they did, it was rather hard to say that the two gentlemen to whom he alluded in the head Department of the Police Force were not fit to carry out their work because of their age. He should not enter further into the subject. He had made these observations out of courtesy to the noble Lord; and he still adhered to the opinion that those who were at the head of the Metropolitan Police Force were perfectly competent and capable to carry out the duties imposed upon them with zeal and energy. No doubt the other points to which the noble Lord had alluded—such as superannuation, an increase in the powers of search, and the assaults on the police, were matters which were worthy of consideration.

### MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for consolidating enactments relating to Municipal Corporations in England—Was *presented* by The Lord Chancellor; read 1ª. (No. 198.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Three o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Monday*, 12*th August*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Thomas Garfit, esquire, *for* Boston.

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance [296]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).

*Committee—Report*—Inclosure Provisional Orders [192]; Telegraphs [257]; Territorial Waters Jurisdiction [137].

*Considered as amended—Third Reading*—Intermediate Education (Ireland) [275], and *passed.*

*Third Reading* — Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) * [295], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn* — Naval Discipline Act (1866) Amendment * [290]; Bankers' Books (Evidence) * [293].

### EASTERN AFFAIRS.

### HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

The COMPTROLLER of the HOUSEHOLD (Lord Henry Somerset) *reported* Her Majesty's Answer to the Address as followeth:—

*I thank you sincerely for your loyal Address. And I receive with great satisfaction the assurance of your cordial support in the course which I have pursued in order to secure Peace on permanent foundations, the independence of Europe, and the interests of My Empire.*

## QUESTIONS.

—∽o∽—

### INDIA—THE SALT TAX.—QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he will lay upon the Table the further Papers about levelling down the Bengal Salt Tax, and those, if any, about levelling up the Madras Salt Tax; and, if he will produce Papers to show the details of taxation in Madras, and other parts of India, by which it will be seen, as mentioned in the Financial Statement of 1877 (vide Hansard), that "Bengal is more lightly taxed and richer than any of the other Provinces;" and,

> "under the permanent settlement she (Bengal) paid eight millions less land revenue than she would pay if the land revenues were liable to revision?"

Mr. E. STANHOPE: The House has already ordered, upon the Motion of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), a Return of any Papers relating to the changes in the salt duty made in December last. As regards the recent reduction in Northern India, we have at present no Papers; but I hope to have an opportunity of giving an explanation to-morrow. With respect to the first statement made by my noble Friend the Vice President of the Council in his Financial Statement last year, I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to a speech of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, Sir Ashley Eden, in the Legislative Council, on the 27th of December, 1877, in which he described Bengal as advancing rapidly in wealth, and its people as "the most lighty taxed in all India." As to the second quotation made by the hon. and gallant Member, I can only say that it is a point which it is impossible to prove absolutely, and which must be more or less a matter of opinion. But if the statement should be challenged, I am very confident that my noble Friend would give to the House very good reasons for it.

### THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND).

### QUESTION.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If it be true that it is laid down as a general rule that no appointment to a resident magistracy in Ireland is made of persons over forty years of age; if so, how long this rule has been in force?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: It is not the case that any general rule has been laid down on this subject; but it is the opinion of the Lord Lieutenant that, generally speaking, it is not desirable to appoint gentlemen who exceed the age of 40 years.

### PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT—PRISON INSPECTORS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is the intention of the Government to select the Inspectors under the new Prisons Board from the Local Inspectors when they are found efficient?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: There are only three Inspectors of Prisons in Ireland to be appointed under the new Prisons Board. The local Inspectors, as the hon. Gentleman is aware, are a very numerous body, and they will be eligible, like all other persons, as candidates; but it is not the intention of the Government to confine it to them.

### INDIA—MYSORE.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If, in compliance with the Despatch of the Secretary of State, 16th April 1867, arrangements have been made for restoring a Native Administration in Mysore, by the time the Maharajah attains his majority in 1880?

Mr. E. STANHOPE: The arrangements have been long in progress for restoring Native rule in Mysore, and, though delayed by the Famine, will be completed in all material respects by the time the Maharajah attains his majority. There will be no objection to the production of the Papers, if the hon. Member will move for them.

### CUSTOMS—OUTPORT CLERKS. QUESTION.

Dr. CAMERON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the scheme for the reorganization of the Customs Department, according to which the ordinary terms of retirement under the Superannuation Act of 1859, are offered to the clerks in London, will apply as well to the out-port clerks?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: I can only repeat what I have already intimated to the House—that there is no intention on the part of the Government to offer to any officers of the Customs, in London or at the outports, terms of retirement other than those under the Act of 1859.

### CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ADVANCE. QUESTIONS.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any truth in the rumoured advance of Russian forces across the Oxus, or towards Merv?

Mr. C. BECKETT-DENISON: Before the hon. Gentleman answers that Question, I beg to ask him, Whether the Government have any authentic information regarding the reception of a Russian Resident at the Court of Cabul? If the hon. Gentleman cannot answer that Question now, I will repeat it on a future occasion.

Mr. BOURKE: I should feel obliged if my hon. Friend the Member for Yorkshire would ask that Question again, no Notice having been given of it. With respect to the Question of the hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), no intelligence has reached the Government that the Russian forces have crossed the Oxus in the direction of Merv.

### SCOTCH AND IRISH FISHERY LOAN ACCOUNTS—SECTION 10, 5 GEO. IV., c. 64. QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Why the provisions of section 10 of the Act 5 Geo. 4, c. 64, requiring the accounts relating to the loans for Irish and Scotch Fisheries to be laid before Parliament within fourteen days at the commencement of every Session, have not been enforced, with all the details set forth in the named Clause?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON in reply, said, that so far as Ireland was concerned, the section referred to in the Question was repealed by the 5 & 6 *Vict.* c. 106. In regard to Scotland, the information which the hon. and gallant Member seemed to desire always appeared in the Report of the Commissioners of the Fishery Board (Scotland), which was presented annually to Parliament. At all events, he imagined that that Report would furnish the hon. Member with all the information which he required.

### PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT—PRISON PILLOWS.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If the pillow which he stated is supplied to prisoners who have to pass the night on a plank is a lump of wood, the same as is used in England, and not a pillow in the usual meaning of the term; and, if that is so, whether he will state by whom he was informed that prisoners were supplied with a pillow?

MR. J. LOWTHER: Sir, I have confined my inquiries on this subject to Irish prisons, and I find that the information which I previously furnished to the House was correct. The pillow is made, I am told, of ticking, stuffed with cocoanut fibre, which is, in its turn, further covered with pillow slips, which are changed weekly.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: I wish to ask, Has it not been stated to the House, that the Prison Rules are the same in England and Ireland?

MR. J. LOWTHER: I never so stated it, though others may have done. The Rule referring to this subject is drawn up in identical terms; but its application as regards Ireland I have already stated. England is in this matter under the charge of the Home Secretary.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether the pillow issued in England to prisoners who sleep on the plank bed is of wood?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Generally speaking, it has been a piece of wood in England; but, at the present moment, as far as women, children, and old men are concerned, orders have been given for some alteration to be made.

## CONSULS — CONVENTION WITH THE UNITED STATES.—QUESTION.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can state to the House what progress has been made towards the negotiation of a Consular Convention between Great Britain and the United States?

MR. BOURKE: The negotiations, which are exceedingly voluminous, have been going on for some time. No Conventions can be entered into with reference to the powers and privileges of Consuls, until an Act of Parliament has been passed which shall enable Her Majesty's Government to secure to foreign Consuls in this country reciprocal advantages. Several draft Bills for this purpose have been prepared, and have recently been under the consideration of the Foreign Office; but it has been found necessary for various reasons to postpone until next Session the introduction of the proposed measure. I hope, however, that the Foreign Office, or some other Department, will introduce them next Session.

## JUDICATURE ACTS—LEEDS ASSIZES.

### QUESTION.

MR. BARRAN asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether, now that it is decided that a Civil Assize in addition to those already held at Leeds is to be established, pleadings are to be made deliverable during the vacation?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): By the 57th Order framed under the Judicature Acts, no pleadings can be either delivered or amended in the Long Vacation, except by the order of the Court or a Judge. With respect, however, to pleadings in cases designed for trial at the Assize intended to be held in October at Leeds, it is clear, I think, that the vacation Judge will give the requisite orders.

## BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)— ACTION FOR LIBEL.—QUESTION.

MR. ISAAC asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been called to the evidence given before Mr. Woodlock, one of the Dublin Divisional Police Magistrates, by a Departmental Committee appointed by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury to inquire into the constitution and organization of the Board of Works in Ireland, and deposed to by him in certain criminal proceedings instituted by Mr. Lefroy, manager of the Queen's Printing Office in Dublin, against Mr. Burnside, proprietor of "Saunders' Irish Daily News," to have informations returned for libel; and, whether the manner in which an advance copy of the Departmental Committee's Report was obtained and published is in accordance with the rules and practices of this House, or was approved of by the Chairman and other Members of the Departmental Committee; and, if not, whether any and what steps will be taken to prevent a recurrence of such proceedings, which have already led to litigation and other inconveniences?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: Sir, I am aware that criminal proceedings have been instituted by the manager of the Queen's Printing Office in Ireland against the proprietor of *Saunders's Irish Daily News.* The case having been sent forward for trial, the hon. Member will not expect me to make any comments on it pending the decision of a Court of Justice; but I may say that nothing, so far as I am aware, has been done contrary to the Rules of this House or contrary to the approval of any Member of the Committee with whose Report the present proceedings are connected.

## CONGRESS OF BERLIN—GREECE.

### QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have become aware of the intention of the Porte to refuse to arrange with Greece for the rectification of frontiers approved by the Congress of Berlin?

Mr. BOURKE: No, Sir; Her Majesty's Government are not aware of any such intention on the part of the Porte.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to give Notice that either to-morrow or Wednesday, upon a stage of the Appropriation Bill, I will call attention to the refusal of the Porte to carry out the suggestion of the Congress at Berlin with regard to Greece, which Her Majesty's Government seem to be unaware of.

## RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE FLEET IN THE DARDANELLES.

### QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will be good enough to inform the House when Her Majesty's Government intend removing the Fleet, now under the command of Admiral Hornby, from the neighbourhood of Constantinople?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The British Fleet will be removed from the neighbourhood of Constantinople at the same time as the Russian Forces are removed, which I hope will be soon.

## NAVY—THE CHANNEL AND PARTICULAR SERVICE SQUADRONS.

### QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, The nature of the summer sea-going manœuvres, in which the officers and men of the Channel and Reserve Squadrons have been exercised; if they have been exercised in the working of submarine, harbour, and sea-going torpedoes, and in the landing of men, guns, and stores, and other duties incident to a state of war; and, if the officers have been practically educated in procuring a knowledge of coast navigation on both shores of the English Channel, North Sea, and Baltic?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I have not, Sir, been able to refer to the Commanders-in-Chief of these Fleets in order to ascertain the particulars which the hon. Member asks for; but the Channel Squadron has done good duty in the Mediterranean during the last three months, and its services are well known through the medium of the Press. Both the Commanders-in-Chief of the Mediterranean and also of the Particular Service Squadrons are officers of distinguished merit, who thoroughly well know how to exercise their men and their ships in all the evolutions incident to warfare; and I assure the hon. Gentleman that the Admiralty—and I think this House also—have perfect confidence in these officers.

Mr. GOURLEY said, that in consequence of the answer of the right hon. Gentleman, he should call attention to the matter early next Session.

## PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL.

### QUESTION.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS (for Mr. Mellor) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, considering that this House on two occasions has unanimously insisted on disagreeing to the Amendments made by The Lords to the Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill, he can explain the position in which the Bill now stands; and, whether he can state if any, and what, steps should be be taken to bring about its reconsideration by the Lords?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am sorry to say that the state of this matter has now become such that its further re-consideration appears to be impossible. The Bill has been twice before this House, and twice this House has agreed to disagree with the Lords' Amendments. The question has been twice argued in the House of Lords, where the Government, I am informed by my Colleagues, did what they could to support the view of the House of Commons, but were outvoted on two occasions; and the Bill is now, I believe, dead. Therefore, I apprehend nothing more can be done in the present Session.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the Bill, though not one of the first importance, was one in which a very large number of people took an interest. He was rather surprised to hear that in consequence of the disagreement between the two Houses the Bill came to an end. Generally the result of a disagreement was a Conference. He did not know whether the Government considered the Bill unworthy of a Conference.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think that all I can do is to appeal to the Speaker on a point of Order. No doubt, this matter is one of importance; and, as far as the Government is concerned, we should be anxious to give the Bill any chance of being accepted by the House of Lords. If it is in accordance with the Rules of Parliament that a Conference between the two Houses should be held, that course might be followed.

MR. SPEAKER: Upon the Motion of the hon. Member in charge of the Bill (Mr. Mellor), the House insisted on disagreeing with the Lords' Amendments, and thereupon the Bill was dropped. If the hon. Member had thought proper he could have invited the House to appoint a Conference; but on neither occasion when the Lords' Amendments were before the House was such a course taken.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Matthew Ridley.*)

[BILL 296.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, who had the following Motion on the Paper:—

> "That this House regrets that legislation with regard to Corrupt Practices at Elections has not taken place in the course of the present Session,"

said, he did not, under the circumstances, intend to move his Resolution; but he would point out that this Bill contained a renewal of the Corrupt Practices Act now in force. Last year he had called attention to the negligence of Her Majesty's Government in relation to Corrupt Practices at Elections. During the present year there had been no legislation on that question, although the hours of polling and the subject of registration had been dealt with. For the last three years they had had promises from the Government on the matter, and not only had those promises been made, but they had been made in very direct terms on three several occasions by the Home Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Leader of the House respectively, and yet the Bill dealing with the subject had not been introduced until the last week of the Session. He did not think that was a proper way of dealing with a large and serious question; and he hoped to receive from the Government a promise of such a character on this occasion that they would be ashamed to meet the House next year without having it carried out. The Bill now before the House proposed to continue in its present objectionable state the law regarding the employment of cabs, when it was notorious that at every Election that law was broken, and the sooner it was made clear the better.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS reminded the House that one of the recommendations of the Select Committee of 1875, which was carried by a majority of 11 to 5, was that Election Petitions should be tried by more than one Judge, and that no seat should be vacated upon an allegation of corrupt practices, except by a decision of two Judges. There were strong reasons for supposing that the Government did not intend to propose a measure to give effect to that recommendation. He wished to call attention to a short Return, from which hon. Members might form their own opinions as to the desirability of leaving the liberties and privileges of constituencies at the mercy of the decisions of Judges from whom there was no appeal. It was a Return showing the number of cases in which the decisions of single Judges in Chancery had been reversed on appeal; and the statistics proved that out of 253 decisions given, between January 1, 1877, and March 4, 1878, only 106 had remained undisturbed by superior Courts. Such, then, was the fallibility of single Judges. It was to be noticed that the Act had been originally passed for only three years; and he thought that now that it had been seven times renewed by a Continuance Bill, in spite of the strongest evidence for its discontinuance, the Government ought to have introduced a measure of reform. He trusted that during the Recess the hon. and learned Attorney General would apply his vigorous and practical mind to the matter.

Mr. O'CONOR called attention to the continuance of the Corrupt Practices Bill. Although it was expected in 1874 that something effectual would be done in the matter of corrupt practices, nothing was attempted, for a new Government came into Office, and the matter was forgotten in the excitement of Election Petitions. Great dissatisfaction was expressed at the inaction of the Government in the matter. In 1875 they promised to introduce a Bill. The promised Bill, however, did not make its appearance that year. Indeed, it was not until the 8th of August, 1876, that a Bill appeared on the subject, and that entirely ignored the chief recommendations of a Select Committee that had sat on the subject. The Home Secretary, who had charge of the Bill, stated that his object in introducing the measure at so late a period of the Session was that it might be considered in the Recess. It was a very comprehensive Bill. It was that Bill which made permanent the system which was established in 1868. Last year he asked the hon. and learned Attorney General whether he intended to introduce the same Bill as the previous year; and he replied that it was the intention of the Government to substantially introduce the same Bill. He (Mr. O'Conor) was, however, astonished to find, after this assurance, that an entirely different Bill was introduced—a Bill, in fact, for continuing for two years more the Act of 1868. That Bill was introduced in May, but never passed the second reading. They had not now any opportunity of discussing the question, and he thought it time that some steps should be taken to put an end to this farce which was going on. He hoped, if the Government did not show greater aptitude next Session, that some private Member would force on the subject by the introduction of a Bill.

Mr. HOPWOOD criticized the continuance of one section of the Salmon Fisheries Act of 1861, by which the Government were enabled to appoint Inspectors under the Act. These gentlemen, who were originally appointed for three years, had neither powers nor duties of an important character, and he could not understand why an ineffectual Act should be continued.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker) said, there could be no doubt that a Committee was appointed in 1875 to consider the whole question, and that they presented a Report; but they were not unanimous except on one point, and on other points their views were not in accord with the opinions of the Government. The Government were, however, convinced that some of the suggestions made by the Committee should be adopted. A promise was certainly made that a Bill should be introduced in 1876, and, if his memory served him, a Bill was introduced at a tolerably early part of the Session; but, owing to the state of Business, it could not be advanced so as to afford an opportunity for having the subject discussed. He promised to re-introduce the measure in the Session of 1877; but a good deal of time was then occupied—he did not care to say how—and his intentions could not be carried into effect. When, he might add, he promised to bring in another Bill this Session, he fully intended to perform that promise; but, owing to circumstances over which he had no control, he was unable to give it practical effect. It was thought right that where a candidate had been guilty of personal bribery, and where that bribery would subject him to grievous penalties under the 43rd section of the Act of 1868, there should be some further remedy given to him, and that he should have an opportunity of appealing, not only upon questions of law, but also upon questions of fact; and he was directed to introduce provisions in the Government Bill to that effect. In consequence of that alteration, and other matters to which he need not refer, he had been unable to fulfil his promise as he should have liked, or to bring forward the Bill until the other day; and if he had done so, no opportunity could have been afforded for discussion on the subject, in consequence of the time which had to be given to the debates on the Eastern Question, and other questions of importance. He would do his best to secure an early discussion on the subject next Session; and when that discussion was obtained, no doubt hon. Gentlemen who entertained strong views on the question would strongly express them. He would further observe that if the Committee were right in the views which they took, the Government were wrong; for, with regard to their principal recommendation—that an Election Petition should in future be tried before two Judges, instead of one—the Government differed from them in opinion, inasmuch as they believed that the present tribunal for the trial of those Petitions had, in the main, worked satisfactorily. It was desirable that cases affecting the seats of Members of Parliament should be disposed of quickly; and, generally speaking, the questions of fact which were raised were exceedingly simple, and there was no difficulty in dealing with them once intelligible principles had been laid down with reference to what did and what did not constitute agency, and some other matters. On questions of law there was an appeal; but he certainly felt—and the feeling was shared by the Government—that where a candidate was pronounced by the decision of an Election Judge to be guilty of personal bribery, and where such a decision entailed on the candidate the loss of his seat and other grievous disabilities and penalties, fixing on him a stigma which might last for life, there ought to be either a tribunal consisting of a greater number of Judges, or, it might be, a jury trial presided over by a Judge, or, what he thought still better, a right of appeal. That appeal the Government measure proposed to give, and he hoped the question would be fully discussed next Session.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD hoped the Government would deal with the matter before a General Election took place, which could not be very far distant. The question was one of very great importance. In other cases of importance, where questions of fact were left to the decision of one Judge, there was invariably an appeal, subject to certain limitations; and surely the question of unseating a Member for personal bribery was one of sufficient importance to justify an appeal even on matters of fact. There would be no difficulty in forming a tribunal which would be satisfactory to the country. He had himself a doubt as to whether two Judges would be better than one, because, when they differed in opinion, the trial would prove inoperative; but he suggested that there might be two Assessors appointed to act with the Judge in trying questions of fact, or that there should be a right of new trial on application to a Court consisting of several Judges—it being necessary, as in other cases, in order to obtain a new trial, to show that the decision in question was against the weight of evidence. What objection could there be to introducing some principle of appeal of that description into the trial of Election Petitions? He hoped the Government would take the matter into their serious consideration, and that the hon. and learned Attorney General would, in the name and on behalf of the Government, promise to introduce and carry a Bill dealing with the subject in the course of next Session.

Mr. BUTT, who had been a Member of the Committee of 1875, said, he would not long take up the time of the House on the subject; but he wished to call attention to the position in which the question now stood. He did think it was a very serious thing to give to one Judge the power of inflicting a penalty in addition to unseating Members, and of disqualifying them from seeking election again in the same Parliament. It was contrary to the general principles of our law. He was very sorry that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department was not in his place, because he asked him, in the year 1876, not to resort in future to the expedient of renewing this measure—the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) Bill—in the ordinary Continuance Bill, but to give the House an opportunity of discussing the subject; and the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was positive—that it would not be placed in the Continuance Bill, but would be put forward in such a shape that the House would have an opportunity of considering the whole question. Were the right hon. Gentleman now present, he

(Mr. Butt) would ask whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce into the Bill one of its provisions to which many hon. Members objected? He would remind the House of a very remarkable instance in connection with this matter. In the year 1874, the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) quoted from some declarations of Lord Salisbury which were made in the House of Lords, in which the noble Lord made the strongest protest against this system of renewing important Bills under the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. At that time assurances were given, which amounted to a distinct pledge to the House, that this system of continuing Bills would be dropped, and that no important Bills would be thereby renewed. In 1877, he (Mr. Butt) again asked the right hon. Gentleman a Question on this subject, whether he would then give an assurance on this matter, and the assurance was repeated; and he did now think that before they renewed this Bill for another year they ought to have an assurance, not from the hon. and learned Attorney General, who had the best intentions in regard to this matter, but from the Government, that this Bill would be brought forward early next Session. For himself, he would rather go back to the old system than be subjected to the present Bill, which, he thought, ought to be fairly considered.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT joined in the appeal which had been made to the Government, that they would give some assurance as to this Bill being placed in a different position next Session. He did not attribute any blame to the hon. and learned Attorney General, who had done all he could to redeem his promise; but the question was one of great importance, and ought to be dealt with before the General Election, which could not be very far off. He asked that the Bill might be placed in the first rank of Government measures next Session, with the intention of then re-considering the subject, so that it might not be hung up for an indefinite period.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was quite ready, on the part of the Government, to give the assurance which was asked for by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt). He thought it was undoubtedly a matter which ought not to stand over any longer; and although, of course, there had been a great jostling amongst Bills this Session, and this measure could not be brought forward in time, he thought he could undertake, with a good conscience, that the Government would make it one of their first measures next year.

Mr. MONK wished to remind the House that a promise had been given early in this Session that a Bill for continuing and extending the powers of the Railway Commissioners Act should be brought in this year, and said, that both the Railway Commissioners and the public interested in the matter were extremely anxious that an amending Bill should be brought forward, and that the powers of the Commissioners should not be limited as they were at present. He hoped an assurance would be given that the whole subject would be dealt with next year.

Viscount SANDON said, that the pledges to which the hon. Gentleman referred were only conditional. Besides, there were two classes of views on the subject, some persons being desirous that the Commission should be abolished, while others wished to see its powers enlarged. He had thought it better, in these circumstances, to postpone legislation with regard to it till next year; but he hoped early in the Session to bring in a Bill dealing with it.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

## INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.—[*Lords.*]—[Bill 275.]

(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

CONSIDERATION, AS AMENDED.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Mr. J. LOWTHER, in moving that the Bill, as amended, be now considered, said, he desired to inform the House of the names of the Commissioners selected under the Bill. Giving them in alphabetical order, they were—The Right Hon. John Thomas Ball, the Earl of Belmore, Professor Molloy, the O'Conor Don, the Right Hon. Christopher Palles, Professor Porter, and Professor Salmon. These names required no introduction, still less any explanation from him. Hon. Members, however, might be struck with the omission of one name, which he believed all of them would have desired to have seen in the list—he meant that of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt). He regretted to have to inform the House that the hon. and learned Gentleman, although most desirous, as he always had been, to give all the assistance in his power to the promotion of the cause of education in Ireland, felt himself precluded by his multifarious engagements, and also, unfortunately, by the state of his health, from undertaking the duties of a Commissioner.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration."—(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

MR. CHARLES LEWIS, who had a Notice on the Paper for the consideration of the Amendments that day three months, said, that the Bill had been promised to Parliament in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech at the commencement of the Session, and now they were asked to discuss some of the main provisions of the measure on the 12th of August, when a large number of Members had deserted their duty, when there was only an attenuated House, and when, if it were not for the serried ranks of Irish Members opposite, who had so loyally obeyed the call of their distinguished Leader, there would hardly be a quorum. Not only the House, but the people of Ireland, it seemed to him, had not been properly treated by the Government in this matter. Unfortunately, the form of government of the Episcopal Church of Ireland was such that neither by Courts, Synod, or meetings, had there been an opportunity of testing the opinion of that religious Body since the introduction of the Bill. Upon the second reading, the hon. Member for Dungannon (Mr. T. A. Dickson), speaking on behalf of one section of Presbyterians, said their support of the measure was all but unanimous, and challenged the right of himself (Mr. Lewis) to speak as a representative of that Body. The hon. Member was mistaken in supposing he had made any such claim. At that time, public opinion was doubtful and quiescent; but since the Bill had passed Committee a portion of the Protestant community of Ireland had not been slow to express their opinion upon the character of the Bill. On Thursday week last the Presbytery of Belfast, which represented 60 congregations, had, with but one dissentient, passed a vote of condemnation of the Bill. The Ballymena Presbytery, also a great centre of Presbyterianism in the county of Antrim, unanimously condemned it; as did also that of Glandermot, near Londonderry. But more than that, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, presided over by Dr. Porter, one of the most accomplished, experienced, and judicious scholars to be found in any of the Churches of Ireland, came unanimously to a resolution adverse to the Bill. That was the product of the last few days; and if another month could elapse, the measure would have received the almost unanimous condemnation of the whole Presbyterian Body, which comprised nearly half of the Protestant communions of Ireland. This was the result of the extraordinary course which the Government had pursued, keeping back the Bill until the House of Commons was attenuated and in the power of the Government, aided by their new allies and united Home Rule Party. He hoped the results of the alliance would not be so disastrous as some had anticipated; but when they saw the Government and the Home Rulers shaking hands over the dead body of the mixed system of education in Ireland he could not congratulate the House or the country upon it. The Government in Committee refused to admit anything like a real Conscience Clause, wishing Clause 7 to be read in that sense, although it was altogether different to that in the English and Scotch Elementary Education Acts. This Bill dealt with public money; because, by the Irish Church Disendowment Act, these funds were withdrawn from private use, and from both the old corporation and the new corporation of the Church of Ireland. The Disendowment Act, however, expressly stated the purposes to which those funds should be applied; and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone), in his speech proposing that Act, distinctly refused to allow them to be applied to educational purposes, as in that case they would be likely to lead to sectarian bitterness and party strife. The opponents of the Bill had been beaten on the point of the Conscience Clause and of inspection. His third objection to the measure was that it was a direct step towards concurrent endowment, and therefore was a reversal of the principle of legislation that had been acted upon for the last quarter of a century. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had suggested that the sting would be taken out of the Bill if the results fees were dispensed with, and the whole of the money spent in Exhibition Prizes. How did the Government treat that suggestion? Not a word was said upon it by the Government, and they treated it with scorn and indignation. The fact was that this Bill was nothing less than the precursor of a University Bill drawn upon the same lines which had been promised to a certain section of that House, and to be introduced either next year or the year after; and as it was his intention to test the opinion of the House on several of the leading Amendments, he would not waste 10 minutes by asking the House to divide at this stage. With reference to those Amendments, he would read an extract from a letter of the 5th of August, and dated from this august Assembly, from the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), which had called back the Irish Members from their Recess in such numbers. The letter said—

> "You will perceive by the Notice Paper that the opponents of the Bill will endeavour to secure its rejection; but, failing that, to carry certain sectarian Amendments—[Mr. Butt: Hear, hear!]—which will entirely change the character of the measure."

He would relieve the hon. and learned Member from any apprehension on the first point, by stating that at present he should not divide the House against the Bill; but should it pass the present stage without amendment, he should feel it his duty to give hon. Members an opportunity of voting against the Bill by moving its rejection on the third reading. He denied that the Amendment of which he had given Notice was of a sectarian character. It was a mere copy, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Conscience Clause, in the English Elementary Act of 1870.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Amendments are not before the House. The hon. Member must confine himself to the Question.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, he had no intention of discussing the Amendments. He only wished to say their object was to keep an open door for every one of these schools; to protect the pupils from proselytism when there; and to make sure they would have all the advantages from the expenditure of those public funds to which all classes were alike entitled. The Government had now, at the last moment, under the great pressure which had been put upon them, given the House the names of the Commissioners. He only knew the gentlemen named in a very general and public way; and, on the whole, he thought they might be taken as a fair representation of public opinion, with the exception that whereas there were three Roman Catholics and three Episcopalians on the Commission there was but one Presbyterian, although the Presbyterian Body comprised half the Protestant population. But although he might disagree from the leading principles of the Bill, he was satisfied that Her Majesty's Government had introduced it with the most *bonâ fide* intention to improve intermediate education in Ireland. In his opinion, it was a mistake not to require each State-aided school in Ireland to receive day boarders, who should be admitted at certain times when there would be no fear of proselytism by either religious teaching, services, or symbols. He objected to the measure, however, not so much in itself, but because of what it led to; and the Roman Catholics themselves looked upon it as the beginning of a system of direct endowment of denominational education. A Belfast paper, which had been sent anonymously to him, stated—

> "It is, no doubt, a fact that the Roman Catholics will reap large advantages from the Bill; but their anxiety is more as to what it promises than as to what it gives—the richer gifts of which it is the herald—for this Bill does not cover the whole ground. It is the mere fringe; but before the larger questions come to be settled, the people will be educated."

Yes; educated by a Tory Government—by the successors of the late Lord Derby, who introduced the mixed system. Would the Government throw away this splendid heritage, which was connected with no particular Party, and deliberately break down the hedge which surrounded it? The Government now had an opportunity of repudiating any such policy, and he hoped they would avail themselves of it. He was led to understand that this Bill was likely to be the precursor of a University Bill. It did a good thing in a bad way. That being so, the duty rested with those who thought there was something to be preserved in the education of Ireland to resist the measure. Members had been taken by surprise at the end of the Session, in being asked to reverse the policy sanctioned by Parliament for many years. For himself, whatever might be the result, he would never regret having lifted up his humble voice in striving to induce the House to amend the Bill in a most important direction. Even though he should vote alone, he would give his vote against what he considered was the beginning of a downward and perilous course.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, that the hon. Member for Dungannon (Mr. T. A. Dickson), who was unavoidably absent, had written to him to explain that what he stated on the second reading was that it was a most remarkable—he would not say a suspicious—fact, but a fact eminently worthy of the attention of the House, that of all the Irish Presbyterian Gentlemen sitting in that House, not one could be procured to get up and attack this measure except the hon. Gentleman the Member for Londonderry, who was not himself an Irish Presbyterian.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, his hon. Friend (Mr. Charles Lewis) had again referred to the fact that he, having on the second reading of the Bill trespassed on the indulgence of the House for some considerable time, did not feel himself justified in making another speech when the discussion did not extend to a late period of the evening. On a subsequent occasion, he explained that no disrespect or discourtesy was intended either to him or to any other Member of the House by the course he had adopted. His hon. Friend had, however, now repeated the allegation that he was wanting in respect to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone). Indeed, his hon. Friend said he had treated the observations of the right hon. Gentleman with scorn and indignation. Now, he entirely demurred to the application of those terms. In point of fact, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was a warm eulogy of almost every line of the Bill. It was an expression, exchoed by those who sat around him, of gratitude to the Government for having dealt with this question. In these circumstances, he felt he should not be justified in detaining the House by making a reply to a speech with almost every sentence of which he himself agreed.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY spoke in high terms of the appointment of the Members of the Board, stating that they were gentlemen of general ability, who possessed the confidence of the country, and who had had large experience in dealing with public questions. This matter of public confidence in the Commissioners was, he considered, of far greater importance than many hon. Members supposed; and he believed that they enjoyed the thorough confidence of the people of Ireland. It ought to be remembered that former educational schemes had failed in Ireland, because they were not brought in in a proper manner. In regard to the present scheme, he thought that the Government had acted wisely in most of what they had done. He quite joined in the regret of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) as to the absence of a Presbyterian Member on the Board. He suggested, with great deference, that there ought to be two paid Commissioners appointed—one of whom should be a Catholic, and another should be a member of one of the Protestant forms of religion—and he thought it was due to the Presbyterians that one of their number should be appointed. The great opposition to this Bill had come from a certain section of the Presbyterians in the North; but he, speaking there as a Catholic, begged to say that the spirit of liberality and fairness in which its provisions would be exercised would show that the suspicions entertained of his Catholic fellow-countrymen were unfounded.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the House was greatly indebted to the hon. Member for Londonderry for having again pointed out the direction in which this Bill went. He (Mr. Newdegate) did not desire to withhold a single shilling of the proposed grant from the encouragement of intermediate education in Ireland; but this was a case in which it was possible to season a gift with what might be fairly described as an element of poison. The hon. Member for Londonderry spoke of the Amendments he had attempted to make in the Bill in Committee; but he had said nothing of the Amendment which was moved by the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr.

Courtney)—an Amendment which he (Mr. Newdegate) intended to submit to the House in the present stage of the Bill. That Amendment was directed against the latter part of the Bill, without interfering with the first and the main principle of the Bill—the proposed foundation of scholarships and rewards for the acquisition of knowledge by the middle classes of Ireland. With that, the Amendment he intended to propose would not interfere; but it struck at the second part of the Bill, which proposed the payment by results to the managers of schools in which successful candidates for prizes were educated. Let the House observe the principle which was involved in this proposal. Fifty, at least, of the schools which it was proposed by this Bill to endow were known to be Conventual or Monastic Institutions, and the hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy), when alluding to this subject in 1874, said that he did not urge this proposal of payment to the managers of these schools, because that must inevitably raise the question of concurrent endowment. The Lord Chancellor, in proposing this Bill "elsewhere," said that it was directly connected with future measures for what he called "University Reform in Ireland." Therefore, if the principle of concurrent endowment was allowed to remain in this Bill, that was obviously the principle which it was intended to transfer to University Education in Ireland. This they had on the authority of the author of the Bill himself. Now, he had given Notice of an Amendment, upon which he should presently ask the opinion of the House, and he desired to repeat that his object was that the principle of the Maynooth Grant should not be renewed; but that the principle upon which the Queen's Colleges in Ireland were founded should be adhered to and extended by the operation of this Bill. He remembered the establishment of the Maynooth Grant in 1845. He remembered, also, the establishment of the Queen's Colleges. For nearly 30 years the Maynooth Grant continued to be a bone of contention and a source of discord. The principle upon which the Queen's Colleges were founded was completely different, was thoroughly consistent with the principle of the Irish national system of primary education; though the Queen's Colleges had not been so successful as they might have been, but for the bitter opposition of the successor of the lamented Archbishop Murray, the enlightened Roman Catholic Archbishop, who consented to the principle of the Queen's Colleges. Had it not been for the bitter opposition of Cardinal Cullen, those Colleges would have been more successful than they had been; still, they had been successful. But the principle introduced in the latter part of this Bill was a different principle. It was the principle of the Maynooth Grant; it was fraught with all the disturbing influences which had been incident to the existence of that Grant; until at last, for the sake of peace, Parliament commuted it under the Act for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Protestant Church in Ireland; commuted it under a promise that the principle of it should no more be renewed than the principle of the establishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland. He looked upon this portion of the Bill with the deepest suspicion, and for this reason—that it was the sequence to a system of agitation in this House—a system of agitation which Parliament had had reason to lament; a system of obstruction in this House which had taken the place of external agitation, and had proved highly detrimental to the character of the House. With the permission of the House, he would state a little more fully why he objected to the proposed renewal of the principle of the Maynooth Grant, as contained in this Bill, remembering that, out of the House, and especially in Ireland, it would be represented that this concession was the fruit of agitation, the fruit of obstruction. How did Mr. O'Connell receive the intelligence, in 1845, that the Maynooth Grant was to be enlarged and made permanent by Sir Robert Peel? He (Mr. Newdegate) had quoted the passage which he was about to read before in that House; but he would now quote it again. Mr. O'Connell received a copy of the Maynooth Bill in Conciliation Hall, where he had organized the Repeal agitation, and these were the terms in which he expressed his gratitude—

> "I would not, I confess, go to this length when I came into this room to-day; for I had a little inkling that there was some trick under all this liberality; but my friend, Dr. Gray, brought me the Act of Parliament, and I read

it in my seat here, and I proclaim it excellent in all its parts. [*Cheers.*] But is this to make us give up agitation? [*Cries of* 'No; we will die first,' *and cheers.*] I do not mean to quarrel with anyone who differs in opinion from me on any subject; still less am I inclined to quarrel with anyone who thinks with me that it was the Repeal agitation that produced this change in Sir Robert Peel with reference to Maynooth. [*Cheers.*] Agitation, I thank you. [*Cheers.*] Conciliation Hall, I am obliged to you. [*Cheers.*] Repeal Association, Maynooth ought to pray for you. [*Loud cheering.*] There is a story told of the officers of the Irish Brigade. As long as a young man who came into the French Army, as a cadet, conducted himself well, he was left a cadet; so they always found it necessary to become a little riotous to get promoted to the rank of officer. [*Laughter.*]"

[*Cheers from the Irish Benches.*] Yes, he (Mr. Newdegate) perfectly understood that cheer. Mr. O'Connell continued—

> "We, in Conciliation Hall, represent the officer. The Irish cadets understand the policy of misconducting themselves. This is a boon to us to misbehave in future, and we are too honest not to give them the price for their money. [*Cheers and Laughter.*] When they tell us that we should thank Sir Robert Peel, and the 200 myrmidons that go with him from one side of the House to the other, I say, Thank Conciliation Hall! Thank Agitation! [*Cheers.*]"

The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House the other day that he had viewed obstruction in the House more leniently than most men; and he (Mr. Newdegate) defied the right hon. Gentleman to escape from the inference which would be drawn in Ireland, that this renewal of the principle of the Maynooth Grant—this connection of the administration of public money with the internal system and discipline of Monastic and Conventual Institutions—had been made in the same sense as Mr. O'Connell understood the gift of the Grant to Maynooth. He remembered that the speech of Mr. O'Connell and the passing of the Maynooth Bill were followed by two years of such outrage in Ireland, such an amount of murder, and such a disgraceful condition that, although he (Mr. Newdegate) voted against a Coercion Bill when it was first proposed by Sir Robert Peel, he was compelled to vote for a similar Bill in 1847. Now this, he contended, was the *amari aliquid* in the Bill before the House. He would willingly promote intermediate education in Ireland; but if the Government were about to renew the principle of the Maynooth Grant, the connection of their officers with the methods of teaching and discipline of these Roman Catholic institutions, there was some reason for the Earl of Beaconsfield appealing to the Conservative deputations who lately waited upon him to suppress what he indicated as eccentricities, and to apply themselves to the organization of opinion, and so manifest their devotion to him personally, that he might be able to do anything and go anywhere. They might now have a shrewd suspicion of the sense of which this advice was given, and of the direction in which the Earl of Beaconsfield was going. He trusted, however, that when the House proceeded with the further consideration of the Bill, Her Majesty's Government would yet be disposed to free the measure then under consideration from the principle of the Maynooth Grant, which was directly involved in that part of the Bill which came under the deceptive term of "payment by results." He hoped the Government might be disposed to concede the Amendment, which he, as a humble, but consistently Conservative, Member of that House, intended to propose; but if they did not, they might rely upon it that they had not heard the last of that which, sooner or later, they would find to be a fatal gift.

SIR JOHN LESLIE considered that the names of the Commissioners would give general satisfaction to the people of Ireland. He did not share in those exaggerated fears which were expressed by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) or the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), in regard to this question of intermediate education, but looked upon the system as one of progress and enlightenment. He looked forward with hope to see the measure carried out in the spirit in which it was conceived, and that it should not be allowed to drift in the same direction as the National School Board had allowed the national system to drift, which was away from its fundamental rules, and, as he thought in that instance, to the great disadvantage of education in some parts of the country.

MR. COURTNEY, in reply to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, pointed out that the most striking part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had been directed to the payment of result fees. The Chief Secretary had stated that the speech did not touch the vital principle of the Bill. He therefore hoped, when the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) came to be discussed, the Chief Secretary for Ireland would be prepared to strike out the section of the Bill authorizing the payment of such fees.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, he should be delighted to see intermediate education introduced into Ireland to all classes and to all religions; but it seemed to him that if the Bill was intended for the benefit of those who could not send their children a long distance to be educated, the object sought would not be gained. He considered the proposal of the hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) rather extraordinary—that one of the two paid Commissioners should be a Roman Catholic and the other a Presbyterian, thus excluding every member of the disestablished Church from any share in the administration of the funds which were originally the property of the Church to which he himself belonged. He was afraid that the system of payment by results would have this effect—that the teachers would direct all their attention to the clever boys, to the neglect of the great body of the pupils.

Lord CHARLES BERESFORD congratulated the Government upon having introduced a Bill which seemed to satisfy almost everybody. He hoped they would follow it up by a measure providing for denominational education and the endow ment of a Catholic University.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

New Clause (Reports and accounts), —(*Mr. James Lowther,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time, and *added.*

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS moved the following clause:—

(Regulations for conduct of schools.)

"The Board shall not make any payment to the managers of any school, unless it shall be satisfied of the compliance of the managers of such school with the following conditions:—

"(1.) It shall not be required, as a condition, of any child being addmitted into or continuing in the school that he shall attend or abstain from attending any place of religious worship, or that he shall attend any religious observance or any instruction in religious subjects in the school or elsewhere from which observance or instruction he may be withdrawn by the parent, or that he shall, if withdrawn by his parent, attend the school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs;

"(2.) The time or times during which any religious observance is practised, or instruction in religious subjects is given at any meeting of the school, shall be either at the beginning or at the end, or at the beginning and the end of such meeting, and shall be inserted in a time table to be approved by the Board, and to be kept permanently and conspicuously affixed in every schoolroom, and any scholar may be withdrawn by his parent from such observances or instruction without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school."

The hon. Member said, he should think it his duty to take the opinion of the House on the clause. It was taken almost verbatim from the Elementary Education Act, and, therefore, came with an *imprimatur* which, at all events, would be satisfactory. What had the Legislature done to give effect to the Conscience Clause in England and Scotland? The Conscience Clause — or, rather, the Conscience Regulation—in Ireland did not exist upon legislation, but upon the rules and regulations made by the National Board. The regulations under the management of the Board system in Ireland as regarded elementary education were so generally analogous to those in operation in England and Scotland, that one might venture to regard them all as under one heading. They required that the time set apart for religious worship and religious observance should be either at the commencement or at the end, or partly at the commencement and partly at the end, and that the rest of the day should be solely devoted to secular education. The first part of the clause said that no payment should be made to the managers of any school unless the Board should be satisfied that no pupil at the school should be permitted to remain in attendance at any religious instruction which the parents would not sanction. If it was intended to set apart a certain portion of the day, what was the difficulty in saying so in so many words? It was intended to give the parent apparent protection without any real protection being afforded. For all that appeared in that clause, there might not be a single school in Ireland receiving benefits under this Act which was not purely of a denominational character;

whereas the policy of the Legislature under the English and Scotch Act, and the Irish national system, had been to keep open every school endowed with public money, so that it might be available by members of every religious denomination. He would assume that the Government wished to keep up the principle upon which the Legislature had uniformly acted—that where public money was voted for school purposes, it should be open to the whole community; but this clause did not attempt anything of that kind, and in its present shambling form, it seemed as if it had been framed for the express purpose of not meeting the case. At a deputation to the Lord Chancellor, the statement was made that the clause had been framed on the precedents of the endowed schools; but these precedents dealt with private endowments, and the State had no right to interfere with them. The Irish Church Act of 1869 required that the Church surplus should be, in the main, appropriated for the relief of persons suffering from unavoidable calamity or misfortune. That directly pointed to the relief of lunatics, or persons suffering from intense poverty and distress. If it had been applied in that manner, it would have relieved the rates; and, therefore, in taking that money and appropriating it for that purpose, they were only trifling, shifting it from one portion of the national pocket to the other; but the Irish Church was treated as a corporation of a private character, which ought to be disendowed. Therefore, it seemed to him that they were dealing with it much in the same way as if they were voting so much of the grant to Maynooth for the purposes of public education. He asked the House, accordingly, to pass a real Conscience Clause, not one which was a mere name and a shadow. There was no provision in the Bill requiring any school to be kept open or to receive a single day scholar.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD, in seconding the Motion, said, that while it had always been part of his political creed that there should be no distinction between Catholics and Protestants, he was not prepared to say that Catholics should have advantages which Protestants did not enjoy in any part of the United Kingdom. The clause was found to answer in England and Scotland, and he could not conceive any reason why it should not be applied to Ireland. The clause in the Bill was not a Conscience Clause at all. It was a mere sham. It was competent, as the Bill now stood, to shut a school in the face of any pupil whose parents objected to the religious observances in the school, and so to exclude him altogether.

New Clause—(*Mr. Charles Lewis,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

MR. J. P. CORRY said, that knowing the feeling which existed amongst the Presbyterians in the North of Ireland, he felt bound to support the Amendment. No doubt, the Bill was introduced to improve intermediate education; but he thought that no child should be shut out of the benefit of the grants made under the Bill. That could not be secured unless the Conscience Clause was made stringent; and he should therefore support his hon. Friend if he went to a division, which he hoped he would do.

MR. GREGORY opposed the clause. The names of the Commissioners had been received with universal approval, and he thought they might be trusted to carry out the Act. He did not believe the Bill contained the principle on which the Maynooth Grant was made. It was a Bill for the promotion of intermediate education in Ireland, and as such must necessarily deal with boarding schools as well as day schools. The proposed new clause said that no school could enter into the competitions provided under the Bill if the children receiving instruction in such school were compelled to attend any place of religious worship. He ventured to think there was hardly any boarding school in this country, and he presumed it was the same in Ireland, where the children were not compelled to attend some place of religious worship, generally such as their parents chose; and, therefore, if the clause was adopted, it would have the effect of shutting out from the competitions any child brought up in a school where religious worship was required.

MAJOR NOLAN said, the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) had more than once informed the House they were dealing with public money. Just as the county rates in Galway were public money, the Church funds were public money; but in the sense that it was Imperial money the Church surplus was not public money. It was Irish money, raised in Ireland; and he thought, therefore, that it should be exclusively devoted to Irish objects, and that in its disposal deference should be made to the wishes of the Irish people. Now, he might remind the House that when the Bill was in Committee an Amendment to the effect proposed by the hon. Member was rejected by 50 Irish Members to 3. He believed that the Conscience Clause as it stood in the Bill would be quite sufficient for the protection of children; and that the only result of adopting the clause suggested by the hon. Member would be to harass Catholic schools. There was a large Protestant population in Londonderry and Belfast; but there was a much smaller one in the three towns of Galway, Tuam, and Ballinasloe. In each of these towns there was a Protestant school, and the Protestants would not be forced to send their children to Catholic schools. In such circumstances, the new clause could have no useful object. It was said that Presbyterians were anxious for mixed education; but it was not shown that they were placed at any disadvantage by the Conscience Clause already provided. It was all very well for Presbyterians to have less objection than others to mixed education; but that was no reason why they should force it on others. He believed that the Roman Catholics would hardly get their fair share of the grants to be made under the Bill, if that share were tested by numbers. With a few exceptions, hon. Gentlemen did not object to the Roman Catholics deriving this assistance; and he hoped the House would reject an Amendment which would be fatal to the efficiency of the Bill.

Mr. MACARTNEY repudiated the idea that those who approved of the Amendment desired to harass Catholic schools. It was an utterly unfounded accusation. Nothing could be further from his own thoughts than any such intention. The imputation came with a bad grace from those who advocated equal laws for England and Ireland, seeing that the clause was already in operation in England. To say that the same principle should not be applied to Ireland was to deny that the property derived from the disestablishment of the Irish Church was not public property, which it was asserted to be at the time the Act was carried. When it was said that it was peculiarly Irish property because it was paid by Irish land, it must be remembered that the majority of those who paid it would not derive any benefit from the Bill, for they did not belong to the Roman Catholic or the Presbyterian Churches.

Sir. WILLIAM HARCOURT fully admitted that the surplus of the disestablished Irish Church was public property, and also that, as it was derived from Irish sources, it should be applied to Irish purposes; and the only question was, how was it to be applied? No doubt there had been in this country a strong feeling in favour of an undenominational system of elementary education; but Parliament established what was substantially a denominational system, and that fact materially altered his views as to what ought to be done in regard to Ireland. He could be no party to pressing upon the people of the latter country a system which had not been insisted upon for England. The argument that the present proposal was one for placing Ireland in the same position as England, would be tenable if it were not that the English Conscience Clause was enforced only in elementary schools. It was obvious that intermediate schools must be dealt with in a different manner; and the Government had taken as their model the clause in the English Endowed Schools Act, which was stronger than this clause, for it required that the education to be given should have the sanction of parents. It was of no use imposing conditions that would not be accepted by managers of schools, and they must deal with the facts as they found them existing in Ireland. He should support the clause as it stood in the Bill.

Mr. COURTNEY said, that although denominational education, both in primary schools and at Universities, was assisted in England, the State had required, as a condition of that assistance, that the Conscience Clause and open inspection should be carried out. He admitted, however, with shame and regret, that at the great intermediate public schools of the country attendance at the religious instruction of the Church of England was still required; but those who had conscientiously opposed that restriction upon education in England were perfectly free to claim for Ireland the liberty which they had not been able to obtain for England. He could not understand why the managers of a school receiving public money should refuse to receive a boy professing the religion of the minority. If the parent did not object to send the boy, he did not see why the managers should object. The extreme jealousy which appeared to be felt with regard to this Proviso on the part of managers did show that there would be intruders if there was liberty for parents to send their children. It was not a matter of creed, but of the majority and minority, and they were bound to protect the rights of minorities. He warmly supported the clause of the hon. Member for Londonderry, which he hoped would be pressed to a division.

MR. BUTT said, if there were a number of Protestants who were anxious—enthusiastic, even—to place their children under the guidance of Roman Catholic teachers, he could understand the clause which had been moved; but it was no such thing. This clause was not a Conscience Clause. A Conscience Clause, according to the meaning he had always understood was attached to it, was a clause introduced for the protection of the child. He said that that subject was fully provided for by the clause which the Bill contained at present; and it would be impossible, he thought, to frame a clause which would more effectually gain that object than the one now contained in the Bill. The clause in the Bill said that a child should not be excluded from the benefits of a secular education, even if that child was prevented from joining in the religious instruction. He asked whether that did not do everything for the child that could be done? He knew it had been objected that there were very few places where there would be children of different persuasions in the same school. He must say that he thought the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Charles Lewis) made a number of regulations vexatiously interfering with the ordinary rules of schools, and doing so in schools in which there was not the remotest chance of children of different religions being educated together. He must, in justice, say that the hon. Member had greatly changed if he wished to vex or harass any human being; but what he wished to point out was that the effect of this new clause would be both harassing and annoying. The Bill was not a measure for the purpose of establishing a great system of undenominational or intermediate education in Ireland. No Government would attempt to do that; but it was a very modest attempt to aid existing institutions—to take the institutions they found there, and to aid them. And how did the Bill propose to aid them? It would aid them by payment by results, and the true test would be, could they encourage education efficiently? The effect of the Amendment would be to exclude at once a large number of schools, because they knew that every Roman Catholic manager would not agree to the test that was proposed in it. He asked the House to say if that was the way in which they would remedy the injustice? There were already Protestant endowments for Protestant education in Ireland. One of the grievances of which Catholics complained was that they had none, and now, when a very poor and small aid was proposed to be given to schools not founded by this House, hon. Gentlemen would pass a rule which would admit Presbyterian and exclude Catholic schools. The great merit of the Bill was that it avoided altogether entering into religious dissensions, and took part with neither denominational or undenominational. It came forward upon that principle, and it said to the managers—"Educate the boy, and you will be paid exactly in proportion as you do so." What should be the wish of every Protestant? Why, it should be to bring education into those schools in which they would tell him there was now only darkness.

"Didicisse fideliter artes,
Emollit mores nec sinit esse feros."

Instead, however, of that, by pushing this Amendment, they would, by way of meeting the ignorance which it was said existed in Roman Catholic schools, give them no encouragement whatever. Such a view as that was most bigoted.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS rose to Order. He never made the slightest imputation of ignorance or bigotry whatever.

MR. BUTT said, he really was not thinking of the hon. Gentleman at the time.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, if the hon. and learned Gentleman had not named him, he certainly looked at him.

Mr. BUTT could assure the hon. Gentleman that he did so unconsciously, and if the hon. Member's form reached his eye, it certainly did not reach his mind. He was not thinking of the hon. Gentleman at all.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman had his eye on him (Mr. Macartney) while he used the words referred to.

Mr. BUTT assured hon. Gentlemen that he had not meant any hon. Member in particular; but he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that this Amendment was framed upon a false and bigoted view of the teaching of Roman Catholics in Ireland. ["Order!"] He was at perfect liberty to say that. He believed there was no subject which was spoken upon with so much inaccuracy as the subject of mixed education in Ireland. There was no such thing as mixed education in Ireland. The Presbyterians would not have it. He must say he wished the hon. Gentleman could induce the Presbyterians to admit the Roman Catholics to their schools. How was it, then, that the Presbyterians condemned the Bill? He had seen the papers, and they said the Presbyterians would not be satisfied with any system of education that did not provide united secular and separate religious instruction. Now, he had the greatest respect for the Presbyterians; and if it was a matter relating to their own Church, he would attach far more weight to their opinion on this matter than he did. But if they wished united education in secular matters and separate education in religion, they could have it, for they could establish separate schools for religious education. He must say that, so far as he could see, the Bill did not interfere in any way with any Presbyterian obtaining the benefits of this Bill. He did not attach the same weight to these representations coming from a body which he so highly respected as he should if they had come in a legitimate capacity. The question, after all, was this. This Bill gave certain advantages. Would the House say now—"We will withdraw those advantages from the Roman Catholic schools?" That was the real question, because this Amendment imposed conditions that they knew a great many Roman Catholic managers would not accept. [An hon. Member: And Protestants, too.] Yes; and Protestant managers, too. He asked whether there was a Protestant parent in that House who, if anxious for his son's education, would send him to a Roman Catholic boarding-school, where the Roman Catholic religion was to be taught, under the control of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics? Did they did not see every day in the Courts of Chancery cases arise in which there was a dispute as to what religion children were to be brought up in? And the Lord Chancellor, when he decided, said, let the child be kept at a Roman Catholic school or at a Protestant school, as the case might be. That showed that the law recognized a distinction. This Bill was, perhaps, not entirely approved of by all parties; but he considered that it was a fair compromise between the contending parties. He therefore hoped the House would not spoil the measure, and would not permit any *doctrinaires* to hack it; but would take the course of ignoring all religious discussions, which could not be gone into without defeating the object of the Bill, and take the educational institutions as they had grown up amongst the people of Ireland, aid all those institutions fairly, and ignore altogether those quarrels with which the House had nothing to do.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that on the second reading of the Bill, the clause under discussion was completely ignored, with the exception that some suggestions respecting it had emanated from a quarter entitled to great respect. It had been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich that the 7th clause should be altogether omitted, and his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) seemed to think that the right hon. Gentleman's observations had not been sufficiently attended to. His (Mr. Lowther's) answer on a former occasion was that he thought a clause of this kind was required. The clause of his hon. Friend differed from that of the Government. He (Mr. Lowther) was not quite an impartial judge of their relative merits; but he preferred the clause in the Bill. His hon. Friend's clause, however suitable for elementary and day schools, was wholly inapplicable to a system of boarding-schools. In the clause of the Bill, as it stood, precautions had been taken that no pupil should be present during religious instruction which his parents and guardians had not actually sanctioned. That would throw the onus on the right quarter. His hon. Friend said there was nothing in the clause to prevent managers from excluding pupils. But what object would they have in doing so? If Roman Catholic managers were so anxious to proselytize as some hon. Gentlemen seemed to apprehend, surely they would admit with welcome as many as they could of a different religion from their own? Besides, on the principle of the more the merrier, the managers would wish to have as many boys as possible in order to earn more by result fees. Every inducement, indeed, was offered to them to give a good secular education to all comers. The utmost precautions were taken that inspections should be held at the discretion of the Board, and every facility was offered in the Bill for the Boards acquainting themselves by personal inspection with the manner in which the measure would be carried out. He hoped the discussion which had taken place would not be any further prolonged, and that it had convinced the House that it would not be advisable to accept the hon. Member's Amendment, and that it was in every respect less preferable than the clause of the Government as it stood in the Bill.

MR. J. COWEN said, he was, and always had been, an advocate of secular education. He held that the State had nothing to do with teaching religion, and that all schools—whether primary or secondary, supported either in a large or limited measure by the State—should confine themselves to secular instruction. Imparting the belief of any religious Body in national institutions was, in his judgment, unwise and unfair. But while that was his abstract opinion, he could not disguise from himself the fact, which he was sure was shared by many hon. Gentlemen, that in this case another course had been adopted, and that an attempt was deliberately made to treat Ireland in educational matters with considerable injustice. They had instituted a denominational system of education in England, where the predominating religion was Episcopalian or orthodox Dissent. They had adopted a like system in Scotland, where the belief was Presbyterianism. But in Ireland, where the inhabitants were mainly Catholics, they had adopted a system of secular education. He could not divest himself of the opinion that the difference that was thus instituted between the treatment of Irishmen and the treatment of Scotchmen and Englishmen arose from the fact that the Irish were Catholics and the English Protestants. The reason why Ireland was not dealt with like the other portions of the Empire was an unworthy and unmanly fear of the Papal faith or its upholders. If the Roman Catholic priests were as dangerous to the State as some hon. Gentlemen on the opposite Benches would have them to believe, the very best way, in his judgment, to deprive them of that authority over the people was to treat them with absolute impartiality and complete justice. As long as ever they laboured under the belief that they were dealt with unfairly, they would always have the sympathies of their countrymen with them. If they wished to weaken the influence of the priesthood over the Irish peasantry, they could not do better than grant the Roman Catholic Church every concession that in right it could demand, and which they had now given to their Protestant brethren. On these grounds, therefore—although he saw the force of a good many of the arguments of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis)—he would support the Bill as it stood. He did not approve of Conscience Clauses under all circumstances. It was an undignified thing to ask a parent to define the faith of his children. He would rather that no such restrictions existed; but if they were to be enforced, the one embodied in the Bill was just as good, and, in his opinion, better, than the Amendment. They should always recollect the education, the traditions, and the circumstances of the country they were legislating for. They might not like the Irishmen to be Catholics, but they were Catholics. They had to deal with that fact; and being Catholics, they would refuse to avail themselves of the concession that was now proposed to be made to them, if it was clogged with the condition suggested by the hon. Member for Londonderry. To make a present to a man, and to load it with qualifications to which the recipient conscientiously objected, was to give him nothing at all. It was a species of mockery. The Catholics would accept the Bill as it stood; but they would not accept it if the clause now submitted was embodied in it. While, therefore, a strenuous advocate of a secular system for all parts of the United Kingdom, he could not do otherwise than vote against the Amendment; because, to support it, would really be to deprive the Bill of any value that it possessed. It was intended as a message of peace and goodwill to the Irish people, and as such he voted for it.

Mr. NEWDEGATE hoped that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) had convinced the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) that the denominational system, which the Bill was intended to establish in Ireland, was of a far more exclusive character than that which prevailed either in Scotland or England. The hon. and learned Member for Oxford had said that because they had not succeeded in establishing a purely secular system in England, therefore he should vote against the only means presented to the House by which a more stringently denominational system than the hon. and learned Member for Limerick advocated could be avoided in Ireland. Believing, as he did, that the clause proposed by his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) would effect that object he (Mr. Newdegate) should vote for it.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS, after the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), thought himself entitled to say a few words. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Limerick had taken the liberty of saying that his (Mr. Charles Lewis's) Amendment was framed on a false and bigoted view of the action of Catholic teaching in Ireland. He had long been an admirer of the hon. and learned Gentleman; he had admired his character and his ability, and he had imbibed his principles. Many a time he had attended public meetings in the Freemasons' Hall, which the hon. and learned Gentleman addressed. He had admired the oratory of the hon. and learned Gentleman, and if he imbibed of the spirit of which the hon. and learned Gentleman now called bigoted, if he drank too deeply of the spring that had always been copious, though not always the same, it was hardly fair for the hon. and learned Gentleman to enter into the statements about the bigoted Amendments. He challenged the hon. and learned Gentleman to refer to the speech he (Mr. Charles Lewis) made on the second reading of the Bill, and to say that his action throughout had not been consistent; whether he had not argued that it was unfair to set up one class of religionists against another, but that all should be placed on an equal footing? Therefore, when the hon. and learned Member said that he had formed a false and bigoted view of the Catholic system, it passed by him and affected him not, and if anyone was the cause of it, it was the hon. and learned Gentleman himself. What was complained of was that, whereas the National School system kept the school door open, under inspection, for every denomination, this Bill proceeded in a totally different line, there being not the slightest provision that the school should be open to all classes. It was said that the present system of education in Ireland was denominational. It was denominational in this sense—that if they had a village where there were no Catholics, the school would be Protestant, and *vice versâ*. According to the Report of the Commissioners in 1877, no less than 56·9 per centage of all the schools in Ireland had a mixed attendance of Catholic and Protestant pupils. In Ulster, where there was a mixed population, the percentage was so high as 76·3; in Catholic Munster there were no less than 800 or 900 schools, with only about three or four Protestant scholars in each school. He did not expect that there would be the slightest discussion made on this subject, but that the union between the Home Rulers and the front Bench would be carried out to the resistance of every Amendment, a union which he hoped would he looked upon with felicity. He should be compelled to take a division on the question of the Amendment.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 21; Noes 102: Majority 81.—(Div. List, No. 271.)

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS then moved a clause providing that—

"Every school whose managers may make claim to any payment under this Act, shall be open at all times to the inspection of Inspectors appointed by the Board, so, however, that it shall be no part of the duties of such Inspector to inquire into any instruction in religious subjects given at such school, or to examine any scholar therein in religious knowledge, or in any religious subject or book."

The clause was a counterpart of the Conscience Clause in the Education Act. He simply moved it as a protest, and should not divide upon it unless requested by hon. Members.

New Clause—(*Mr. Charles Lewis,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, that the subject of inspection was fully discussed in Committee, and that inspection was sufficiently provided for by the Bill as it stood.

Mr. COURTNEY said, that on his side of the House, hon. Members were prepared to support this Inspection Clause, who could not consent to the proposed Conscience Clause.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS, though he had no hope of breaking the phalanx of the Government and the Home Rulers allied against him, felt it his duty to move the insertion of a new clause, as follows:—

(Day pupils.)

"No school from which day pupils are excluded shall be allowed to receive any payment under this Act."

The Amendment had for its object that in those cases where managers of a school thought proper to make a hard-and-fast rule to receive no day scholars, thereby closing their door against any but a particular denomination, then the school should not participate in the benefits of the Act. Of course, he would be told it would be impossible to do that, and that the people of Ireland would not receive such a proposal; but he hoped the House would be disposed to ask for something more than that broad and general denunciation, when he tried to carry out what he believed were the intentions of that legislation—that the greatest facilities should be given to the greatest number to participate in the benefits intended to be given under it.

New Clause—(*Mr. Charles Lewis,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Serjeant SHERLOCK could not see how all educational establishments could be put on the same footing as regarded day schools, and debarred from the benefits of the Act, if they found it impossible to take a day scholar. The Amendment would have no effect except to inconvenience the managers of schools in their arrangements. The best educational institutions in Ireland would either be excluded from the benefit of this measure, or they would be obliged to alter their entire management, and considerably lower the standard of their pupils.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) failed to see that such a clause would advance the cause of education. If the managers found it desirable to take a day scholar, no doubt, they would do so; but if the school was a boarding school only, in a country district, for the education of the sons of gentlemen, it would be unreasonable to refuse that school a participation in the benefits of the Act unless day scholars were admitted from the rural district, where the class might be entirely different. If it was desirable to prescribe to schools in towns that they should receive day scholars, then, under the Act, the Board would have power to enact some provision to meet the case, in which it would be undesirable to lay down a broad maxim of this kind.

Question put, and *negatived.*

On the Motion of Mr. J. Lowther, the following Amendments were made:—

In Clause 2, page 1, line 17, after "year," insert "if any casual vacancy occurs in the office of chairman or vice-chairman, the Board shall, at a special meeting to be held not sooner than one month after the occurrence of such vacancy, choose some member of the Board to fill such vacancy, and the chairman or vice-chairman so elected shall continue in office so long only as the person in whose place he is so elected would have been entitled to continue if such vacancy had not occurred;

Clause 3, page 1, line 27, after "appoint," insert "such examiners, for such terms as the Board shall fix, and;"

Clause 4, page 2, line 5, after "the," insert "examiners and."

Clause 5 (Functions of Board).

MR. CHARLES LEWIS (for Mr. NEWDEGATE) moved to omit Sub-section 3. This was the first Amendment which would be necessary in order to strike out the result fees, which constituted a part of the scheme of endowment provided by the Bill.

MR. M'LAREN seconded the Amendment. He looked at it entirely as a question as to what were the best means of disposing of the £30,000 a-year. He most sincerely thought that the plan of giving to the managers of the schools result fees, the amount of which might have been given to pupils in another form, was a wrong plan. It was unjust to the pupils, and would impede rather than promote education. If the funds so proposed to be distributed were devoted to prizes or exhibitions, then a larger number of pupils would be rewarded, who would by the section, as it stood, be excluded. He should on this matter cordially divide with the hon. Member who moved the Amendment, although he had felt bound to vote with the majority in the last division.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 16, to leave out from the word "students," to the word "students," in line 19, inclusive.—(*Mr. Charles Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, the House had already distinctly expressed an opinion that encouragement should be given to teachers and managers, as well as pupils. The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) had done enough to save his credit among the community, showing his views and it was to be hoped a division would not be necessary. If, however, one was to be taken, the House had better dispose of the Amendment as soon as possible. He should vote against it.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that he had to thank the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) for proposing, during his temporary and accidental absence from the House, the Amendment, the Notice for which stood in his name. That Amendment, as he had already indicated to the House, was to this effect. The Bill contained two principles; one was the principle of the direct payment to scholars of prizes for successful examinations, which was the principle on which the Queen's Colleges were founded; the other principle was the principle of the former Maynooth Grants, now abandoned. The College of Maynooth was originally founded at a time when the Papacy appeared extremely liberal. The First Napoleon, as the exponent of the principles of the first French Revolution, had overturned the Papacy, and deprived the Pope of his temporal dominions. The education of France having been, for a long period previous to the first French Revolution, under the direction of the Jesuits and Ultramontanes, who had worked the Monarchy and the aristocracy of France into the form that they preferred, the result throughout that country became—that the tyranny of their Government became so oppressive that the nation rose, and, after perpetrating, he was sorry to say, very gross excesses, abrogated the *ancien régime* and destroyed a system of government they could no longer endure. This country, alarmed by the outrages which were committed, and the danger to life and property which that Revolution entailed, made common cause with other European Powers, against the subversive principles of the Revolution. The Pope, having been deprived of his temporal Sovereignty in Italy, as he is now, became, under the necessity of the case, to all appearances, exceedingly liberal. The Papacy professed, through its organs in this country, doctrines more liberal even than the doctrines of the old Gallican Church, and the Pope and his agents seemed to renounce the extreme opinions, which had now been re-adopted by the Papacy, and affirmed by the Papal Council of 1870. At that time, when the College of Maynooth was founded, there existed a deficiency of education in Ireland; and the Irish House of Commons voted money for the establishment of the College of Maynooth, not exclusively, however, for the education of Roman Catholic priests, but also for that of the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland. Time went on. This was done, the House would observe, by the Irish Parliament, and during the existence of that Parliament, he must admit that it kept Maynooth very much within the bounds of moderation. At the time of the Union, this House conceived that it had inherited, as a matter of honour, the duty of providing means, by annual Votes, for the sustentation of Maynooth. But there came a change over the spirit of the Papacy. When peace was restored, in 1814, the Pope, as a mark of his gratitude to the Protestant countries which had re-established him in possession of his temporal dominions in Italy, proceeded at once to re-establish the Order of Jesuits. Some of the Professors at Maynooth, especially Professor Kenny, being connected with the Jesuits, left Maynooth, and at Clongowes, not far from Maynooth, established a strictly Jesuit seminary.

MR. SPEAKER: The House, I must remind the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, is engaged in considering the 3rd sub-section of the 5th clause of the Bill, and I am at a loss to understand how the observations of the hon. Member apply to that subject.

MR. NEWDEGATE submitted that his observations would be found to have a direct application to the question at issue. It was clear, from the Report of the Commission on Primary Education appointed in 1868, that a great part of the payments by results under this Bill would be made to schools, possessed and conducted by the Monastic and Conventual Orders of the Church of Rome, and any hon. Member of the House who chose to read the Blue Books which contained the evidence and Report of that Commission would find that there had been great difficulty in accommodating grants for primary education to the requirements of those institutions. Those institutions were similar to the College of Maynooth, as it now existed, a distinctly denominational establishment, provided for, in great measure, by a sum which this House had voted in order to terminate its connection with that establishment.

MR. SERJEANT SHERLOCK: I rise to Order, Sir. This is not the Question before the House. It seems to me that nobody but the hon. Member himself can see the application of his arguments to the matter at issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now considering an Amendment to Sub-section 3 of the 5th clause; and I confess that, at present, I do not see the connection between the remarks of the hon. Gentleman and that Amendment. At the same time, I do not wish to interrupt him, if he thinks that he can establish the relevancy of his remarks to the Question before the House.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he would establish the relevancy of his remarks, if he might be permitted to do so. It was distinctly in evidence, and had been admitted in debate, that many of the Roman Catholic schools to whom it was now proposed to grant money as the result of the successful examination of their pupils, were exactly in the same position as the College of Maynooth, after the House had decided upon dissolving its connection with that institution. He held that all the reasons which had induced the House to sever its connection with Maynooth, to give up the attempt to inspect the educational discipline of Maynooth College, to separate itself entirely from the form of education conducted there, were involved in the Question before the House. There were Commissioners in the case of Maynooth; but it was found practically there was no power of inspection—the inspection was so futile that Parliament gave it up. He (Mr. Newdegate) saw, and he condemned in the Bill on the Table, this proposal to adopt that principle of connection with the system of education conducted in these Monastic and Conventual institutions — institutions which were analogous to the College of Maynooth. He supported the Amendment, therefore, because he considered that—["Oh, oh!"]—he knew that this was a sore subject with the Home Rule Members opposite, who would prefer that there should be no inspection, or seemed to rely upon its becoming futile. He (Mr. Newdegate) would, on the contrary, vote for the Amendment; because its effect would be that, instead of making those payments to the directors and managers of those Monastic and Conventual institutions, of which there were at least 50 in Ireland, which involved the necessity of a pretended inspection, the payments would be made upon the same principle as the payment of prizes was made in the Queen's Colleges—in other words, the payments would be made directly to the successful examinees or their parents. That principle had been found consistent with the national system of education in Ireland, and which Parliament had maintained, while it had abandoned its connection with Maynooth, where the other principle—the principle of State connection with the management of these Roman Catholic institutions—had been in force. The proposal before the House, made by the Government—and he lamented that they had made it—was to establish a connection with these exclusively Roman Catholic Monastic and Conventual institutions exactly upon the same principle as that by which the State had formerly been connected with Maynooth. The difference was that the payment to those institutions would only be made on the production of successful examiners, instead of by a yearly allowance. He was surprised that hon. Members from Ireland should appear to be so utterly ignorant of the investigations and Report of the Commission of 1868. He held in his hand the Report of that Commission, and it referred to this payment by results without any very strict and therefore efficient system of inspection. The Commissioners suggested the adoption of a modified Conscience Clause as the only way by which it was possible for them to make payments to the primary schools, conducted by those Monastic and Conventual institutions. This gave force to what had been said by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick, as to the objections of the managers of these institutions to inspection; but if public money were to be granted to the managers of these institutions, some sort of inspection was inevitable. The Commissioners of 1868 admitted, in their Report, that in Conventual schools a Conscience Clause was a mere embarrassment to the managers, while it could not afford real security or protection to the pupils; yet hon. Members advocated a Conscience Clause, proposed by the Government, in a form which the evidence taken under the Commission of 1868 showed would be a mere embarrassment to those Monastic and Conventual institutions and their managers, and could scarcely be of any avail to the pupils. When a Conscience Clause, modelled on the principle of the Conscience Clause operating in England and Scotland, was proposed by the hon. Member for Londonderry, it was rejected; the decision of the House, pronounced by a large majority, was totally inconsistent with the evidence given before the Commission of 1868, so far as the contemplated effect upon these Conventual and Monastic schools. He thought, then, he had established some connection between the facts he had adduced, and the arguments he had drawn from them. Hon. Members opposite, who professed Liberalism in this matter, sought to reconcile themselves to avoiding their principles by a determination to ignore the nature, the characteristics, and the discipline of these schools connected with the Monastic and Conventual institutions, which they were about virtually to endow—in fact, they seemed to have determined upon ignoring the leading facts of the subject with which they were dealing. For himself, he went upon this broad principle—that this State of England was a Protestant State, and was bound to the great principle of toleration; and he held that it was more consistent with the principle of toleration, when they did not profess to teach religion, and debarred themselves from meddling with religious education, that they should be stern in their adherence to respect for parental right. The best way to secure parental right in this case was to pay the school prizes directly to the successful pupil or his parent; thus leaving unfettered and uninterrupted the power of the parent to regulate the relations of the pupil with the school in which he was educated. That was the most tolerant principle; and when the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) confessed that these schools, in many instances connected with Monastic and Conventual institutions, were of such a nature that they would not admit practical inspection, and that a Conscience Clause was to the managers of those schools a mere futile embarrassment; when the hon. and learned Member argued thus, he (Mr. Newdegate) asked the House to steer clear of all the difficulties manifestly inseparable from interference with the management of these schools, and to rest its confidence as to the method of education upon parental right, and not to connect itself, however indirectly, with the discipline and management of institutions which the law still declared to be illegal. That seemed to him the simple solution of the matter, and strictly in accordance with the first principle of the Bill. The first principle of the Bill was that the rewards or prizes should be given for successful examinations in such subjects as were comprised in what was termed "intermediate education." Then let the House adhere simply to that principle. It was absurd to suppose that the inspection of these Monastic and Conventual institutions would be a reality, when it was known that they would not submit to inspection, if it were rendered practical. He had in his hand the evidence which was given by some of the Christian Brothers before the Commissioners of 1868, and, with the permission of the House, he would read what some of them said—

> "Brother Grace, the acting Director of the Richmond Street Schools, Dublin, objects to the examination and classification of the Brothers."

Professor Sullivan put this question—

> "9,698. Professor Sullivan—With respect to the general question, would there be any objection to the examination and classification of your body by any external authority? Brother Grace answers—I would never submit to such a process. It would not become us as a religious body; our training is such as we consider quite equal to any we could get outside. We have the training and classification in our own hand, and I don't see why external parties should seek to come and decide upon that which we have already settled."

That was the spirit with which the House had to deal. Again, Brother Grace was asked by Professor Sullivan—

> "9,700. Then, if afterwards it was found possible to connect your schools to the Government, so as to receive Government aid, would you forego the advantages of payment by classification, and rest satisfied with payment for results alone?—I would sooner submit to an injustice than allow the members of our body, who are religious men, trained and brought up for years to our method of teaching, to be submitted for examination and classification to an external body."

Now, all that showed that the House did wisely, when it ceased its connection with, and its pretended supervision of, the College of Maynooth. But what were they doing now? They were proposing to revert to that which experience condemned—the attempt to establish educational supervision over Monastic and Conventual institutions in 50 cases. He thought that at length hon. Members were beginning to see the relation of his argument to the Question immediately before the House. Hon. Members seemed determined, if possible, to pass the Bill without its effect being known by the country. Her Majesty's Government, in order to carry the Bill, had cleared the House of their oldest supporters, as was apparent by their absence. The front Opposition Bench was positively empty! Why was that the case? Because right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite knew perfectly well that the same objections which had existed for years to Governmental connection with the Roman Catholic institutions, which had for years prevailed against the Maynooth Grant, continued strong and rife among the English and Scotch constituencies; many hon. Members, therefore, sought to be excused from voting on this occasion. The House might thus be cleared, and at the end of the Session a connection between the State and these Monastic and Conventual institutions might be instituted, to which the people of England and Scotland and the Protestants of Ireland had always objected; the House might thus depart from the great principle upon which the system of primary education in Ireland had been established. They might do all this; but he was determined, by dividing the House on the Amendment, that hon. Members present should declare by their votes whether they preferred the connection through these grants between the Legislature and those Monastic and Conventual institutions, to adopting the more tolerant principles upon which the Queen's Colleges were founded. He lamented that any hon. Members of that House appeared to be prepared to vote that they would not leave unchallenged and uninterfered with the right of parents to direct the education of their children, by rejecting the principle that, when they awarded prizes, or provided for prizes being awarded, to successful examinees, the payment should not be made to the successful candidate; that it should not be made to his parent or next of kin, but should be made to the conductors of the school in which the candidate was being educated, thereby involving themselves in a connection to which the great body of the people of England and Scotland had always objected, and to which the Protestants of Ireland also, before they were politically crushed, had always objected; he should regret the decision of the House, if the majority should choose, against the teaching of experience, to incur great difficulties rather than adhere to the simple principle of paying to the examinee the reward of his success, and leaving his parents to settle the method of his education as a matter between themselves and the managers of the schools.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, that the question of results fees had been so fully discussed at an earlier stage of the Bill that he did not propose to follow his hon. Friend through the objections he had taken to the measure, seeing that he (the Attorney General for Ireland) considered that the system proposed in regard to payments by results was in the main deserving of their support. The question was hardly looked at in a reasonable way by his hon. Friend. Results fees could be looked at from two points of view. First, suppose there were no results fees to be paid at all, what would be the effect upon the education of the country? Surely, the only boys that would present themselves, or be prepared for examination, would be the ablest and brightest boys in the schools. If, however, they were to be paid, surely, if the masters were able to turn out boys creditably, it was but reasonable that they should be entitled to a moderate amount in the shape of results fees. The most powerful argument for the system was the benefit which would accrue to the average, or what might be called the stupid boy. By offering a powerful incentive, the master was induced to devote his energies on the average boy, so that an examination grant might be obtained, instead of cramming clever boys only. That appeared to him (the Attorney General for Ireland) to be the commonsense way of looking at the question, and on that ground he hoped the House would support the Bill.

MR. SHAW, as one of the crushed Protestants to whom the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) had alluded, had no hesitation in supporting the Bill, which he looked upon as one that would be of exceeding advantage to Ireland, and to Protestants as well as Roman Catholics. Many of the schools in which formerly boys of Protestant parents were educated and prepared for College had disappeared, and he knew that in several places it was in contemplation to set up those schools again; but it would not be possible to do so if the proposal of the Bill as to results fees was rejected. The Bill interfered as little as possible with the prejudices of the country, and he thoroughly approved of it, believing it to be one of those happy thoughts that pleased nearly everyone. There could be little doubt that even the Dissenting community, if they were appealed to, would be found to be in its favour, for the only resolutions that had been carried against the Bill were those of separate Presbyteries and not the whole Body. Indeed, the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) seemed to be quite unaware of the fact that the Methodist Body of Ireland, who lately held a meeting in Dublin, refused to pass a vote condemning the Bill. It was conceded on all sides that there was a good case for legislation, and he wished to know what the opponents of the Bill would propose to substitute in its stead? If they brought forward a Bill to cut off the right arms of the whole of the people of Ireland, it would be thought a most monstrous thing; but by denying the opportunities of education, they were stunting the minds of the people. He regarded the measure as an earnest, an honest, and a true effort to promote the cause of education in Ireland, and as time went on he believed it would produce great results.

MR. COURTNEY said, he wished to point out that the Bill contained no definition of the word "manager," and that no attempt had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland to define it. That was the first difficulty. The second difficulty was that there was no inspection except in a very limited sense, and how were they to judge of management without efficient inspection? The moment the system of payment by results was introduced, they lost all control over the schools. The Bill did not make its appearance until April, and it was not brought forward again until the energies of the House were exhausted by a protracted Session, and they saw the extraordinary spectacle of a House, three-fourths of which were Irish Members, who could, if it were competent for them to do so, carry a Motion in favour of Home Rule. No doubt the Bill would be carried, but it would open up the way to endless difficulties. In fact, it was like opening up one of the seals in the Revelations. The simplest way was to cut out this proviso. The real question was, whether the method of payment by results was as convenient and as expedient in the cause of education as it was undeniably novel? In his view, that was certainly not the case; and to a great extent he agreed with the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, when he had spoken of the difficulties which would result from the Bill. Was it necessary that all the difficulties attendant on the relations between the State and the schools should be created? There could be no such necessity; and the troubles that would follow might easily be obviated by rewarding the pupils themselves rather than their teachers. That plan would give an equal stimulus to education, and would be in every way preferable to the system that would be established by the Bill.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, constant references had been made to a speech he delivered four years ago, in which it was said that he stated the results fees involved such difficulties that no Ministry would think of introducing them. The position was that when he brought the measure before the House, he was anxious to bring it forward in as simple and inviting a manner as possible. There was not the slightest foundation for the argument that results fees involved concurrent endowment, that private venture schools in the Irish towns had gone out of existence, and that they would be resuscitated by results fees. The results fees constituted the most important and the most necessary part of this Bill, if teachers were to pay fair attention to ordinary pupils, instead of concentrating their attention on those likely to earn prizes. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had endangered the passing of the Bill by countenancing the opposition to results fees; but his absence indicated that he had changed his opinion, and had made a second mistake in connection with Irish education. Not a penny of the results fees would go to the funds of religious Bodies, some of whom conducted schools at a loss; but they would be expended upon libraries, or other means of improving the general education. They tolerated denominationalism in elementary schools, for the schools were Protestant or Catholic according as the majority of the population were one or the other; and the protest against it in intermediate education could come only from the determined foes of middle-class schools in Ireland.

MAJOR NOLAN pointed out that the question had been fairly argued in Committee, and that result fees were paid at the primary education schools. With reference to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), he must say the Irish Members present, all told, were 49; and it did not require to be a Second Wrangler to know that 49 were not three-fourths of 129. He contended that because some £3 or £4 a-year should be paid to the managers of schools, instead of to the boys, it would not create that plague and pestilence all over Ireland which some hon. Members seemed to imagine would be the case.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 110; Noes 24: Majority 86.—(Div. List, No. 272.)

MR. SULLIVAN claimed the indulgence of the House while he stated that inadvertently he had voted with the minority. He had been writing in the Library, and when he entered the House he did not hear the Question put, and through mistaken information he went into the wrong Lobby. He wished to know whether any alteration could be made in the record?

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, he was in a similar predicament. He had not a particle of sympathy with the objects of the minority.

MR. SPEAKER said, there was no mode by which the record of the vote could be altered. Both the hon. Members having been in the House when the Question was put, the result of their votes must be recorded as they were given.

Clause 6 (Rules to be made by Board).

MR. CHARLES LEWIS moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, line 32, after "examination," to add—

> "And for payment of the necessary expenses of juveniles and subsistence of students to, from, and at the place of examination."

The Amendment was intended to provide for the encouragement and assistance of poor scholars.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 32, after the word "examination," to add the words "and for payment of the necessary expenses of journeys and subsistence of students to, from, and at the place of examination."—(*Mr. Charles Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment. It would open up a source of unlimited expense.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. COURTNEY moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, line 33, to omit the words "as far as conveniently may be." The object of the Amendment was as far as possible to prevent the Board of Commissioners from making any Order giving boys any advantage over girls in regard to the benefit of the Bill. He believed that as the Bill stood originally, and before those words were inserted, boys and girls stood on the same footing; but those words seemed to suggest that the girls were to wait until the boys were fully provided for. That ought not to be the case. The two sexes should be placed on a footing of perfect equality, and it was principally to elicit from the Government a declaration that that was their intention that he had moved the Amendment. It was said that there was not sufficient money to provide adequately for both boys and girls, and that it was not desirable to limit the assistance to be given to boys. But he believed that that idea was founded on a misconception. He did not think more than 2,000 boys would pass in three subjects, and obtain pass certificates, &c. At the most, those boys could not obtain more than £100,000 in result fees for their schools. Then, calculating that it might be assumed no more than £8,000 a-year would be required for exhibitions, that made £18,000 to be given to boys. Then, taking the extravagant estimate of £10,000 a-year for management, that would make £28,000, leaving £7,000 for the girls; but he did not believe that anything like that expenditure on boys could take place without a reduction of the standard of examination beyond any reasonable level. If that were so, there would be a still larger sum disposable for girls. Girls were admitted to the local examinations set on foot by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with this result—that the number of girls competing in the senior class was greater than that of the boys, and the same was the case in respect to those who passed with honours. The figures connected with the examination of girls in connection with these examinations were conclusive as to their capacity to stand, and even to succeed, in the same examination as boys. The Queen's University and Trinity College had started examinations for girls precisely the same as for boys, and he had been told that 360 girls had obtained certificates from Trinity College, and 230 from the Queen's University. Why, then, if there was money available, should not girls be examined in the same way and on the same subject as boys? It was said that it was sufficient if young women were instructed in needle-work and cooking. He did not at all undervalue those acquirements in the education of women; but if they were not to be taught anything else, then, logically, it ought to be sufficient to educate boys in merely carpentry and farming. The object in both cases was not to inculcate special technical knowledge, but to develop the mind and the mental capacity. In both cases, the same training was equally applicable, and he should move the Amendment, with a view of eliciting from the Government an assurance that such an application should be made.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 33, to leave out the words "as far as conveniently may be."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, when the words were brought forward in Committee, they were approved by the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) and others who took an interest in the education of girls. In fact, with the exception of the hon. Member for Liskeard, all the friends of female education were content with the Bill as it stood. He believed, also, that ladies who had adopted the cause of the higher education of their sex were disposed to acquiesce. The hon. Member for Liskeard, however, was more Loyalist than the King. The words to which the hon. Gentleman objected were not his (Mr. Lowther's); they were taken from the 12th section of another Statute—that relating to English Endowed Schools—in which they had been found to work well and without injustice to girls. What was intended by the words to which the hon. Gentleman objected was, not that girls should be placed at a disadvantage as compared with boys, but that the Commissioners should make reasonable rules for the examination of girls, and the grant of exhibitions to them.

MR. HOPWOOD supported the Amendment, the principle of which was to deprive the Commissioners of anything like an option in the matter, and to impose it upon them as a duty to make provision for the education of girls. The words proposed to be left out might be applicable enough in a measure dealing with old endowments; but were altogether inapplicable to a measure which proposed to establish new endowments, forming, as they did, an unworthy condition, tending in the direction of restricting female education.

MR. BUTT said, that the cry for intermediate education which had arisen in Ireland had no reference whatever to girls. The complaint was that the education of young men, who had to bear the brunt and battle of life, and whose education in that respect was of more importance than the education of girls, ought to have provision made for it. When this Bill passed the House of Lords, there was not the slightest intention of providing for the education of girls. ["No, no!"] Whoever said "No" had paid very little attention to the passing of the Bill. The meaning of the Amendment was to place the education of girls and of boys on precisely the same footing; but if that duty were imposed on the Commissioners, they would be involved in very difficult questions. There were some hon. Members in that House who were too fond of assuming that public opinion was always on their side, and in favour of every crotchet they took up—and he could assure the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), who, perhaps, knew less of public opinion in Ireland than he did, that there was no desire in that country to spend money in order to give exactly the same class of education to girls as to boys. The question of girls' education might be made the subject of a distinct Bill, to be considered next Session; but the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Liskeard would destroy the real use of the present measure. There was a strong objection to raising questions of this nature at that late stage of the Bill, and he hoped that the Government would not give way upon the point, but would adhere to the Bill as it stood, leaving the Commissioners to exercise their discretion in the matter.

MR. HERSCHELL denied that the Lords had passed the Bill with the clear understanding that it was not to apply to the education of girls. On the contrary, when Earl Granville was about to propose an Amendment in that direction, he was assured by the Lord Chancellor that the Bill as it stood might be applied by the Board equally to the education of girls as to that of boys. He had the very best authority for that statement.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS protested against the charge that had been brought against those who objected to the Bill as it stood, that they were resorting to obstruction to get rid of it. When that measure, of the greatest public importance, was being discussed, the front Opposition Bench was entirely empty; and therefore it was the duty of those who opposed the Bill as it stood to do their best to enforce their views on the matter, without succumbing to the terrorism which the hon. and learned Member for Limerick had resorted to. Everyone knew that the hon. and learned Member was one of the fathers of the Bill, and that the whole thing had been settled between him and Her Majesty's Government.

MR. BUTT denied that he had resorted to terrorism, and stated that he represented no views on this question but his own and those of the Irish people. All he had done was to enter his protest against Amendments of this nature being introduced into the Bill at that late stage instead of in Committee, and thus endangering the measure.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN was rather astonished at this display of warm enthusiasm on the part of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis). He had promised that if the opportunity afforded, he would do what he could to support the claims of women in this matter; but he could not support little Amendments of this character, which might have the effect of imperilling the Bill, and which would never have been introduced as questions of principle if they had not been intended to interfere with the measure now that the House was within four days of the close of the Session. Power ought to be given to teach women in Ireland especially music and drawing, for which they had the greatest capacity, and thus to enable them to earn a livelihood. He would support any proposition to secure that object. He trusted an opportunity would be given in a future Session to amend the Bill in that respect.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD suggested that, as the words in question were unnecessary, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland should consent to omit them. In his opinion, that might be done without materially affecting the Bill, and he believed it would carry out the object of the Government more completely to do so.

Mr. FAWCETT did not think that anyone would accuse him of desiring to hinder the passing of the Bill; but he was bound to say he was inclined to think that if any hon. Member of the House had done more than another to effect that purpose, that Member was the hon. and learned Gentleman who represented Limerick (Mr. Butt). That hon. and learned Gentleman ought to know the House sufficiently well to be aware that of all the expedients which could possibly be adopted to interfere with the progress of a Bill, none was so likely to succeed as the unfortunate tone which he had taken of assuming that every person who desired to amend a particular measure was in reality an enemy to it in disguise. Those who were endeavouring to make the present Bill as good a Bill as possible were in no degree responsible for its being considered on Report on the 12th of August. But there was no decreed necessity why the House should rise on any particular day; and they were bound to consider carefully every part of the measure, though the 12th of August had been reached. The Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Courtney) raised a question of undoubted importance, and that Amendment he supported. He did not say that in administering for educational purposes the funds of the disendowed Church of Ireland the Commissioners to be appointed under the Bill should lay down any hard-and-fast line declaring that women must be educated exactly in the same way as men, and pass exactly the same examinations as men; but he did say the Commissioners ought to bear in mind that they were just as much bound to look after the education of the women of Ireland as they were to attend to the education of the men of that country. Those funds were as much the property of the women as of the men of Ireland, and he contended that in their administration there should be no distinction of sex.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 123; Noes 32: Majority 91.—(Div. List, No. 273.)

Mr. J. LOWTHER moved, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 5, at end, to add—

"No candidate shall be allowed to obtain a pass, nor be awarded any exhibition, prize, or certificate at any examination under this Act, unless he satisfies the examiners that he possesses an adequate knowledge of one at least of the first, second, or fourth divisions of the subjects mentioned in the Schedule of this Act."

The O'CONOR DON hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would fully explain the meaning of his Amendment, because it raised a very important question. Under the first division, it was proposed to include the ancient languages of Greece and Rome, and also, if the Board thought fit, the Celtic language. What he required to know was, whether it was intended that the Board should have the power, under the Amendments which would come on subsequently, to place the Celtic language on exactly the same footing as Greek and Latin; whether it was intended that the passing in the Celtic language would apply to conditions? He now proposed that the candidates must obtain a pass in a subject under the 1st section.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he had placed on the Paper an Amendment which was somewhat similar in character to the right hon. Gentleman's. Ireland had, even in remote ages, the highest reputation for its scholarsaip—so great a name had one of her scholars—Scotus—on the Continent, that it used to be said at Salamanca—"*Qui scit Scotum, scit totum.*" He was not disposed to allow that scholastic reputation to be lowered by the provisions of the Bill, and it was, therefore, that he embodied in an Amendment the making a condition precedent to obtaining a prize a knowledge of either Greek, Latin, or mathematics.

The right hon. Gentleman proposed to make it imperative that the students should not only have a knowledge of Greek and Latin and mathematics, but that they should also possess a knowledge of the Celtic language, of Irish history, and of English history. Now, the Celtic language was, for all material purposes, except so far as regarded its connection with theology and ancient history, as much a dead language as Latin and Greek. ["No, no!"] He would ask any hon. Member to tell him whether a shopkeeper or farmer was likely to send his son to learn the Celtic language, at a cost of £60 a-year, when he had the opportunity of learning French and German, which would be so much more useful to him in after-life; and did the right hon. Gentleman mean to say that in any of the 32 counties of Ireland, except in portions of Mayo, Kerry, and Galway, shopkeepers would send their sons to learn the Celtic language for the purpose of obtaining prizes? He remembered in 1846-7, in some parts of Ireland—Mayo, for instance—the Celtic language was generally spoken; but being in the same district 20 years after, he found a knowledge of the ancient language confined to the oldest inhabitants. He need not say the last thing he would attempt would be to discredit the Celtic language or literature. His name would save him from such an imputation; but the question must be looked at practically, and it would be a farce to suppose that in this utilitarian age parents would pay for education not likely to be useful to their sons in official or commercial life. To say that the Bill would result in boys learning the Celtic language was a delusion, and he was sick of delusions. The knowledge of mathematics, Greek, and Latin, however, was necessary to true scholarship.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, the particular Amendment suggested by his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary was really a very small matter, which ought not to give rise to much discussion. It was suggested to his right hon. Friend that as many more people knew Latin than knew Greek, those two languages should be placed in separate divisions, while the claims of Celtic should be recognized in the curriculum. His right hon. Friend, therefore, proposed to add to the language, literature, and history of Rome, the Celtic language, literature, and history. Thus, in his opinion, the claim of the Irish language would be fairly recognized.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, the hon. Baronet (Sir Patrick O'Brien) had made an attack on the Celtic language. [Sir Patrick O'Brien: No!] He, and those who agreed with him, had made no exaggerated claim for the Irish language and literature, and he agreed with the hon. Baronet that it might not be of so much importance as Latin or Greek; but the Irish people still spoke it, and that was an argument in favour of teaching it. More than four-fifths of the people of Mayo spoke it daily, and in the interest of education, it was desirable to hold out such inducements as would lead the people to take advantage of it. The hon. Baronet was the only Member of that House who had attempted to crush the first efforts of Parliament to revive the study of the Celtic language, to which the English people owed so much, and he trusted that the hon. Baronet would find himself in quite an isolated position on a division. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had withdrawn from the engagement he first made with reference to that language, and had now brought forward a proposal for which nobody was prepared. He (Mr. O'Connor Power), however, thought that the Celtic ought to be placed in the same category as the other modern languages, and in that intermediate position after the study of French and German to which it was justly entitled.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN explained that he had never intended to deride or decry a knowledge of the Celtic literature. He merely alluded to the fact that it was not likely to be made a subject for pass under this Bill.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Mr. E. JENKINS moved the insertion of words, providing that the Board should define what persons should be deemed to be managers entitled to receive payment of result fees.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 8, after the word "fees," to insert the words "and for defining what persons shall be considered to be managers in order to be entitled to receive payment of result fees."—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. SULLIVAN said, he was at a loss to understand the purport of the Amendment.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, what was intended was that the result fees should be paid to the *de facto* managers, whoever they might be, and it might well be left to the Board to deal with the question. If a master was his own manager, he would, of course, be entitled to receive the fees.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, that out of respect for the convenience of hon. Members opposite, and also from a desire not to obstruct the Bill unreasonably, he would take the sense of the House upon only one other Amendment. That was to insert words giving powers to the Board to make rules for the inspection of schools the managers of which received any payment under the Act.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 11, after the word "Schedule," to insert the words "for the inspection of the schools the managers of which receive any payments under this Act."—(*Mr. Charles Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that if the hon. and learned Member looked at the clause referring to inspection, he would find that the Board had absolute power to accomplish all the objects he had in view. To introduce the words of the Amendment would limit and restrict those powers, and they were, therefore, not only unnecessary, but might be injurious.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 20; Noes 119: Majority 99.—(Div. List, No. 274.)

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD moved, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 18, to leave out the words "within forty days after the same shall have been so laid before it," in order to insert the words "before the end of the Session." The hon. and learned Member said, great powers were given to the Board by the Bill. Amongst other powers, he found that the power was given of making provision to carry out the rules in the Schedule of this Act, and for varying, altering, and amending the rules. That was a legislative power. He had no doubt it was the intention of the Government to give the House a real control over the action of the Board. If that was their intention, he had no doubt they would agree with him that such an intention could not be fairly carried out by the provisions of the Bill as they now appeared, for 40 days was not enough to enable the Legislature to interfere with effect. He proposed that, instead of limiting the rights of Parliament to 40 days, they should be exercised at any time within the Session. He would not detain the House with any further observations, but trusted that the Government would adopt the Amendment, as its object must be identical with theirs.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 18, to leave out from the word "within" to the word "before," inclusive, in order to insert the words "before the end of such Session of."—(*Mr. Morgan Lloyd.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. J. LOWTHER thought it would be unadvisable to make the Amendment suggested. As the hon. and learned Gentleman was aware, there were precedents for the form which had been adopted. Under these circumstances, he saw no reason to alter the clause as it stood in the Bill.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD said, his only reason for wishing to add the words was to give Parliament a real control in the matter.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. J. LOWTHER moved, as an Amendment, in the Schedule, page 5, line 33, to insert "either separately or together with the Celtic language or literature." He said, that an understanding had been arrived at with the Committee that the Celtic language should be made part of the curriculum.

The reason for making the present Amendment was, that the French, German, and Italian languages, literature, and history, formed a class of studies, and it was necessary to add—"either separately or together with the Celtic language or literature"—that was to say, that the Celtic language should not be made a distinct subject by itself.

The O'CONOR DON thought that the simplest plan would have been to have placed the Celtic language on the same level with the other languages mentioned in the Schedule. As now proposed, the Celtic language would not be placed on an equality with the others; it was only an addition which might or might not be taken up. It was not quite clear what advantages would be derived from taking it up, and it seemed to him that all that was promised was that a candidate who took up Celtic should not lose any marks for so doing. There was, therefore, no advantage offered for studying the language.

Mr. O'DONNELL observed, that in the Queen's Colleges, the Celtic language was made so entirely a side study that it really was not included in the general studies. The result was that the Celtic language had ceased to be studied; and he was very much afraid that the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman would be just as useless in the intermediate education of Ireland as the provision for the study of Celtic in the Queen's Colleges, and that its only effect would be to make Irish a sort of side study, which would not be taken up. He felt assured that the Amendment would not be of the slightest practical effect in promoting the study of Irish, and he could not but think that its passing would only give a purely illusory satisfaction to Irish national sentiment.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL would like to be informed what was the Celtic language? The Celtic language, he believed, was the Gaelic. He came from a part of the country where the Celtic language was used—the Irish, and the Welsh, and the Gaelic spoken in Scotland, were all Celtic languages.

Mr. PARNELL observed, that he saw no advantage in the Amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the hon. Member that he had already spoken on the subject before the House.

Mr. PARNELL stated that he merely wished to ask a question.

Mr. COURTNEY said, there was no such thing as the Celtic language. Many languages came under that head, and, as the Bill stood, it was difficult to know which was meant; though if the Irish language were mentioned, it would be clear. He was sure that no single boy in Ireland would be competent to undergo an examination in the Celtic languages.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA apprehended that all that would be effected by this clause would be to add a subject to the list of studies in which marks could be obtained. The number of marks to be raised for Celtic was not prescribed, and it would be one part of the duty of the Board to fix the particular number of marks that would be given for proficiency in the Celtic language. It would be much better if the language were called Irish, for nothing was more clear than that the Celtic language was sub-divided into several others — the Welsh, the Breton, and the Irish and Scotch dialects. The Irish people were anxious that there should be a certain amount of instruction in the Irish language, and, therefore, he thought that it was right that there should be power to award a certain number of marks for proficiency in it.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER observed, that after all that had been said on the subject, it would be scarcely right to pass a clause that would be inoperative. The Government should pass a provision that would encourage the study of the Irish language. No Irish Member of the House used the word Celtic in speaking of it; everyone was satisfied with the word Irish, and yet the word Celtic had been introduced by the Government. Their Amendment simply said that a knowledge of Celtic would not be a disqualification; but there was no encouragement to the study of Irish, unless it were in the provision for instruction in the "language, literature, and history of Great Britain and Ireland." He would call the attention of the hon. Member for Roscommon (the O'Conor Don) to that sentence, and would ask him what would be its effect upon the study of the Irish language? If it did not cover the claim they had put forward, then he should be very much disposed to object to the Amendment. It was not desirable that the Bill should be passed in a shape which would be likely to give rise to misunderstanding.

The O'CONOR DON did not think that the clause referred to included the Irish language. The hon. Member for Newry (Mr. W. Whitworth) had distinctly laid it down on the second reading of the Bill that the language of Great Britain and Ireland was the English language.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. COURTNEY proposed, as an Amendment, that students should not be permitted to hold exhibitions amounting to more than £80 per annum; he thought £100, the limit fixed, was excessive.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 37, after the word "endowment," to add the words "when the joint annual value of such scholarships, exhibition, or prizes shall exceed £80."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. J. LOWTHER thought that the limit fixed by the clause was the best.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. MELDON said, he did not intend to move the Amendment which stood in his name with regard to National School Teachers. The object that he had in view had been attained, and the slur which would have been cast on teachers had been removed.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, all the Amendments to the Bill had been disposed of; and as the Session was now nearly at an end, he hoped the House would allow the Bill to be read a third time.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, that if there were the slightest chance of substantially adding to the number of hon. Members who opposed this Bill at the third reading, he should feel it his duty to object to the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman; but he did not desire to throw any factious impediments in the way of Public Business, or to carry his opposition to the Bill to an undue extent. He had done his best to oppose the Bill, and he had failed. He was satisfied, though still protesting against the Bill, that it would be useless to oppose the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman.

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

## INCLOSURE PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL—[*Lords*]—[Bill 192.]

(*Sir Matthew Ridley*).

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [9th August], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on the Inclosure Provisional Orders Bill).

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. E. JENKINS moved that the Order be postponed till after the other Orders of the Day. He wished to protest against the unusual course taken by the Government in putting the second reading of the Appropriation Bill in the place it occupied among the last of the Orders of the Day. The consequence was that it would be impossible for hon. Members who had Motions down before it to enter into discussions upon them. He wished also to protest against the Government trying to carry the Bishoprics Bill through on the back of the Consolidated Fund Bill. The Bishoprics Bill was a very important Bill, and one to which many hon. Members had the strongest objection. It was extremely unusual for the Appropriation Bill not to be placed on the Paper as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON seconded the Amendment. He said, that he had had a Motion on the Paper for some time; but, unfortunately, he had been prevented by other important debates taking precedence of it from bringing it before the House. If he did not bring it forward that evening, he did not see what chance he should have of doing so that Session, and he was particularly desirous that the subject should be brought forward. Those who naturally took a great interest in having his Motion in reference to the death of Mr. C. C. Ogle, *The Times* Correspondent, properly and fairly discussed, had intrusted him with the duty of bringing it before the House, and he had pledged himself to bring it forward that Session. Unless the Government could promise him another day, he must bring it forward that night.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate be postponed till after the other Orders of the Day." — (*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. FAWCETT inquired, whether he was precluded from moving his Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER said, that the House had now before it a Motion. If it were passed, the Bill would go down to the bottom of the Orders of the Day, and when it was called on the hon. Member would be entitled to move his Amendment.

MR. FAWCETT asked, whether, if the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. E. Jenkins) was not carried, he should be at liberty to move the Resolution he had put down?

MR. SPEAKER said, that no doubt, in that case, the hon. Member would be precluded from moving it.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER hoped that under the circumstances the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) would consent to withdraw his Motion for postponing the Bill, because it would certainly be very unfair and very inconvenient to the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) who had had this subject under his consideration for a very long time, and who had got a Notice on the Paper, if he should be precluded from moving it. He was ready to say, in answer to the hon. Member for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson), that he fully recognized the importance of the question the hon. Member wished to bring forward, and he would undertake to place one of the stages of the Appropriation Bill in such a position as would enable the hon. Member to bring it forward when there would be a fair opportunity of having it discussed.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked, that the hon. Member (Mr. E. Jenkins), in making his Motion, which he hoped would be withdrawn, had not stated that it had been almost invariably the custom of the House to take all the stages of the Appropriation Bill at a very early hour of the evening. He hoped that they were not now making a precedent for the future. He had not wished to interrupt the proceedings of the House at an early hour that evening; but he might now state that he had found that for a good many years the Order for the Appropriation Bill had never been delayed by more than a quarter of an hour or half an hour's debate. Neither in its second reading or Committee stage had it been taken at a later hour than 8 o'clock, and he hoped they were not about to establish a precedent for a different course.

MR. E. JENKINS consented to withdraw his Motion.

MR. H. SAMUELSON begged to say that he should certainly accept with pleasure the courtesy offered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who always treated Gentlemen on that side in the most courteous manner; but he should be obliged if the right hon. Gentleman would inform him when he should be able to bring his Motion on? There was sometimes a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip, and he should like to be sure of his opportunity.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the difficulty in which they were placed was that some little time ago he gave Notice that they would take the Indian Budget as the first Order on Tuesday. If he were to place the Committee on the Appropriation Bill before that Order, he was afraid it would be a breach of faith towards those hon. Gentlemen who wished to deal with that question. What he proposed to do, therefore, was to place the third reading of the Appropriation Bill as the first Order for Wednesday.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. FAWCETT moved—

> "That it is inexpedient to proceed with this Bill until evidence has been obtained from disinterested witnesses as to the desirability of sanctioning the proposed inclosures, and until the obstacles which impede the application of the Clauses for the regulation of Commons, contained in the Commons Act of 1876, have been removed by the Commons Regulation Expenses Bill now passing through Parliament."

The hon. Member said, he was extremely sorry, at that late hour of the night, to trespass on the attention of the House, and, as he felt it was absolutely impossible to deal with the subject fully, he should reserve the greater part of the observations he had intended to make until the third reading. He could not be in a worse position than he was at that moment, and he would briefly explain to the House what that position was. The Bill proposed to inclose close upon 6,000 acres of land. Out of that 6,000 acres, he had no objection whatever, and he could not conceive that any hon. Member would have any objection whatever, to the inclosure of the greater portion of it—namely, about 4,900 acres. The Bill dealt with land of three classes—first of all, with common field land; secondly, with large open wide fields; and, thirdly, with two large pastures. Now, 4,900 acres of that were common field land, and to the inclosure of that he made no objection whatever. But the difficulty in which both he and the House were placed was that it was impossible to amend those Inclosure Bills. He had carefully considered every course of procedure, and he saw no way of proposing that the common land should be inclosed, and that the rest of the land should not be inclosed; and therefore he was under the necessity, much against his will, of proposing the rejection of the entire Bill. There were two points which he particularly wished to bring before the House. In the first place, he wished to say that no inclosure ought to be sanctioned by the House unless the local inquiry had obtained evidence, not only from those pecuniarily interested in the inquiry, but also from those who could look upon the question from a public point of view. Now, that position of his was clearly marked out by the Commons Act of 1876, which was passed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department; for if anyone would turn to that Act and look at Subsection 6, Clause 11, they would see that the Home Secretary distinctly contemplated that the Assistant Commissioner should not be satisfied with simply obtaining evidence from those who were pecuniarily interested, but that he also thought it desirable to obtain it from those who could take a public view of the question apart from a private and interested view. Now, in this particular case, he wished to bring no charge whatever against the Inclosure Commissioners. It was the first to be dealt with under the Act of 1876, and any omissions which were made in the inquiry, he was quite willing to admit, were not made through intention, but from accident; but still it was most important that the House should show that they were anxious that the Act of 1876 should be carried out strictly in its spirit, and he said that a fundamental principle of that Act would be absolutely disregarded unless the Commissioners took most scrupulous care to secure those public interests. Now, he believed that in that particular inquiry that care was not taken; because, when the Bill was referred to a Select Committee in the preceding year, this—the following—was unanimously their Report. That Committee was presided over by the President of the Local Government Board. The Committee distinctly reported this—"That in future cases, care should be taken to procure disinterested evidence." They could not have a more clear and distinct intimation that in this particular inquiry disinterested evidence was not taken. He would prove that by a second fact. With regard to one group of commons—namely, those of Rutlandshire, there was an inquiry held on the spot, and meetings were held. Who were present at those meetings? At the morning meeting, 18 people were present, and of those, 11 were solicitors and land agents of the large landowners, seven were freeholders, and there was not one single independent person present. At the evening meeting, the only persons present were five solicitors, some of whom were London solicitors who had come down to represent the large landowners. Now, could they possibly conceive a case in which it was more distinctly shown that the Assistant Commissioner should not be satisfied with the evidence taken, but should have given instructions that the evidence of the people of the neighbourhood should be taken? He also wished to call attention to the case of Riccall. At Riccall, 45 people were present, and out of those persons, everyone except five was pecuniarily interested in the inclosure. Of the five persons, three were tenants-at-will holding cottages under the chief person who was interested in that particular inclosure.

Therefore, it seemed to him that it was clearly shown that evidence from disinterested persons was not obtained. He did not, of course, mean to throw any suspicion upon anyone; but he did say that it was evidence given by persons who were pecuniarily interested in recommending those inclosures; and he said, therefore, that the House was not in a position to judge properly from the evidence given before the Committee. There was a second point upon which, on the third reading of the Bill, he hoped to speak at greater length, but to which he would now ask the attention of the House. He would put this to the Home Secretary. When the right hon. Gentleman was passing the Commons Act, he again and again stated—and he (Mr. Fawcett) accepted the assertion—that the object of the Bill was to promote the regulation of commons as distinguished from the inclosure of commons. When the Bill was passing through the House, although he admitted that intention, he thought that, as the Bill was drawn, there was very little chance that those regulation clauses would come into operation. The Act had now been working for a couple of years, and what some of them predicted as to the working of the regulation clauses had been abundantly verified. He made this as no charge against the Home Secretary, because, as soon as it was pointed out to him, the right hon. Gentleman lost not a moment's time in introducing a Bill to amend his Commons Act of 1876; and he believed the result of the Bill, which had now passed the House of Lords, would be to give the regulating clauses of the Commons Act of 1876 a chance of being brought into practical operation, such as they would never have had under the Bill as it stood, and that he could explain by a single sentence. If a proposal was made to regulate a common, the whole expense of it, by the Act of 1876, would be thrown upon the lords of the manor and the commoners, and so no wonder they declined to undertake the duty of imposing regulations. But now the regulations would be practically presented to them, for, by the new Bill brought in by the Home Secretary, a certain small portion of every common which was proposed to be regulated could be sold, in order to pay the expenses of the regulation. Consequently, the regulation could be carried out without throwing any cost upon those who were interested in the common, and in that way a great obstacle which stood in the way of the regulation of commons would be removed. Now, he would again put the question to the Home Secretary. He said not a word about the commons to be inclosed, but he asked him to consider the position of the 114 acres of pasture; and, if that were not regulated, he asked him whether he could possibly imagine the case of any common that would be regulated under that Act. What was the position of that 114 acres of pasture? It was right in the heart of the village. It was largely used by the villagers for the purposes of recreation. He could not conceive of a case in a rural district where they could possibly have a stronger argument in favour of a recreation ground than they had in the case of the 114 acres of pasture in the heart of a village which was largely used by the villagers for the purposes of recreation. It was never represented to them when the inquiry was held that it was possible to inclose the commons and regulate this piece of ground, for very likely if it had been so, there would have been some evidence on the other side. If the Home Secretary would consent to postpone this Bill, and see what the effect of the regulating Bill would be, and if the Assistant Commissioner would go down and say that there was no objection to inclose the common field, but that there was an objection to inclose the pasture and the open heath, he believed that under those circumstances there probably would be no opposition offered to the regulation of the pastures. He therefore desired, by the Resolution he now intended to move, to assert two principles. In the first place, that it was of the utmost importance that in those local inquiries that were held in regard to proposed inclosures, that the Act of 1876 should be faithfully carried out, and that the Assistant Commissioner should not be satisfied with simply taking the evidence of those pecuniarily interested; and, secondly, he felt that if the scheme for regulation had been presented in the way in which it could be presented now that the amending Act of 1877 had been passed, much of the opposition which was now heard against regulation would be removed, and the regulation clauses of the Act of 1876 would have a much better chance of being brought into operation than they had at the present time.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient to proceed with this Bill until evidence has been obtained from disinterested witnesses as to the desirability of sanctioning the proposed inclosures, and until the obstacles which impede the application of the Clauses for the regulation of Commons, contained in the Commons Act of 1876, have been removed by the Commons Regulation Expenses Bill now passing through Parliament,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, as Chairman of the Commons Committee which had recommended those inclosures, thought it right to say a few words. The hon. Member had made a similar proposition in Committee; but, finding himself in a minority, he had given Notice to oppose in Parliament the Bill which confirmed the Provisional Orders. He was not complaining in the slightest degree that the hon. Member had not acted with perfect fairness from his own point of view. He did not wish to go into the merits of the particular case, because they had been carefully considered last Session by the Committee to which the hon. Member referred. That Committee recommended the inclosures upon certain conditions which had been complied with by the promoters. They also appended to their Report an opinion that in cases of future Provisional Orders evidence of disinterested witnesses should be taken. Now, he confessed that to his mind the old plan of hearing only promoters and opponents was more satisfactory, and more likely to bring about the requisite effects. It was difficult to say what really disinterested evidence was. There might be persons who had no interest whatever in the inclosures, and, therefore, were not technically interested witnesses; but those persons might be actuated by prejudices or by animosity against promoters which might bias their judgment. He recollected that there was a very great feeling about rabbits in the case of one witness who came before the Committee. However that might be, the inclosures had been recommended by the Committee of last year, and it was quite clear that the Resolution was not intended to apply to those particular inclosures. It was, no doubt, the intention of the Committee to pass those inclosures, and to limit the Resolution to future cases. In fact, those particular Provisional Orders would have been passed last year; but, unfortunately, the Bill for carrying them into effect was withdrawn at the end of the Session on account of a technical informality. He thought this need not have been done. As it was, the case came again before their Committee. The informality was corrected, and the conditions were all fulfilled. When the cases were selected, as had been stated by Mr. Caird before the Committee last year, they were selected as being the most deserving, and against which no allegations whatever had been made; and they were, therefore, chosen for the purpose of being submitted to the Committee, as if to see whether any inclosures should be permitted or not. It certainly appeared to him that, if such cases were to be met by conditions more onerous and stringent than the Act itself, they would be doing a very great injustice to the promoters and owners whom they asked to come before them and make applications for inclosures. He sometimes regretted to see inclosures of land anywhere near centres of population; but as long as the law was unrepealed, it was hardly just to meet applications for inclosures in a way that almost amounted to a refusal before hearing. He thought that the proposal the hon. Member for Hackney was making to postpone the Inclosure Bill, which had already been too long delayed, was still harder—namely, in order to wait for the passing of a Bill which was not yet passed, and which, if passed, might not apply to the particular inclosures in question. He did not in the least complain that the hon. Member should have expressed what he felt so keenly; but, at the same time, he thought it would be very unfortunate if the House were to delay any longer the passing of that Bill.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 66; Noes 22: Majority 44. — (Div. List, No. 275.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Confirmation of Provisional Orders).

MR. FAWCETT moved to omit Riccall from the operation of the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that the proper place for the hon. Member to move his Amendment was on the Schedule of the Bill.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 *agreed to.*

On Schedule.

MR. FAWCETT moved that Riccall be omitted therefrom. He did so in order to get from the Secretary of State some reason why the portion of the land proposed to be inclosed should not be regulated instead. In Riccall there were 114 acres of pasture land in the heart of the village, which were largely used by the villagers for the purpose of feeding cattle and for recreation. If that land was not to be regulated in the case of Riccall, he would ask the Home Secretary, whether he could suggest any single case in which regulation was the proper course to be taken? He had never yet heard any explanation why the particular portion of land he had mentioned should be inclosed, and not regulated.

MR. LEEMAN trusted that the Committee would refuse to adopt the proposal of the hon. Member for Hackney. It had already been explained to the House by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cave) that this was a Bill for the inclosure of certain spaces, and that it had been practically before Parliament for two years. It would have been supposed from what fell from the hon. Member for Hackney, that there had been some opposition to the Bill outside himself. He (Mr. Leeman) ventured to say, and he thought he could make it clear to the House before he finished his observations, that every possible inquiry had been made into the merits and demerits of this application. There had been a Committee upon the Bill, presided over by the right hon. Gentleman, which sat last year for no less than seven days. Before that the Commissioners had had the matter advertised, and had called upon persons in the locality, and not a single person had any objection to make to the Bill, so far as Riccall was concerned. The Commissioners not only advertised the proposal, but they called upon all parties in any way interested in the locality to state any objections that could be raised to the Bill. Moreover, meetings were held, first of all in the morning, and afterwards in the evening. Upon that occasion the hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that nobody came to the meetings but those interested in the inclosure; but the whole world was invited by the advertisement to attend, and the advertisement was inserted in the various newspapers in the neighbourhood. It was provided by the Act of 1876 that great care must be taken that everyone should have the fullest opportunity of stating his objections. It was very odd that the hon. Member for Hackney exhibited so great a knowledge of Riccall; he wished the hon. Gentleman would be good enough to favour the House with all the information he possessed with regard to that place.

MR. FAWCETT said, that he had never mentioned a single fact connected with Riccall, although he had heard many facts connected with it privately; but he never mentioned a single fact that he had not obtained from Blue Books that were before the House, or from evidence that was considered by the Select Committee.

MR. LEEMAN said, that the hon. Member himself sat as one of the Committee listening to the evidence which was brought forward. If the hon. Gentleman referred to a Blue Book for the proceeding he was now taking, let him show the Committee that every Member of the Select Committee voted against him, when the subject was before them; and that, by this overwhelming majority, the Committee voted in favour of the particular inclosure now before the House. The Committee made certain stipulations that additional quantities of land should be inserted in the Provisional Orders to what had been originally inserted; but when that was done, every Member of this Committee, with the exception of the hon. Gentleman, voted for the Bill being passed. And why were they not passed last Session? It was simply because technicalities were found to exist, and the Inclosure Commissioners had to withdraw the Bill. But, said the hon. Gentleman, the Committee had passed a Resolution that on all future occasions, the Commissioners should call before them what had been termed disinterested witnesses. But, nevertheless, the Committee had voted that these Bills should be passed through the House. What took place afterwards? After the different owners of property affected to the extent of some 6,000 acres had made the alterations required by the Committee and the Commissioners had made the Provisional Orders required by Act of Parliament, it was necessary that the matter should come for confirmation before the House. There was not a living soul had any idea of opposing the application. No one knew that better than the hon. Member for Hackney, and yet he now sought to exclude Riccall. Months went over, after the Committee came to the resolution mentioned, and the labouring classes in the village of Riccall, which contained some 800 persons, were in expectation of the passing of the Bill. It was proved before the Committee that those were the persons most interested in the inclosure, and those men had been waiting for months in expectation that they would speedily have this Provisional Order as regarded Riccall put in force. But suddenly there turned up in the village of Riccall a man whom no one knew anything at all about. When he arrived, people said—"What are you doing here?" He asked—"Are any of you opposed to this inclosure?" No one was aware of any opposition. Then he said—"I am a gentleman from the 'Anti-Inclosure Suburban Commons Association.' If you listen to me and follow the advice I am about to give you, I shall be able to do you some good." That person—who it turned out afterwards came from London—laid birdlime, into which some persons walked, and he would tell the Committee who they were. They were the men who, in former years, had been owners of cottages in which they lived, and to which commonable rights were attached, which they had sold and got the value of. The agent of the "Anti-Inclosure Suburban Commons Association" induced those persons to believe that he could bring about the regulation of a part of the common, instead of inclosure. He therefore induced those persons to walk into the birdlime he set, and 18 of those persons were dishonest enough to sign a document called a Petition to the House of Commons. The rest of the persons interested thought it was scarcely fair that they should have been paid for their commonable rights, and yet keep the land uninclosed. But, oddly enough, there was a Petition, of which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney had some knowledge, for he moved before the Committee this year that the resolution to which it had come should not be confirmed until the Assistant Commissioners had been examined as to whether the recommendation of the Committee as to obtaining evidence from disinterested parties had been carried out, and until a certain Petition from Riccall against the inclosure of commons had been considered. The hon. Member was thus aware of that Petition. He (Mr. Leeman) had searched the records of that period, but could not discover the Petition. If that Petition were not produced, upon whose authority was it that the hon. Gentleman was making the statements he now did with regard to Riccall? The hon. Gentleman himself was never in Riccall in his life, so far as he (Mr. Leeman) knew. There were several reasons why the people of Riccall should have wished for this inclosure to take place, and their wish was evident, notwithstanding the efforts of the "Anti-Inclosure Suburban Commons Association." The land at Riccall was, to a very great extent, swampy, and the particular 114 acres of pasture to which the hon. Member had alluded was called the "Riccall Dam." The Committee took far greater care of these people's rights than would be done by the Anti-Inclosure Association. When they came to ask for Petitions, they found one presented by about 120 of the labouring population of Riccall, who were conscious that if the inclosure did not take place, the land in question would continue in its present bad state; whereas the inclosure would involve an expense of £15,000 in the reclamation of the land, which would go into the pockets of the labouring population. Did the hon. Member consider what he was doing in preventing that money from being spent for the benefit of the people of Riccall? He (Mr. Leeman) was describing a locality which he knew well, for it was within half-an-hour of his own place, and he stated his deliberate opinion that the inclosure ought to take place. The hon. Member said he did not object to the arable land and common field land being inclosed; but he proposed to stop the Bill for another year, because, upon his own showing only, there happened to be 114 acres of land in Riccall which he did not think should be inclosed. Why was this inclosure asked for with respect to the other land? There were between 600 and 700 acres of land in Riccall held in common between something like 45 owners, each man holding from six perches to about six acres; the land was close to the River Ouse, and required extensive draining. The inclosure was one of which everyone had had notice, and which, but for the hon. Member, would have taken place years ago. The 144 acres was part of the common land, and like the other portion, was lowlying, having a porous surface and a clay sub-soil. It was proved before the Committee by independent witnesses, consisting of the most eminent agriculturists in Yorkshire, that the drainage operations on that common would take three to five years to carry out. Did the hon. Member think that the labouring classes of Riccall considered that he was doing them any good in objecting to this expenditure of £15,000? Rather, he should have thought, that after having done all in his power to oppose the inclosure the hon. Member for Hackney would have been satisfied to have let the Bill pass without keeping hon. Members in town for the purpose of supporting the Bill. The discussion of this subject was a pure waste of time, and he called upon the hon. Member to show the Petition which he had mentioned, and the Committee would then be able to see the value of the objection. The people of Riccall had petitioned the House in favour of the Bill; and he, therefore, with some confidence, opposed the Amendment of the hon. Member.

MR. FAWCETT observed, that it was quite impossible for him, at that time of night, to answer the hon. Gentleman's arguments at length. He had no motive for his criticism, except that derived from the impression produced on him when this question came before the Committee. His hon. Friend waxed extremely indignant with him, though he had only spoken from the sincerest motives; but he must remember, when he spoke with such unwonted enthusiasm, that he spoke as a professional advocate. He spoke for the lord of the manor, and he (Mr. Fawcett) spoke from a public point of view. The Petition to which his hon. Friend referred was not drawn up for presentation to the House, but to the Committee. He knew nothing about the Petition; but certain strong allegations were made with regard to it, and he was anxious that they should be sifted. It was proposed that the Petition should be considered by the Committee. He had known the hon. Member too long to object to-night to the strong language he had used; and as he thought he would speak in a different way after further consideration, he (Mr. Fawcett) would postpone further remarks till the third reading.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, speaking with reference to the hon. Member for Hackney's statement that the case of Riccall was one in which it appeared that it would be most convenient that the regulating clause should be applied, assured the Committee that the question of regulation was put to the witnesses over and over again. He was Chairman of the Committee, and all the witnesses agreed that there was no desire to enter into that question; but that inclosure was desired was proved by the promoters, and no objection on the part of any of the inhabitants was urged. These questions came before the Committee not so much promoted by the parties, as by the Inclosure Commissioners, who were responsible for bringing before the Committee the cases which they considered ought to be so brought. He, as Chairman of the Committee, however, was anxious that there should be no question as to the *bona fides* of the Commissioners, and he caused notice to be given to the inhabitants that a Committee of the House of Commons was to adjudicate in these inclosures, and that any person who had anything to say was invited to give evidence. In his opinion, a most grievous injustice would be done to those interested in the inclosures, if they were not carried out this Session.

MR. FAWCETT said, he would not put the Committee to the trouble of dividing.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Schedule *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment.

On Question "That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow?".

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked, what would be the order of Business? An unusual number of Bills still remained on the Orders, and nothing had been said as to the probable day of Prorogation. The House would lose a most important opportunity of having grievances brought forward at the close of the Session, if the Appropriation Bill were taken so late, as he feared it was likely to be, at the next Sitting. If, in fixing the Bill now before the House for that day, the Government meant the House to understand that there would be several Bills set down before the Appropriation Bill, a most unusual course would be taken. On Wednesday, when the Appropriation Bill might be the first Order, time was limited, and probably the first Motion would take up the whole day, so that the House would only have the opportunity of bringing forward one grievance. On former occasions there had always been three ample opportunities, at least, of bringing forward grievances on the Appropriation Bill. On one important subject—the attitude of the Porte towards Greece—it was most important that there should be some opportunity for debate. Information had reached him as to the Porte's reception of the directions of the Congress in regard to the Greek frontiers, which convinced him that the subject ought to be considered by the House; but he feared lest there should be no opportunity given for its consideration.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I must remind the hon. Baronet that there have been a great many opportunities this Session of bringing forward this question of the treatment of Greece. As to the Order of Business for to-day, we propose to take—first, the Committee on the Indian Budget; then, the Committee on the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill; then, the third reading of the Bishoprics Bill; then, the Inclosure Bill; and then, the third reading of the Telegraphs Bill. On Wednesday, we put the Appropriation Bill down for third reading; and I should hope that the Prorogation may take place on Friday; but, at all events, not later than Saturday.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON explained that the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had not referred to Greek questions that had already occupied the attention of the House, but to questions raised by the receipt of recent intelligence.

Bill to be read the third time *Tomorrow.*

## CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

### SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

## NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND).—RESOLUTION.

Mr. MELDON rose to call attention to the claims of the Irish National Teachers; and to move—

> "That this House, having, with the assent of Her Majesty's Government on the 7th of May last passed a Resolution that the position of the Irish National Teachers called for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government with a view to a satisfactory adjustment of their claims, this House is of opinion that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to have given effect during the present Session to such Resolution, and to have made proposals to this House for securing with certainty to the Irish National School Teachers the full amount of the result fees to be earned by them in the current year."

The hon. and learned Member said, it was unprecedented that the Appropriation Bill should be brought forward at such a late hour, and he should not have brought forward his Motion then, were it not that there never was a fitter subject for discussion than the case of great hardship and injustice which he had to present. So far back as the 1st May, he moved that the claims of these teachers called for the immediate attention of the House, with a view to the satisfactory settlement of their claims. The House passed the Resolution, and he thought there was ample ground for saying that it was the duty of the Government to have given effect to such a Resolution of the House. When he added that the gist of the Resolution —namely, its demand on the immediate attention of the Government—had been the subject of discussion between himself and the right hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland, and that the Government had assented to the Motion, after he had declined to withdraw the word "immediate," it would appear still more surprising that no steps had yet been taken by the Government. He was one of those who tried to negotiate with the Government before bringing grievances before the House, and he had put himself in communication with the Chancellor of the Exchequer on this subject; but he did not even respond to him. He took no notice of his reasonable demand. He called the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant to the subject. He was courtesy itself; but he avoided discussing what means ought to be adopted to remove the grievances of the teachers. In two or three words he would now state their case. In 1874, the full justice of the demands of the teachers were admitted. In 1875, the Government proposed a scheme, which they themselves stated was a temporary scheme. They took a Vote of £120,000 towards the payment of two-thirds of the result fees. They said—"We will give you £60,000 unconditionally. We will give you the other £60,000 on condition that the Unions of Ireland provide another £60,000." It was stated in the House that this scheme must necessarily fail, and it was urged by the Government that it would only be temporary. It had wholly failed. Where the Unions did not contribute, and where voluntary subscriptions could not be had, the teachers would actually lose two-thirds of their result fees. There were many cases of the grossest hardship. What had occurred in the North Union of Dublin? Since 1875, up to the present year, that Union had been contributing, and the teachers had received the benefit of the provision which the Government intended for them in 1875. They had been receiving the full amount of their result fees. This year the Union had ceased to be contributory, and these men were, at one sweep, deprived of two-thirds of their earnings. Upwards of £5,000 was lost to the teachers of that Union. There were 10,000 teachers in Ireland, and it was a monstrous thing that, the justice of their demands having been acknowledged in 1875, nothing had yet been done for them. They were now left in the same slough of despondency as before. If he rested his case on these facts alone, it ought to be recognized that they were suffering injustice. But there was the clearest breach of faith; there was no use in putting it in a milder way. The Government having assented to the Resolution, declaring that the subject should have their immediate attention, had done nothing, and not a word was said on the subject when the Irish Education Estimates were before the House. He had pointed out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that large sums voted for these result fees had, in consequence of the failure of the plan of 1875, found their way back into the Exchequer. This year, £20,000 out of the £120,000 had found its way back. Last year, something like £30,000 was returned; and similar sums were returned in the two preceding years. So that £100,000 intended for the teachers had not been paid to them, owing to the imperfection of the scheme. He had suggested to the Government that, as they had done nothing in accordance with the Resolution of the House, they should take £60,000 out of that £100,000, and apply that towards the payment of funds which ought to have been contributed by the Unions. The Government might do that this year, and bring in some scheme for finally settling the subject next year. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not deigned to reply to his communications. He granted that the question of pensions was a difficult one, and he did not intend now to touch upon that; but the question of salaries demanded immediate settlement. He would, therefore, move the Resolution which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, having, with the assent of Her Majesty's Government, on the 7th of May last passed a Resolution that the position of the Irish National Teachers called for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government with a view to a satisfactory adjustment of their claims, this House is of opinion that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to have given effect during the present Session to such Resolution, and to have made proposals to this House for securing with certainty to the Irish National School Teachers the full amount of the result fees to be earned by them in the current year,"—(*Mr. Meldon,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. J. LOWTHER: The hon. and learned Gentleman speaks of a breach of faith on the part of the Government. I am sorry that language so strong should come from him; but I feel sure, when he hears what is the actual state of affairs, he will not wish to repeat the language. What took place was this. On the 7th May, the hon. and learned Gentleman, in a speech of great ability and moderation, as I myself took the liberty of observing at the time, brought forward the question of the position of the teachers of National Schools in Ireland. In reply, I called attention to the fact that the Government, in past Sessions, had not been unmindful of the interests of that class. They had introduced the Bill of 1875, to which he has referred, and had founded on it some regulations which I admitted did not lead to the results hoped for. I said, further, that the Government were not disposed to take exception to the Motion proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman, provided some verbal Amendments, which I indicated, were acceded to. They were acceded to, and we accepted the Motion. That was a voluntary act on our part, and I do not find fault with the hon. and learned Gentleman for wishing us to carry out that engagement. But what was the nature of the engagement? Without referring to the details of the past debate, I must remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that what I said was much to this effect—that this matter had been referred to the Treasury, with whom these questions rested, and that it had been found necessary to submit the figures bearing on the subject for an actuarial Report. We hope no long time will elapse before we get that Report. [MR. MELDON: That refers to the pensions.] The Resolution of the hon. and learned Member referred to the whole subject, and my reply referred to the subject as a whole. I never for a moment dreamt of dealing with the subject this Session, and that was shown by my indication of the probable appropriation of a portion of the surplus of the Irish Church funds. [MR. MELDON: My Resolution now deals solely with the question of salaries.] That may be, but the whole question of the National School Teachers is under the consideration of the House, and a considerable portion of the last discussion bore on the subject of pensions, and the appropriation of part of the surplus of the Irish Church funds was one of the suggestions entertained by the Government. It was found necessary that the persons who made the Report to which I have referred should have what is called an experience statement drawn up—a table based on averages. [MR. MELDON: That is with reference to pensions.] Exactly, and my idea is that the subject must be dealt with as a whole. As to the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman, it is made in forgetfulness of the fact that the large sums of money to which he refers do not remain with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but are paid back into the Treasury according to law, and can only be given out on a fresh Vote of the House. It is impossible to deal at once with the subject in a comprehensive manner; but I hope, under these circumstances, that the hon. and learned Gentleman will see that we are studiously endeavouring to carry out our engagement to the House.

MR. WHITWELL was sorry to hear the right hon. Gentleman turning aside from the question submitted to the House, and endeavouring to divert the attention of the House altogether from the subject of discussion. Pensions had not been referred to by the hon. and learned Member who introduced the subject to the House. He advocated an arrangement for increasing the salaries of teachers; but the subject of pensions for the Irish schoolmasters was a new one to him, and it struck him as extraordinary, if such a subject was to be coupled with an appropriation of Irish Church funds. What the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Meldon) contended was that it was acknowledged by the House that the Irish teachers did not receive as much salary as they ought to receive, and the attention of Her Majesty's Government had been directed to the adjustment of their claims. In the meantime, pending such adjustment, the poor teachers were receiving a mere nothing; it was all very well to wait for another year, but everyone knew that the present income of the teacher in Ireland was utterly insufficient. The mode in which the subject ought to have been dealt with was to have made the scheme compulsory on the Unions, and not merely voluntary. He was extremely sorry that another year must again pass over before the teachers could receive a single farthing in addition to their present miserable salaries.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY observed, that the right hon. Gentleman, in his reply to this matter, had dealt only with one branch of the subject brought forward—namely, that of pensions—ignoring the other part of the case put forward by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Kildare. It was an attempt to draw attention away from the real ground of complaint, notwithstanding that the hon. and learned Member had written two letters—one to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the other to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in respect of the matter. As the matter at present stood, the Resolution of the House remained nugatory, the Unions of Ireland refusing to contribute anything while the matter was left to their discretion. After an experience of two or three years of this refusal, the teachers were to be allowed to starve, while for four Sessions continual attempts were being made on the part of the Irish Members of every Party to obtain justice for them. The average salary of Irish teachers was only £51 a-year; and it was a great injustice to the men and women employed, and a greater injustice to the scholars, who were being huddled together in the schools under the control of those insufficiently-paid teachers, that they should be reduced to that condition. It was a mistaken system that would leave these men and women, on whom the intellectual life of the Irish nation depended, to be reduced to the half-starved condition in which they now were.

MR. O'CLERY remarked, that, no doubt, it would be said by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and by some other Members of the Government, that unless Ireland contributed in some measure towards the support of the teachers, Irish Members had no right to come to the House and demand that further sums should be voted on their behalf. He thought it had been clearly shown to the House that the system of national education, as it at present existed, had been forced upon Ireland contrary to the wish of the Irish people, and of the Irish clergy and hierarchy. The people were compelled to receive this system of education, and it was hard to expect them to contribute to a system forced upon them against their will. According to law, the school boards were to be elected by the people; but when they found that only about 20 per cent of the population voted in respect of them, it was clear that the people did not agree with the system of education. If the Government would force upon the Irish nation a system of education, it was perfectly clear that if the teachers were underpaid, the Government could not refuse to make up their salaries. Therefore, there was no right to expect that these teachers, forced by the system of education upon the Irish people, were to be maintained by them. At the same time, it was absurd to expect that the National School Teachers of Ireland would continue year after year to discharge their duties faithfully, unless justice was done to them by the Government. Ten thousand teachers were now placed in the unworthy position of the Government receiving their services and insufficiently paying them. The Irish people had reason to hope that when the Intermediate Education Bill was passed, something would have been done to place the teachers in a position to exist, and to enable them properly to discharge their duties.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER wished, in the first place, to express his regret that the hon. and learned Member should have written a letter to him, which he did not acknowledge. He had some recollection of a letter coming to him, and of sending it to another Department, he himself not knowing what had been done in the matter. He was really very sorry that the letter had neither been acknowledged nor answered; but he could assure the hon. and learned Gentleman that it was from no want of courtesy on his part. He was under the impression that he spoke to his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary on the matter; and it was also his impression that the Chief Secretary informed him that he had attended to it.

MR. MELDON said, that the answer he got was simply a mere acknowledgment of the receipt of his letter.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER was extremely sorry that there had been anything like a want of courtesy; but he must ask the hon. and learned Gentleman to remember that, in the multiplicity of matters to which he had to attend, he might occasionally forget something. But the much more material point was as to the justice of the complaint which the hon. and learned Gentleman made with regard to the conduct of the Government. He wished to remind him and the House of the position in which the Irish National School Teachers were, and of the different questions which, at different times, had been brought forward in respect of them. One point was with reference to their residences; another was as to the salaries of the teachers; and a third with regard to their pensions. As respected residences, he believed that that question had been practically settled; with regard to the salaries, the experiment was made two years ago by his right hon. Friend the present Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), of dealing with the matter in such a way as would involve a certain amount of local contribution in aid of the Imperial grant. The Government were then of opinion, and still thought, that that was the proper proposal to make, and one in accordance with what was done in this country. Undoubtedly, to a certain extent, that proposal might be said to have failed. Why? Because there was a failure in the local contributions that were expected and hoped for. Contributions were made in some Unions; but in others, and the larger class of cases, no contributions were made, and the teachers were the sufferers. He did not know to what extent they went; but the proposals of the hon. and learned Gentleman now were in entire subversion of the scheme of the Government. It was proposed by the Government that if localities would contribute certain sums, the Imperial Exchequer would grant a like sum. Some Unions did contribute, and the State, accordingly, granted a like amount; and the hon. and learned Gentleman said, with regard to these cases, that he would leave them alone. But, undoubtedly, it would be hard upon the Unions that had contributed, if the other Unions were placed in a like situation, without any contribution. It would be placing those that did not contribute on a level with those that did. With regard to the third question—that of pensions—it was a point upon which it had always been admitted that something ought to be done, and a scheme in respect to the matter was before the Government, and would be carefully considered. It was in regard to pensions that the Government admitted something ought immediately to be done, and that immediate attention should be given. It was unnecessary that he should refer in detail to the debate that took place on the 7th of May. His right hon. Friend then stated very little. What he said as regarded salaries was that the first class of teachers were in receipt of sums amounting to £2 a-week; the second class to £1 10*s.* a-week, and the third to £1. He was not aware that in the speech of his right hon. Friend, or in any other speech on behalf of the Government, consideration was promised to the question of raising salaries; but undoubtedly, as regarded pensions, a promise was given, and the Government were prepared to fulfil that promise.

Mr. MELDON said, he understood that, in the debate of the 7th of May, a promise was made by the Government with regard to pensions. He did not think that they were receiving fair treatment by the mode in which the Government were now acting. As respected salaries, it was a most important matter, and the Government could raise them by bringing up the amount of public money given to Ireland to the same amount as that allowed Scotland. Between £60,000 and £70,000 was allowed to Scotland, and if the sum contributed to Ireland was raised to that amount, there would be an opportunity of paying the Irish National School Teachers proper salaries. He only asked that the same amount per head should be paid in Ireland as was paid in Scotland. In Scotland the Government spent about 3*s.* 2*d.* per head; whereas in Ireland the public money spent did not exceed 2*s.* 4*d.* per head. He considered that during the next six or eight months the Government ought to do something with regard to this matter. At all events, if the Government did not wish to contribute, they might allow the teachers to receive the result fees earned by them without the contribution of the Union.

At the present time, about £25,000 to £35,000 was returned into the Exchequer as surplus money, voted for national education in Ireland; that should be expended in increasing the salaries of the Irish National School Teachers—for it could not be expected that those people would remain contented to receive £50 a-year in Ireland, while the same class in England and Scotland obtained £105 a-year. If the suggestion he had made were attended to, it would do a great deal to put an end to the feeling of discontent which the action of the Government in regard to education in Ireland had excited.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 47; Noes 30: Majority 17.—(Div. List, No. 276.)

### STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES (IRELAND).—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY wished to call the attention of the Government to the condition of the stipendiary magistrates in Ireland. They were now appointed under the Act of *Will.* IV., which reduced the amount of their retiring salaries and placed them under a disadvantage as compared with their former position. The result was that while magistrates appointed before 1847 were allowed to retire on their full salaries, those who were appointed after that date had to retire at a much reduced pension; consequently, the Bench in Ireland was now stocked with men who were really not capable of discharging their duties. The men appointed before 1847 retired on completing the full period of 20 years' service, while the magistrates appointed after 1847, having to retire on a diminished pension, were averse to retiring at all. He did not mean to advocate that any larger pensions should be given than at present—that was a question for the Government—but he did submit that some steps should be taken to induce these gentlemen to retire from the duties of their office when they had reached the ordinary period when a man's labours should cease. At present, it was no uncommon thing for magistrates to be 71, 73, or 76 years of age. It was all very well to have men in the Superior Courts of very great age, because they were under the eye of public opinion; but these local magistrates were little kings in their own districts. They represented the law in rural localities, and it was most desirable that the law should be wisely and properly represented. Without suggesting that there should be any larger increase of the pensions, or that other stringent measures should be adopted, he would suggest to the Government the desirability of removing these magistrates at the proper time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, that the matter, as he understood it, was rather difficult to decide by any legislation, and must be left to the action of public opinion, which up to that time had been found to be adequate. It had not been found necessary to lay down a hard-and-fast line as to the age at which a man should retire, and he did not think it was desirable to increase the compensation.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

### TELEGRAPHS BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 257.]

(*Lord John Manners.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 4, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Differences relating to a street or public road to be determined by stipendiary magistrates, county court judge, or sheriff).

MR. BRISTOWE moved, as an Amendment, in page 3, line 28, to leave out all the words after "difference" to the end of the clause, in order to insert the words "shall be decided by a judge of the High Court of Justice." He explained that the object of the Amendment was to enable any difference that might arise to be disposed of by the High Court of Justice, instead of by the Railway Commissioners. He did not think that the Commissioners, being a temporary body, should be the persons to whom references should ultimately be made. He had been informed, however, by the Postmaster General, that the matter had been under considerable discussion, and that, without giving any distinct opinion as to the merits of the

Amendment, he could not accept it. Under these circumstances, he would not divide upon it, but would consent to have it negatived, having regard to the communication that had been made to him.

Amendment *negatived.*

Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

### HIGHWAYS BILL—[BILL 298.]

#### CONSIDERATION OF LORDS AMENDMENTS.

Lords Amendments *considered.*

In reply to Mr. WHITWELL,

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, that by an Amendment to Clause 24, it was intended to give a more extended notice to owners than was provided for under the original clause.

Lords Amendments *agreed to*, with Amendments, and with Consequential Amendments to the Bill.

### TRAMWAY ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL—[BILL 299.]

#### CONSIDERATION OF LORDS AMENDMENTS.

Lords Amendments *considered.*

MR. MONK said, he should be glad to know what course the Government proposed to take with regard to these Amendments, and if they intended to agree to them. His constituents had learnt with great astonishment that, after the recommendations of the Select Committee on Tramways, with regard to steam power, and after a Bill had passed through that House for the purpose of authorizing its use, the House of Lords had struck out all the clauses with regard to mechanical power on tramways. The Committee had reported unanimously in favour of steam power; and, in addition to that, the principle was confirmed in a very full House by 216 votes to 119. The Bill had gone before the other House, and it had come back with all the steam power clauses struck out. It appeared, so far as he could learn, that that had been done at the instance of one person, without any evidence having been taken by the other House; and therefore he wished to ask the Government whether they intended to agree with these Amendments, or to confirm the views arrived at by the House in the case of the Private Bill to which he had referred, as well as by a Committee which sat for several weeks and took a great amount of evidence, and eventually issued a Report in favour of the use of steam power based upon evidence of the most satisfactory nature? This was a matter in which he knew his hon. Friend the Chairman of Committees had taken a great interest, and upon which he had appointed a very strong Committee, consisting principally of hon. Members who were usually Chairmen of Private Bill Committees. It was a very serious matter that after the enormous expense to which the promoters of these Bills had been put, at the last moment, by the mere will and whim of a single Member of Parliament, the power and right to use steam on tramways should be denied to England and Wales. He therefore hoped, in the first place, that the Government would not agree to those clauses being struck out; or, at all events, if they did so, they would assure him that the expenses to which the promoters of these tramways had been put in the matter should not be thrown away, but that legislation with regard to steam power should be proposed next year.

MR. J. G. TALBOT agreed with his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Monk), that it would be a great convenience to have the consideration of the matter taken to-morrow.

Consideration of Lords Amendments *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

### TERRITORIAL WATERS JURISDICTION BILL—[*Lords*]—[BILL 137.]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

#### COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, that he much regretted that the Bill had been so placed on the Paper that it was impossible to have a fair discussion of it. He had not expected that the Bill would be taken that night, nor did he believe that his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General thought it was likely to come on. Three o'clock in the morning was a very improper time to enter upon the discussion of a Bill involving such momentous questions as this, violating, as it did, the rights of foreign nations, and, as he was told, being directly in opposition to the opinion of foreign countries. The Bill was perfectly unnecessary, for he considered that the law of England, as it at present stood, together with the good relations that now existed between nations, were quite sufficient to accomplish the purpose aimed at by the measure. It reversed the solemn decision of the Judges in the Court for Crown Cases Reserved in the case of the *Franconia*, and, therefore, it was a matter of very great importance. The effect of the Bill, as it now stood, would be to give a jurisdiction to the English Courts over all foreign ships within three miles of the shore of England, whether they were ships of war or merchant ships. The principle of the law of England was that the jurisdiction of the Admiralty commenced at low water mark, and that only the Court of Admiralty had jurisdiction there; but by Statute, Judges of Assize had jurisdiction in the space between high and low water mark — that was to say, there was a jurisdiction to that extent in the Common Law Courts. Thus, at high water, the Admiralty had jurisdiction over the fore shore; but at low water, the ordinary Courts exercised authority up to the limit of the strand left bare by the sea. In running-down cases, the matters were dealt with by virtue of the good relations which existed between various nations. In the case of the *Franconia*, the man who was charged with the running down was tried in his own country for the offence, and it was thereby clear that there was no need for this legislation. He ventured to say that if any foreign ship did any injury on the high seas, a remedy would be afforded to this country by the nation to which the captain of the vessel belonged; and, therefore, no change of the law was necessary to meet this case. No doubt, the ordinary rule of International Law was that every country had jurisdiction within three miles of its own shore. That, he admitted, was the principle laid down by the authorities on International Law, who held that a jurisdiction was exercisable by any particular State within a certain distance of its own shores, wherever the safety of such State rendered it necessary. Thus, any country had a right to provide for its own safety by exercising a certain jurisdiction over the sea near its own shores, and over the ships within that limit, in such particulars as were necessary for her safety, and came within the range of International Law. But it was unnecessary for the safety of any country that its Courts should have jurisdiction over the sea within three miles of the shore in ordinary criminal cases. He did think, therefore, that this Bill was founded on a misapprehension of the rule about the three miles' distance—that the Bill was unnecessary, and that it was calculated to bring this country, as it would bring it, into difficulties with foreign nations. It was true that there was a clause in the Bill providing that no proceedings should be taken against persons other than Her Majesty's subjects without the permission of the Secretary of State; but that clause showed the weakness of the measure. It was an admission that the Bill was contrary to the rights of other nations. Therefore, to provide that no proceedings should be taken against foreigners without the previous permission of the Secretary of State was not sufficient, for a Public Bill should be so framed as not to violate the rights of foreign countries; it should only be framed within the limits which International Law had laid down as the jurisdiction of a country. It was not right to go beyond that, and attempt to give jurisdiction to the ordinary Courts in cases where it was not required for the safety of the country, and where International Law was against the exercise of such jurisdiction. By so extending the jurisdiction to Criminal Courts, the principles of International Law were really violated. Last Session, the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) brought in a Bill like the present, and the hon. and learned Solicitor General then very properly said that such a Bill ought not to be introduced without previous communication with foreign countries—and in the earlier part of the evening the Chancellor of the Exchequer had told him that no such communication had taken place — and obtaining their consent to its passing. In his opinion, the wisest course for Her Majesty's Government to take would be to withdraw this Bill and re-consider the Motion; and, if necessary, to introduce another Bill next Session, after communications with some of the principal foreign nations. He would not say more at that early hour; but would reserve any further observations to the third reading. He was afraid, if the Bill passed in its present form, it would be found to give rise to considerable difficulties with foreign countries.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Amendment of the law as to the jurisdiction of the Admiral).

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, that its effect would be to include a ship of war as well as a merchant vessel. By the law of nations, every ship of war was part of the territory of the country to which it belonged. Supposing an offence were committed on board a ship of war, and steps were taken to punish the criminal according to the law laid down by this Bill, it would be, in effect, a violation of International Law. It was no answer to say that the Secretary of State might not possibly allow such steps to be taken, nor was it any answer to the objection to the clause on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of International Law to say that an offence committed on board a ship of war belonging to a foreign country would not be cognizable by the English Courts, for the Bill already made it so. The effect of the clause, therefore, was to violate the principles of International Law, and it was desirable that at some future stage of the Bill this should be remedied. That could be done by making the only offences cognizable by the English Courts such as were committed on board any foreign ship, or by the crew of any foreign ship not being a ship of war. Such a Proviso would render the clause less objectionable, and he, therefore, begged to move that as an Amendment to it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Hardinge Giffard) observed, that the Amendment was unnecessary, and might imperil the passing of the Bill. The Bill did not affect to deal with any principle of International Law, and he might observe that such authorities as the Lord Chancellor, Lord Selborne, and Lord Hatherley agreed in the opinion that a foreign ship of war was not included by the definition given in the clause.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER was not aware that the point had yet been raised; but he considered it unquestionable that

the words "foreign ship" included a ship of war. By the Interpretation Clause, it was provided that "foreign ship" should mean any ship that was not a British ship. It was all very well to say that International Law would operate to prevent any breach of its own rules; but there would be an Act of Parliament expressly to override it. The Judges would have the words of the Act of Parliament before them, and not the rules of International Law; and supposing that there were words in the Act of Parliament which, in their opinion, included foreign ships of war, they would have to give effect to them. He maintained that a Judge would have to decide on the words in the English Act of Parliament, and would have no power to say that the rules of International Law overruled an Act of Parliament.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Hardinge Giffard) remarked, that the same observation would apply to every Act of Parliament. Surely the hon. and learned Member could not consider such a position tenable.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, that the case cited by the Solicitor General was not *pari materia.* Clearly, if the term "French ship" were used, it would mean every French vessel, whether a ship of war or not. Even with regard to a merchant ship, there was a principle of law that it was ex-territorial, though in a minor degree to a ship of war. Let them take another case. If an Act of Parliament prescribed certain regulations with regard to all foreign houses in this country, that would apply as well to the houses of Ambassadors as to others. The Judges, in such a case, would not be at liberty to hold that the rules of International Law prevailed, and exempted the houses of Ambassadors from the operation of the Act of Parliament.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Wednesday.*

House adjourned at half after Three o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Tuesday*, 13*th August*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) *.

*Second Reading*—Metropolitan Commons * (199); Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (197).

*Second Reading — Committee negatived* — Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland) * (200).

*Third Reading*—Marriages (Fiji) * (195); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. * (170); Prison (Officers' Superannuation) * (184), and *passed.*

*Royal Assent* — Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 53]; Debtors Acts Amendment [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 54]; British Museum (Transfer of Collection) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 55]; Commons Regulation (Expenses) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 56]; Statute Law Revision (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 57].

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 197.)

(*The Lord O'Hagan.*)

### SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD O'HAGAN: My Lords, in asking your Lordships to read this Bill a second time, I shall not find it necessary to occupy your attention beyond a very short time in discussing the reasons for that Motion. The Bill has been, as your Lordships are all aware, for a long period indeed before the country. It has been debated night after night, week after week, and month after month, in the House of Commons, *usque ad nauseam.* It has been, in all aspects of the question which it raises, discussed by most of the public journals in this country on the one side and on the other. The result is that I should be very much unwarranted in supposing that there is a single Peer of those whom I now address who is not tolerably well acquainted with the reasons which can be given both for or against the Bill. The Bill comes before your Lordships under very remarkable circumstances. It is a measure which, though it has been modified in its progress, has been substantially more than one Session in the House of Commons. It has been encountered, during the last Session and in the present, by an opposition as ingenious and as obstinate as was ever offered to any measure presented to the House of Commons; and it has weathered that opposition by the aid of sweeping majorities on every occasion when any question has been raised. It comes before your Lordships, further, with the approval of the Government, who considered the measure very carefully and very anxiously, and from time to time proposed modifications, all of which were accepted. Finally, it comes before this House supported by a body of Irish opinion which, having regard to its weight and character, has never before been brought to bear, I believe, in support of any measure. I do not mean to say that this is a very great measure. It is, in fact, very small in extent. It is a Bill of very few clauses, its principle is exceedingly simple, and its object is very easily understood. It is not a Bill which will create a social revolution, or vitally change the manners of the country; but it is a Bill aiming at a good object, and it seeks, so far as can be done by such machinery as it contains, to destroy a vice which is the greatest curse of Ireland, and which is at the root of the misery and crime of that country. It is therefore, I believe, my Lords, that it has received, I will not say from all, but from the great mass of the intelligent Irishmen, most cordial support, and that a most anxious desire has been exhibited by the people, or most of the people, of all classes in Ireland, to have this Bill carried, and carried, if possible, in its integrity, or at least as it now stands modified by the action of the Government. I do not think it necessary to go much into detail as to the reasons for the measure, because I do not consider it desirable that I should tell a twice-told tale, which would be very tedious to your Lordships. I will not repeat trite and stale arguments which are familiar to most of those I am addressing; but I may say that there seem to have been two main objections presented by the opponents of the Bill, and by those chiefly who are interested in the liquor traffic; though I do not mean to say there are not others who have taken exception to the Bill on grounds which I do not entirely disapprove. But one of the principal cries that we have heard in the House of Commons and elsewhere is that it is a new Coercion Bill for Ireland; and we have had the changes rung on that expression till people have almost persuaded themselves into the belief that it was not a mere perversion of the English language, but that there was some foundation for it. It is a Coercion Bill, it is true; but only in the sense in which all laws are coercive. A law which interferes with the free action of any individual, for any purpose whatever, may be said to be a Coercion Bill; and if this is said to be a Coercion Bill, it is a Bill for a good and beneficent purpose—it is a Bill aimed to put an end to the greatest and most blighting vice of the country to which I belong. It is a Bill which is not at all out of the ordinary course of legislation; because, as your Lordships are fully aware, those who are pursuing the liquor traffic have not been left by the law of the land the same freedom of action that has been accorded to other traders, and for the plainest of reasons—that the liquor traffic, badly pursued, has results most injurious to the morals and good order of society. Over and over again restrictions have been imposed upon this particular trade, and by the Bill now before your Lordships, nothing is done but to extend to the whole of the Sunday the restrictive legislation which now affects a very great portion of the Sunday. The hours of closing which have been long prescribed by law no one objects to now, though, except in the matter of degree, the law which fixes them is as much a Coercion Act as this Bill is. These restrictions were designed to save the Sunday as much as possible from desecration, to prevent the day from being spent in idleness, immorality, and sometimes in the destruction of life, instead of being devoted to the service of God, and to the cultivation of good and kindly feelings. It is said, again, that all this sumptuary legislation is a mistake, and that it is useless to attempt to make people moral by Act of Parliament. I entirely concur that morality is only to be secured by training the heart and the understanding—but the process may be assisted by legislation. In a case of this sort, the law is a sort of external conscience to a man, warning him what is evil and showing him what is good; and therefore, though we cannot make people moral by law, we can assist them to become moral by removing temptations from them, and putting them in such a condition that good and virtuous habits may be cultivated more easily and better than they were before. Therefore, so far as these arguments are concerned, it appears to me that the case against the Bill fails altogether. But if there were any ground for alleging that this is an interference with the liberties of the people, I may remind the House that in Ireland this experiment—and it is nothing but an experiment, limited in its operation and duration in a very careful way—is not without precedent, though this precedent has not taken the form of legislative enactment. In some dioceses the closing of public-houses on Sunday, though not enforced by law, has been voluntarily submitted to for a very considerable time by the vendors as well as by the consumers of spirituous liquors. In those dioceses the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church—men of the greatest benevolence but great force of will—saw that Sunday drinking was most injurious to the morals and to the habits of their people. Over and over again they saw faction fights occurring on the Sunday, over and over again they saw in the neighbourhood of their churches people congregated together consuming intoxicating drinks, and in the end becoming the victims of secret conspirators. There was no combined action; but each Bishop acted for himself, and in two dioceses a Sunday closing law, not appealing at all to the civil authority, was put in operation. A great body of the publicans themselves were anxious to be permitted to close their houses, and when they found that they would not be placed at a disadvantage by others remaining open, but that all would close together, they were glad of the change. In those particular dioceses, the closing of the public-houses showed the advantage to the people in promoting order, peace, and domestic happiness, and the greater security of the district generally. Should this Bill produce as great moral and social effects on the country as have been produced by the voluntary action of the people in these districts, it will be a most happy thing for Ireland. I should not do justice to the cause I am advocating if I did not ask your Lordships' careful attention to the National Memorial which was presented last year on this subject. There had, indeed, in the antecedent year, been a similar Memorial signed by upwards of 10,000 persons, and the prayer was simply this. After referring to the past history of the movement, and the difficulty felt by private Members in dealing with it, and stating that the greatest interest was felt by all classes in the speedy settlement of the question, the memorialists begged to express an earnest hope that Her Majesty's Government would respond to the demands which had been made by three-fourths of the Irish Members of Parliament, that Parliament would pass a measure which would, more than any other, tend to give peace to Ireland. The importance of that Memorial is to be judged of not alone by the number of persons who signed it, but by the weight and importance attached to the names of the signatories; and on examining them your Lordships will find that it is signed by nearly all, if not all, the Roman Catholic Bishops, by every one of the Bishops of the late Established Church of Ireland; by the Moderator of the Synod of Ulster, by a large number of Presbyterian ministers, and ministers of other Dissenting congregations; by the great majority of the Magistrates, Town Councillors, and Guardians of the Poor in Ireland, and by thousands of gentlemen, bankers, merchants, and tradesmen. It was, therefore, taken as an appeal from the nation which it is impossible to disregard. It is only natural to entertain a Memorial so presented, and I think that your Lordships will be disposed to entertain the same opinion as I do, and that they will be inclined to agree with me that there has been, for the first time, a combination of Irishmen of all shades of religious and political opinion in complete agreement upon this one point, and joining in a demand that Parliament should take steps to pass a measure, the effect of which will be to improve the morals, and consequently the happiness, of the people of that country. Such being the case, I think that it will take very little persuasion to induce your Lordships to pass this measure as a good one. Still less proper will it be to reject it when we are aware of the fact that the Irish Members generally have rallied round the measure, which is supported not only by the clergy and laity of Ireland but by the whole Press of the country. If ever there was a Bill which deserves to be called a national one, it is this. I think that I have said enough to induce your Lordships to give it a second reading; but if there be any lingering doubt of the propriety of such a course, it will vanish when I tell your Lordships that the measure is tentative in its character and temporary in its operation. All the Amendments proposed by the Government have been accepted by the promoters of the Bill, and it is limited in point of time, expiring in 1882, unless Parliament should see fit to continue it. I entertain very little doubt that if its effect is such as I believe it will be, there will be no difficulty in getting it continued at the end of that period. Whether that is so or not, I trust that your Lordships will find no difficulty in passing it. In conclusion, I can but express a hope that the same Parliament now approaching its close which has passed the excellent measure for the promotion of Intermediate Education in Ireland— a measure for which the present Administration deserves the confidence of the people at large—will also pass this measure, which is one of capital importance, and will be fraught with countless blessings to the community.

*Moved,* "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord O'Hagan.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON: I do not intend to give any opposition to the proposal of the noble and learned Lord. The measure is one which, as the noble and learned Lord has just stated, has occupied the attention of the other House of Parliament for a considerable period during last Session, and for a still greater period during the present Session. All the arguments which could be adduced to induce Members to vote for or against the measure have been put forward in that House in the most forcible manner it is possible they could be done. The noble and learned Lord is perfectly correct in stating that Her Majesty's Government had to consider—during the passing of the Bill through the other House of Parliament—whether it would be for the public benefit of the people of Ireland that some such measure as this should be passed, and thinking that it was, and having considered the Bill, they proposed certain Amendments which were accepted by those who had charge of the Bill; and Her Majesty's Government now views the Bill as amended with favour, and will offer no opposition whatever to the second reading.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON: I cannot allow this Bill to be read a second time without expressing the great satisfaction with which I have watched its progress in the other House of Parliament. It is, as the noble and learned Lord remarked, a tentative measure, and, indeed, it might have been drawn more stringently without any injury to it. It will enable the principle to be tried, and I hope it will be so successful in its operation, and set so good an example, that it will be followed at no distant date by a Bill which may be carried with considerable unanimity for the rest of the United Kingdom.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

### CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL [H.L.]

Returned from the Commons with the amendment made by the Lords to the amendments made by the Commons and the consequential amendment made by the Lords to the Bill *agreed to*, and the amendment made by the Commons to which the Lords have disagreed *not insisted on.*

House adjourned at a quarter before
Six o'clock, till To-morrow,
Three o'clock.

* * *

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Tuesday, 13th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS —*considered in Committee.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee—Ordered —First Reading*—University Tests * [305].

*Ordered—First Reading*—Coroners * [303]; Magistrates (Summary Jurisdiction) * [304].

*Committee—Report*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).

*Considered as amended—Third Reading*—Telegraphs * [257], and *passed.*

*Third Reading*—Inclosure Provisional Orders * (192), and *passed.*

*Withdrawn* — Training Schools and Ships * [48]; Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) (*re-comm.*) * [130]; Public Health Act Amendment (Interments) * [221].

*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*

## QUESTIONS.

### MINES REGULATION ACT, 1872—DINAS COLLIERIES.—QUESTION.

MR. BURT (for Mr. MACDONALD) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to the report of the trial of the manager of the Dinas Collieries for a breach of the Mines Regulation Act, reported in the "Western Mail" of the 8th instant; if it be true that the manager took the sub-inspector (Mr. Galloway) into a place where there was a large body of gas, and that he found two men working among that gas; if he had to order the lights to be put out, and the men to be removed from the place; and, whether, if the above statement is well founded, the certificate of the manager will be removed?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the proceedings were not yet over. Persons engaged in the mine had to appear again before the magistrates, he believed, on Monday next, if not before. Until the legal proceedings were over, it would not be right for him to say more upon the subject.

### INDIA — DECCAN RIOTS COMMISSION. QUESTION.

MR. GRANT DUFF asked the Under Secretary of State for India, When the Report of the Deccan Riots Commission will be distributed; if he would state to what area of country or population that Report relates; and, whether the Government are aware of any steps being taken in India to remedy the steps complained of?

MR. E. STANHOPE: The Report of the Deccan Riots Commission, with the Minutes appended, is very long; but it is in the printer's hands, and will, I hope, be distributed in a fortnight. The Report relates only to the districts of Poona and Ahmednuggur, containing an area of 12,000 square miles, and a population of 1,680,000. It would be a mistake to assume from this Report that a similar state of things had been shown to exist in other parts of India. Legislation based on this Report has been proposed by the Government of Bombay, and has been pressed upon the attention of the Viceroy by the Secretary of State. We have lately heard, but without any details, that the Government of India has introduced a Bill which they hope will remedy some of the very grave evils which have been shown to exist.

### RAILWAY PASSENGER DUTY.

#### QUESTION.

MR. J. COWEN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, since the decision of the 6th July 1874 in the Court of Exchequer on the Railway Passenger Duty, the Board of Inland Revenue has framed any rules for regulating the exemptions; and, if so, whether he will have any objection to lay them upon the Table of the House, and cause them to be printed?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir; it has not been thought necessary to frame any rules. There is only one exemption under the Act of Parliament.

### IRELAND — A DEPARTMENTAL COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA (for Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is true that a Commission has been appointed by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland composed of five Clerks of the Crown and Peace and Mr. Herbert Murray; and, whether the Commission is now sitting in the Castle at Dublin; if so, what is the nature and object of the inquiry entrusted to the Commission?

MR. J. LOWTHER: I understand that a Departmental Inquiry is going on, but to what extent I am not aware. It is composed, I believe, as the hon. Gentleman's Question indicates. I only heard of the Question last night for the first time, and have not been able to obtain full details; but I believe the statement the hon. Gentleman has made is more or less correct.

### PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT (1875)—SEARCHES FOR ARMS.

#### QUESTION.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA (for Major NOLAN) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If Mr. Harris, of Ballinasloe, whose house was searched for arms on the 14th June, has written to the Inspector General of Constabulary in Ireland, stating that the constables who searched his house had exceeded their instructions as described by the Chief Secretary in the House of Commons, demanding an investigation into the actual circumstances which had occurred; and, if such an investigation has been granted or would be granted?

MR. J. LOWTHER: Sir, I understand that Mr. Harris has entered into a further correspondence with the authorities on this subject. As I have stated on several previous occasions, the action of the Constabulary was perfectly legal. They acted under warrants obtained in the proper manner, and no good object would be served to Mr. Harris, or anyone else, by re-opening the subject. It is, I believe, not intended to comply with the request for an investigation.

### THE IRISH BOARD OF WORKS.

#### QUESTION.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA (for Major NOLAN) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If it is the intention of the Government to act upon the recommendations contained in the Report of the Parliamentary Committee appointed to inquire into the conduct of the Board of Works this Session; if not, if they would issue instructions to the Board of Works not to collect any further half-yearly instalments which may become due by the Galway Mills until it is ascertained what amount of relief they are entitled to?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: As I have once before stated, I can hardly, without more fully considering the Report than I have been able to do, in consequence of the pressure of Parliamentary Business, state what action the Government would take upon this Report. The Government will at the earliest day possible take that Report into careful consideration. It would not be right, however, to prejudge the case by making any order with regard to the Galway Mills, which is only one of several cases referred to.

### POST OFFICE—WEST INDIAN MAIL CONTRACT.—QUESTION.

MR. MAC IVER asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is true that a contract has been made for the conveyance of the West Indian Mails; and, if so, when the Papers relating to it will be produced?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in reply, said, that the contract for the conveyance of the West India Mails was signed yesterday. It was for the conveyance of the whole of the mails by one system. He had hoped to be able to lay the contract on the Table this year, and ask the House to affirm the action of the Government in the matter. But as he had promised the House that all the Papers should be produced together, he feared that time would hardly suffice for their being printed soon enough to admit of any discussion taking place upon them; and he therefore feared the contract would have to remain for affirmation till the beginning of next Session. It had been thought wise to adhere to the old system of accepting the tender of one Company for the conveyance of the whole of the mails.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## INDIA — EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS — THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

### COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, it was not his intention to presume upon their indulgence after his short experience by affecting to speak with authority upon any of the numerous and intricate subjects connected with the administration of India. All that he should endeavour to do was to put as clearly as he could before the House the present actual condition of Indian finance. Any lengthened statement on his part was unnecessary, inasmuch as the financial arrangements of the year, as far as they were already known, had been the subject of discussion in the House on two occasions during the present Session, and once also in "another place." But, as the present aspect of the matter was of special importance, and so constituted, it might be a new departure in the history of Indian finance, he should hardly be doing justice to the Government of India if he did not, however shortly, give a comprehensive account. On the present occasion, the comparison that was usually made between the different years under consideration by the House was rendered more than usually difficult by changes in the form of accounts. At the same time, he believed that the changes were so substantially advantageous that they would in the end gain general acceptance. Anybody who chose to look into the matter for himself would find that the general result of those changes was to add something like £4,500,000 to both sides of the account. The statement of the three years which he should have to present to the House would show the accounts of the first year as they had actually turned out, of the second year as they were almost certain to turn out, and of the third year as they were estimated in the Budget. The accounts for 1876-7 showed a Revenue of £55,995,785, and an Expenditure of £58,178,563, leaving a deficit of £2,182,778. Making allowance for the change in the form of accounts to which he had referred, and independently of the charge entailed on the Government by the Famine, those results corresponded very satisfactorily with the Budget Estimate of two years before, the two principal variations being caused by the growth of the receipts on the guaranteed railways, and by the Famine expenditure. If the estimated cost of the Famine in Southern India during the financial year were deducted, the result was that the surplus estimated for the year now under review had been exceeded by more than £1,000,000 sterling. Coming now to the regular Estimate for 1877-8, the Revenue was placed at £58,635,472, and the Expenditure at £62,018,853, leaving a deficit of £3,383,381. The most noticeable feature of the year was the enormous increase in the receipts of the guaranteed railways, which amounted to no less a sum than £1,693,800. The Revenue from salt exceeded the Budget Estimate by the sum of £223,000—a fact which was especially worthy of notice, inasmuch as it was considered that it was only in a slight degree due to the alterations in the rate of duty made in December last. The House would hear with pleasure of an item of receipt of £50,000 for cinchona bark, which was a much larger sum than had been anticipated. Under the head of the Mint there was an increase of £274,000, which was due to the large coinage operations necessitated by the great influx of silver. The only material decrease was a falling-off of £837,800 in Land Revenue, owing to the Famine. That, again, had been the great disturbing element which almost prevented any useful comparison with ordinary years. His noble Friend estimated the direct charge for Famine expenditure during the year 1877-8 at £1,425,000. That amount had been very largely exceeded; but if, as in the former year, they excluded the Famine charges, they would find that the financial result of the year was, on the whole, more favourable than his noble Friend anticipated by the sum of £1,250,000, which was more than accounted for by the receipts of the guaranteed railways. When the Estimates for that year were framed, it was anticipated that all cause for anxiety on account of the Famine might pass away with the arrival of the monsoon. That hope was destined to be disappointed. The late coming of the rains caused a continuance of distress in Madras and Mysore long after the period at which they hoped it would terminate, and the drought which prevailed in other parts of India produced a great strain on the finances. But the strain on the finances caused by Famine must be more a matter of estimate than anything else; because it depended not only on the amount of direct Famine relief, and on the loss on the Land Revenue, the Customs, and the Excise, but also on the indirect expenditure, caused by the necessity of pushing on public works, of increasing the rolling-stock upon railways, of providing loans to Native States, and other items. Estimated upon that basis, and in the expectation, he was happy to say that the Famine expenditure of the present year would be recouped by the arrears of Land Revenue, which it was hoped to receive, they arrived at a total loss due to the recent Famine, directly and indirectly, of £9,750,000, of which £6,500,000 occurred during the last financial year. When they came to estimate the results of that expenditure, it was more difficult to give the House exact information. But many hon. Members had desired to arrive, if possible, at some idea of the degree in which life had been sacrificed. That feeling had been shared by his noble Friend, and by the Government of India also, and they had accordingly caused a partial Census to be taken of the distressed districts in Southern India. The Returns made under that Census were now on the Table of the House, and hon. Gentlemen would observe that the Government of India, while expressing their opinion that there had been a deplorable diminution of the population, thought the results were not sufficient to enable them to form any correct estimate of the mortality. In that opinion his noble Friend entirely concurred; but as the estimates on that subject which had reached this country were of an exaggerated nature, and as it was represented by the Correspondent of *The Times* that the mortality exceeded 6,000,000, and as other influential persons had adopted the same view, the Government had felt it to be desirable that, however imperfect the Returns might be, they should endeavour to give some estimate of the mortality arising from Famine. The result, as far as they could gather it from the figures sent to them, was as follows:—They estimated the mortality in the Bombay Presidency at 260,000 lives; in Madras at 690,000, and at Mysore at 400,000—making a total of 1,350,000 lives. No words of his could adequately express the deplorable nature of that result. At the same time, it was, as the House would see, much more favourable than some of the estimates which had been formed. All he could say was that he was afraid it was almost hopeless in India in every case to prevent mortality; but they recognized, to the fullest extent, the gallant efforts made by all the officers in India, of all ranks, to avert or mitigate the great calamity which had befallen that country. He trusted that the Famine would not fail to leave useful lessons behind it. The House would have heard with satisfaction of the appointment of a Famine Commission, not only to investigate the principles on which Famine relief had hitherto been administered, but also to endeavour to ascertain how far it might be possible to prevent the recurrence of future disasters, or to put the population in a better condition for enduring them. From the labours of that Commission, aided as it would be by the valuable and independent assistance of Mr. Caird, they hoped for very excellent results. But the second lesson to be derived from the recent Famine was the necessity of recognizing, without delay, the fact that the periodical recurrence of Famine in India ought to enter into their calculations upon making financial provision for their ordinary needs from year to year. After the Bengal Famine of 1874, Lord Northbrook declared that in India Famines could no longer be looked upon as wholly abnormal or exceptional phenomena, and that the grave obligations incurred in respect to Famine must be recognized, met, and provided for, among the ordinary charges of the year. That opinion had been approved and reaffirmed by successive Secretaries of State, but was for the first time put into practical operation by the Government of Lord Lytton. Choosing a moment when public opinion was sufficiently excited in regard to endeavours for mitigating the calamities of Famine to strengthen their hands, they had not shrunk even from the unpopularity of imposing new taxation to accomplish that object. It had been estimated by Sir John Strachey, that in the course of every 10 years they had to expend £15,000,000 on Famine relief. Get a real surplus, he said, of £1,500,000, and apply that to the reduction of Debt, and the result would be that at the end of 10 years they would have met all their expenditure on Famines without any addition to the Debt. Hardly any part of that £1,500,000 could be met out of existing sources of taxation. Before the recent Famine, it was estimated that the state of Indian finance showed pretty nearly an equilibrium. In fact, the only source whatever from which they could expect material assistance was from the extension of the system of decentralization which was introduced by Lord Mayo, and which was expected to yield, in the year before them, £400,000 in addition to what was previously obtained. That policy had been pursued with great energy in the past year, and although it was too soon to form a strong opinion as to the results it would achieve, especially as the provincial finances had been disturbed by Famine, still all the Reports received by the Government of India testified to the satisfactory nature of the change which had been made. In Bengal, where that system had got into full working order, the Lieutenant Governor said that its operation had induced a careful scrutiny into all branches of the Public Expenditure, had led to improvements in different branches of the Revenue, and had prevented that friction which might otherwise have existed between the local and Imperial Governments. There remained, then, as the House would see, £1,100,000 to be provided for Famine insurance. Could any part of that sum be met by the diminution of Expenditure? They had had Petitions sent from Calcutta to that House and to the other House of Parliament, urging the adoption of that course; and in presenting a Petition to the House of Lords, Lord Northbrook—whose high authority must be admitted—made some remarks on the subject. But the only practical suggestion which Lord Northbrook made as to the actual diminution of Expenditure in India was—first, that they should keep a very careful eye on the Expenditure for Public Works—an observation in which everybody would agree; and, secondly, that the Home Charges for the Army might with benefit be re-adjusted to the advantage of India. Now, on that he might himself have a little more to say when they came to discuss the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hackney. But what he wanted to invite the attention of the House to was this—that after making those suggestions, Lord Northbrook went on to say—

> "Although he thought something might be done in the way of reduction of expenditure, and he was satisfied that the Government of India were not neglectful of any opportunity that might occur for effecting reductions, he did not think it very likely that the cost of the government of India could be very considerably diminished. Whatever savings might be made in one direction would be met by the increasing demands for improvements of different kinds throughout India."

Then the noble Lord added, that although they could not rely on any substantial diminution of Expenditure, they might possibly avert the necessity of imposing fresh taxation; because the Government of India had been for years in the habit of under-estimating its Income. During the last five or six years, with one exception, there had been a sufficient surplus; and, on the whole, the expenditure on the Famines had been met by the ordinary Revenues of the country. But the noble Lord, in his endeavour to show that a sufficient Famine fund had been provided, had forgotten that in his Estimate he had charged some unremunerative public works—such as the military railways—

to capital, while it had been a special point in a proper system of finance to charge them, not as capital, but as revenue. Sir John Strachey, summing up his remarks on the proposals of the noble Lord, had said—

> "The figures which I have given show that during the past seven years we should have just managed, after meeting all charges for unremunerative public works, to bring our Expenditure within our Income, if there had been no income tax and no Famine; but we cannot omit Famine from our calculations, and we have now no income tax. It therefore follows, judging by the experience of these seven years, that our ordinary Revenues are just sufficient to meet all ordinary charges, excepting those for the relief of Famine, for which we may consider that no provision is now made."

The Government of India, then, had every reason for saying that they could not rely upon an over-estimate of Income, and that if they were to provide for Famine they would have to impose additional taxation. The House was aware of what that consisted. There was the licence tax, and the new taxation upon the land. In Bengal and Northern India the incidence of the new taxation upon trades and agriculturists was about equal; but Madras and Bombay, having suffered from famine very severely, and having had to submit, also, to an increase of the salt tax, were exempt altogether from the land tax. The objection originally urged against the new licence tax would be very considerably lessened by the further explanations received as to the mode in which it was to be enforced. It had been said that it was a tax upon the very poor; but that turned out not to be the case, because it was not to be imposed upon any person earning a net income of less than 100 rupees a-year; and Government had the power of extending the limit of exemption upwards, but not downwards. There were many men in receipt of that income who would escape the tax; and, moreover, anybody who could prove that the amount of the tax was more than 2 per cent of his net annual earnings, might ask either for a reduction or for total exemption. So much for the inferior limit of the tax. As regards its superior limit, there was much more to be said. It had been urged that the tax did not fall upon those who could best afford to pay it, and this was no doubt, to some extent, true. The Government of India had endeavoured partly to meet this objection, and though the maximum fee in Bombay remained at 200 rupees, it was fixed for all Northern India at 500 rupees, and for Madras at 800 rupees. Whether any further steps should be taken to remove an objection to the tax which had been very widely entertained was a matter well deserving the attention of the Government of India. Then, as regarded the tax on land, to which much objection had been taken, it seemed to him that the best answer was that it would have been impossible, and certainly most unjust, to endeavour to raise the amount required without calling for contributions from the agricultural classes. The only result would have been that they would have had to tax them in another form. But when they remembered that Madras and Bombay were excluded wholly from that tax, and the North-Western Provinces partially, because of the recent suffering from drought, they would see that there was nothing in the condition of those classes to justify the statement that they ought to bear no part of the Famine taxation. He had thus endeavoured to dispose of the special taxation imposed for purposes of famine insurance before passing on to describe the other changes which formed part of the financial proposals of the year. The first of these dealt with, perhaps, the greatest object of Indian financiers in modern times—namely, the abolition of the Inland Customs line, and with it of the transit duties upon sugar. It had been so often described that he was almost ashamed to ask the House to bear in mind what it was desired to abolish. In order to prevent the ingress into our territories of salt taxed at lower rates, a line had been maintained of many hundreds of miles in length—at one time 2,400—consisting principally of a hedge of thorny trees and bushes, supplemented by stone walls and ditches, which could not be passed by anyone without examination. This line was kept up at an enormous expense, and guarded by a force of 8,000 men. In the year 1872, the Government of India had called for the opinions of local officers as to the effect of the existing system of taxation upon the people. In reply to that Circular, the officers of the Central Provinces had pointed out that the Customs line to the North and South of these Provinces was one of the measures connected with taxation of which the people most complained; and from Bengal the Lieutenant Governor — now the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy—had written that throughout his tour it had seemed to him that the Customs line had been felt by the people as a greater grievance than all other grievances put together. No one could travel through those districts without being liable to constant search by Custom House officers. Everywhere it was stated that the annoyance to travellers was great, for they were always liable to be stopped and overhauled, and the possession or suspicion of the possession of salt carried with it difficulty and vexation. Besides, though this would apply only to travellers in one direction, the necessity of collecting inland sugar duties caused almost equal annoyance to travellers in the other direction, and the temptation offered to smuggling was so great that the people in some parts were described as becoming demoralized by it. That line had therefore been condemned by successive Governments, and by most of those who had studied the financial affairs of India. The mode in which salt was supplied varied very greatly in different parts of India. Bengal and Assam derived almost their whole supply from Cheshire; Madras and Bombay and a part of the Central Provinces obtained salt made from the sea; and the Punjab had an abundant supply of rock salt. But 47,000,000 of people dwelling in the North-Western Provinces, Oude, and in the Central Provinces depended almost entirely for their salt upon the Native States of Rajpootana and that district. The rate of duty itself, and the mode of levying it, presented almost as much variation. The steps, therefore, necessary for the abolition of the line were—first, to extend railways into the salt-producing districts, and to enter into arrangements with the Native States of those districts, so that all salt might be taxed at the place of production; secondly, to remove the inequalities in the rate of duty in different parts of the country. A great advance in this direction had been made by the extension of railways into Rajpootana; and, during the Administration of Lord Mayo, the lease of the Sambhar Salt Lake had enabled a great reduction to be made in the price of salt. In 1874, the first step towards its actual abolition had been taken, and the Southern Customs line, extending over 800 miles of country, had been dispensed with—the effect of which had been to reduce the price of salt in the Central Provinces and in Orissa, with practically no financial loss at all. In the meantime, the negotiations with the States of Rajpootana had been continued, and had reached such a point that in December last the Government was of opinion that some progress might also be made in the second of the necessary conditions—the equalization of the rates of duty. This was accomplished by a decrease in the rate of duty in Northern India and an increase in Madras and Bombay. This increase, accompanied though it had been by relief from other taxation, and necessary though it was if equalization was to be attained, had been sharply criticized in the House. He did not desire to renew the controversy. The increase which had been made did not amount to more than a tax of 2*d.* a-year upon each consumer, and while the incidence of the tax at the rate of 2 rupees 8 annas did not exceed ¾*d.* per lb., the actual cost of salt was gradually being lessened by the spread of the railway system and the diminished cost of transit. But very recently—within the last few weeks—we had learnt that the negotiations with the Native States had come to a satisfactory termination, and the Government of India had come to the conclusion that the result of those Treaties enabled them at once to take steps for carrying out their long-cherished object of abolishing the Customs line. Accordingly, from the 1st of this month, the salt duty in Northern India had been reduced to 2 rupees 8 annas per maund, except in Bengal, where it would be fixed at 2 rupees 14 annas. The result was that with the exception just mentioned, one uniform rate prevailed throughout India. The accomplishment of this object justified, to the fullest extent, the contention of the Indian Government, which was much criticized at the time — that the recent increase in Madras and Bombay was really imposed for financial reform, and not from financial necessities. The effect upon the Revenue caused by this reduction of the duty was expected to be a loss of about the same amount as was gained by the increase in Southern India. The House would bear in mind, when he came to state the Budget Estimates for the present year, that the loss of Revenue just announced—amounting, in the present year, to £150,000, and in future years to something under £300,000—had not been included. The Government had at present received only the telegraphic announcement of the reduction; and he was, therefore, not yet in a position to make any detailed statement to the House as to the mode in which it was proposed to carry it out. He might, however, at once answer one criticism which had been made. It had been urged that the effect of our obtaining control over the sources of salt manufacture would be to cause hardship to large numbers of the people in the Native States. The Government of India had every reason to believe that the contrary would be the case. Very ample compensation had been made, not only to the Chiefs, but to the people, directly and indirectly. He would not weary the House by entering into any detail, but would merely express the belief of the Government of India that the general result would unquestionably be a great balance of advantage to them. He believed that, when these arrangements were complete, it might be necessary to wait until the stocks of salt which might still be in the hands of traders, and which otherwise might escape taxation, had been disposed of. These, however, were matters of detail, and it might safely be said that no serious obstacle now existed, and that very shortly the Government of Lord Lytton would have the satisfaction of abolishing what had been called the commercial and political scandal of the Inland Customs line. Of course, it would have been very agreeable to have been able to effect that object while fixing a lower uniform rate than 2 rupees 8 annas; and the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy had, he thought, been in favour of endeavouring to approximate to a rate of 2 rupees. But, in the present state of our finances, this would have been impossible. In Madras and Bombay, undoubtedly, the effect of the increase required to be carefully watched, but to a very large part of the population of India much cheaper salt would be available; and he hoped that he was not too sanguine in anticipating from the abolition of the line, and from the other arrangements that would be made, a great stimulus to the internal trade of the country. He was confident that the House would hear with great satisfaction of the accomplishment of this long-desired reform, and would appreciate the perseverance and energy of Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey, with whose names it would hereafter be honourably associated. Few, in fact, would dispute the advantage of abolishing the Customs line. But the question had been raised in "another place" whether the moment was opportune for doing it, and whether it was desirable to impose fresh taxation upon the people of India for the purpose. His answer to that criticism of Lord Northbrook was that, as a matter of fact, no new taxation had been required for this purpose. The effect of raising the salt tax in one part of India while diminishing it in the other had been, in the opinion of the Government of India, to leave the salt revenue just where it was. In other words, this reform had been effected by a new distribution of the charge, and not by a diminution of Revenue. Treating, therefore, these re-adjustments of the salt duty as a whole, and putting them on one side as not affecting the Revenue one way or the other, we arrived at the conclusion that the new taxation was not wanted for the purpose of Revenue. It was imposed on different grounds and for different objects. Intimately connected with the Customs line was the question of the inland sugar duties, for without that line their maintenance would be impossible. Sugar was one of the most important products of our own people in Northern India; but the effect of the Customs line was to place artificial obstructions upon its export. "So far as competition exists," said Sir John Strachey, "the duty acts as a protective duty in favour of foreign and against our own sugar." Believing that that state of things was intolerable, and also that the duty could in no circumstances be maintained much longer, the Government of India determined to make provision, in the ordinary Budget of the year, for its immediate abolition. Another great object which the Government of India had placed before itself had been the amendment of the Customs tariff. The English tariff had been framed upon the principle of levying a large revenue from a small number of articles of universal consumption; but there being no articles, except cotton manufactures, which were imported into India for universal consumption, the Indian tariff was framed on the opposite principle of drawing a little revenue from a great number of articles. Successive reforms had since so reduced the export tariff that only three duties now remained—on rice, lac, and indigo. But the import tariff, on the contrary, even after the reforms of 1875, contained no less than 62 items, some of them realizing only an insignificant revenue, and hardly justifying the trouble of collection and the necessary interference with trade. It had, therefore, been decided at once to relieve the tariff of 27 of these numbers, of which the most important were fruit and vegetables, so much used for the food of the poorer classes, and materials for railways. But the most important change had been the attempt—small in itself, but as great as financial considerations would allow—to deal with the vexed questions of the import duties upon cotton. Hon. Members would recollect that in the last Session a Resolution of the House, unanimously passed, declared that these duties, being protective in their nature, ought to be abolished as soon as the finances would permit. On the present occasion, it was abundantly clear that any large sacrifice of Income was hardly possible. Rather, however, than leave the matter in its former unsatisfactory condition, the Government of India had endeavoured to eliminate the duties upon the coarser descriptions of cotton goods which were beyond any doubt protective in their nature. These had been exempted from duty, and though Her Majesty's Government felt that a good deal yet remained to be done to carry to a completion the policy which they had expressed, and which the House had accepted, he thought he was entitled to claim some credit for the Government of India for the considerable steps which they had now taken, not only in this particular matter, but in the general reform of the Customs tariff. The House would, therefore, observe that in the Estimate for 1878-9, which he was now about to place before it, the Government had to provide, in the first place, for a Famine insurance fund £1,500,000, for the various reforms which he had indicated; and, lastly, they had to secure that margin between Income and Expenditure which was especially necessary in India, and which past experience had shown ought not to be less than £500,000. The Budget Estimates for 1878-9, inclusive of the Revenue from productive Public Works, were as follows:—Revenue, £63,195,000; Expenditure, £61,039,000; leaving a surplus of £2,156,000. But as the loss by the recent remission of salt duty in Northern India was estimated at £150,000, the expected surplus stood, as nearly as possible, at £2,000,000. Comparing these with the regular Estimates for 1877-8, and including, in both cases, the Famine charges, the result was an improvement of more than £5,500,000. But, in order to make a proper comparison, it was more convenient to eliminate Famine expenditure altogether. Excluding, therefore, all plainly distinguishable expenditure on Famine, the net increase of Revenue on the present year was estimated at £4,500,000; and of Expenditure at £3,750,000. Of these excesses, £2,750,000, more or less, on each side of the account, were due only to the incorporation in the general accounts of provincial Income and Expenditure. The effect of the changes in taxation was as follows: — The new licence taxes were expected to yield £765,000; but might not, perhaps, be quite so productive the first year. The new rates upon land, £450,000. These rates would not be levied in the North-West Provinces and Oude until September; and were therefore expected, in future years, to yield a further amount of £55,000. The increased salt duty was taken at £247,000, but would now stand at £97,000. On the other hand, the loss by the remission of the sugar duty was £155,000, and by the removal of the import duties on cotton yarns and other items in the tariff, £77,000. But for the abolition of these duties the Revenue from Customs would have shown a rise of £82,000. The principal increase of Income was under the head of Land Revenue, of which a full estimate for an ordinary year was now taken, besides the arrears which it was hoped to collect, though their exact amount must be a little uncertain. The amount was taken at £1,968,000 in excess of last year; Excise, for the same reason, was expected to yield an excess of £248,000. Opium, of which the crop was deficient, showed a net fall of £480,000; but the last accounts were satisfactory. The Mint receipts were less by £269,000, and the net receipts from the guaranteed railways were very prudently taken at the large decrease of £869,000. On the Expenditure side of the account, he was glad to record a decrease of £632,000 in Army charges, of which £430,000 was in the cost of stores to be supplied from England. The House would also be glad to hear that the long-pending question as to the proper sum to be paid by the India Office for the Effective Services had been finally settled for all past years, and that there was every probability of a basis being arrived at to regulate these payments, at any rate, for a term of years. The great cause of the increase of Expenditure was one which he had not yet mentioned—namely, the loss by Exchange, which amounted, in the present year, to no less than £3,000,000, as against £1,600,000 for the year 1877-8. It was true that this was to some extent an exaggerated view of the actual loss to India, because these calculations were based on the conventional system of reckoning 10 rupees to the pound; but still, due allowance being made for this fact, no one could deny that the financial difficulty presented by the Indian Exchange was enormous. The rate of exchange during the current year was estimated at 1*s* 8·4*d*., and though there had been a temporary depression on the silver market, he was glad to say no further loan would be required from Parliament on the present occasion. No doubt, plausible excuses might have been made out for a loan, the effect of which would have been to relieve the present anxiety of the Government in the matter of exchange; but it was felt that there was no substantial ground for it, and it would only be an aggravation of their difficulties in the future. While upon the subject of Debt, perhaps he might be allowed to say a word as to the proposed conversion of the Five-and-a-Half per Cent Loan which was announced yesterday, and in which two forms of application were proposed. The first form of promissory note was an excessively simple one; but the Government of India was of opinion that some holders might be afraid of a rupee loan because of the fluctuating value of silver. They thought, however, that they might be induced to go into a loan which was practically calculated upon a gold basis, and hence the second form was suggested. The difference amounted to this—applicants under the first form would receive less if the market rate of silver fell, and applicants under the second form would, if the official rate fell, receive a larger number of rupees for their 7*s*. per cent. Passing from this subject, he had to remark that under the new form of account, for which they were very much indebted to the noble Lord the present Vice President of the Council (Lord George Hamilton), it would be possible, in future, to present to the House what he might call the productive Public Works Budget—that was to say, a statement of the income and expenditure of productive public works. For the first time, these public works were treated as commercial transactions. The accounts now included the whole revenue derived from them, and, on the other side, their annual working expenses, including the guaranteed interest, and the interest upon that part of the Debt of India which was estimated to have been incurred for these works, and which had now been separated from the permanent Debt. The consequence of this would eventually be that the accounts would show clearly the results produced by our capital outlay on public works, which before could only be got out in a very unsatisfactory manner. It was most desirable that these details should be in their possession at the earliest possible moment, so that they might, as it were, take stock of what had already been done before they embarked upon fresh undertakings. No branch of the Public Expenditure required greater watchfulness, and it was only by the test of past experience that they could impose any adequate check. It was as yet impossible, however, to give the House definite information in regard to irrigation works. There were some parts of India where they had not yet been able to discriminate between what proportion of Land Revenue was due to irrigation works and what was not; and, therefore, he thought it advisable, rather than give an incomplete statement, to pass over that subject altogether on the present occasion. In saying this, he wished to guard himself from being supposed to depreciate in any way the results of irrigation; it seemed to him the greatest possible absurdity, which seemed to pervade some minds, that it was necessary to depreciate one class of public works in order to enhance the value of the other. In his opinion, India required both. Both, if pushed on with foresight and prudence, would be of the greatest advantage. Coming now to railways, the first thing to be noticed was that since 1853 there had been opened 7,500 miles of line at a cost upon guaranteed railways of £95,500,000, and upon State railways of £17,500,000. The financial results of that expenditure were now to be seen in the accounts. As regarded guaranteed railways, and bearing in mind that the trunk lines were only completed in 1871, it was not, he thought, unsatisfactory to find that, a quarter of a century after the opening of the first line, the net traffic receipts had exceeded the guaranteed interest by the substantial sum of £290,000. To put the result in a different form, the gross earnings of these railways had increased in five years by no less than 70 per cent. He was quite aware that the circumstances of the past year had been somewhat exceptional, the receipts having been swelled enormously by the Famine traffic; but, on the other hand, the necessity of providing for the Famine, and the preference given to consignments of grain, caused a certain amount of traffic of a more profitable kind to be lost. All necessary allowance made, the estimate for 1878-9 was less than that of last year by £750,000. The receipts from these railways, however, judging from the past, might very possibly exceed that moderate estimate. The State railways, he was sorry to say, did not at present show so satisfactory a result; but the House would recollect that they were supplementary to the main lines already referred to. Besides, some of them had been constructed much more for military than financial considerations. These dead-weight obligations were now almost at an end. It was satisfactory to observe, however, that the balance of Income over Expenditure was gradually increasing. It was £263,000 this year, as against £131,000 last year. The time had not yet come for pronouncing any opinion upon these results; but towards the formation of that opinion the labours of the Public Works Committee, now sitting, would afford very material assistance. Apart from financial results, however, it was impossible to deny that the railways had proved very useful. They had enormously strengthened our position as a military Power in India, and they had most materially tended to mitigate the Famine. Lord Lytton spoke of them in the highest terms. He said—

> "It is an unquestionable fact that the railways, and the railways alone, were the salvation of the situation in North Behar during the Famine of 1874, and that they have again been the salvation of the situation in Madras during the Famine of the present year. The sea, no doubt, would have thrown rice into the town of Madras; but with the cattle dying of drought, it would have been impossible to move the grain up country; nor, if every possible mile of navigable canal had been completed throughout the Madras Presidency, would it have greatly helped us to throw grain into those very districts where the Famine has been at its worst, for the broken upland country of Bellary and Kurnool and the Mysore plateau are physically impracticable for big canals; and had there been no railway within reach of these districts, the people where they have now died by hundreds must have assuredly succumbed by thousands."

On the same subject, Sir John Strachey said—

> "Having mentioned these railways, I will ask you not to forget that at least four-fifths of the food imported into the Famine country travelled over them, and I believe that the average journey made by each bag of grain was hardly less than 500 miles. When it is remembered that barely one quarter of this food could have reached the Famine districts at all without the railways, some idea may be formed of the millions of lives they have saved and of the priceless boon they have conferred upon the country."

Lastly, the Government of Bombay said—

> "It is difficult to measure the value of the railway at such a time as this, or the magnitude of the calamity which, without it, must have supervened. If these events had happened before the construction of the railway, the misfortunes of the people and the responsibilities of Government would have been indefinity increased."

There was one more subject on which he thought it right to touch, and that was the trade of India. No doubt, the figures which he had to lay before the House were very satisfactory, and were full of promise for the future of India, as showing, in a year when £6,500,000 had been spent in Famine relief, and almost the whole autumn harvest of Upper India was lost, a general improvement in the condition of the people and the flourishing state of trade. In the figures which he was about to place before the House he purposely excluded treasure, because the movement of silver was influenced by so many considerations, such as the Government policy as to the construction of railways, or as to the Secretary of State's Bills in this country; but, taking merchandize alone, and adding together the gross exports and imports, they had abundant proof of the real and advancing prosperity of the country. The average annual value of the exports and imports in the four quinquennial periods since the Mutiny was as follows: — First five years, £52,000,000; second—which included the cotton famine years—£85,000,000; third, £89,000,000; fourth, £93,000,000; while, in 1877-8, the year next following, the total was no less than £106,600,000. In other words, the trade of India had doubled in 20 years. Comparing this result with previous individual years, they found that the imports of merchandize, which had fallen in the previous year, rose to a point very nearly £2,250,000 in excess of the highest year on record. The exports showed an increase of more than £4,000,000, and had only been exceeded by the three cotton famine years, 1863-6. The imports of treasure showed an increase of £6,000,000 over the previous year, and of £12,000,000 over 1875-6. The low rate of exchange had undoubtedly given an artificial stimulus to some branches of the export trade. But the opening of the Suez Canal, and the reform of the tariff, might be reckoned among causes which were likely to be permanent and to tend to still further development. The growth of the wheat trade was the most remarkable of all. It dated its existence from 1873, when the export duty was taken off, and a rise occurred in European markets. Not being an article of food in Southern India, it had been exported in spite of the Famine, and the diminished rates of transport by railway had largely contributed to its increase. In both of the two previous years the export of wheat doubled that of the year preceding in quantity and value; and yet, in 1877-8, it increased 13 per cent in quantity and 46 per cent in value, the total value of the wheat exported in that year being £2,857,000. Of this export, four-fifths came to England, and India had stood third among the countries supplying wheat to England. In the present year, the abundant harvest in America and elsewhere might very probably have the effect of causing a large diminution in the export of Indian wheat. But, looking to the enormous capacities for production, and the readier means of export likely to be soon afforded by the railway to Kurrachee, it was impossible not to feel sanguine as to its permanence. The export of seeds afforded another remarkable instance of growth. For some years previous to 1875 it made, speaking generally, no advance. The removal of the duty in that year had produced the result that, in the year last past, it was double in quantity, and more than double in value, what it was in 1875. The same proof of the advantages conferred upon the Indian cultivator by the removal of export duties was shown by the satisfactory growth of the trade in jute, and especially in tea, where the progress had been regular over a series of years. Even rice, for which there was an enormous demand in Southern India, while showing a diminution in quantity, exceeded in value the amount recorded in any previous year. The export of cotton, he regretted to say, still continued to decline considerably, and though something might be attributed to the greater amount now worked up in India itself, the prospects of this trade could not be called satisfactory. Happily, other articles of export had been found to take its place. In his opinion, these facts justified him in looking hopefully at the prospects of the trade of India. But, even in the event of hon. Members thinking that he had taken too sanguine a view of this or any other matter connected with the financial future of India, he could assure the House that he had not done so with the idea of under-rating the difficulties which he had to encounter. He did not forget the precarious nature of the opium revenue, although he thought that the probability of a fall in the income from that source had been exaggerated. But of their rocks ahead, of all the circumstances which, at the present time, had threatened the disturbance of their calculations, two stood especially prominent. The first was the depreciation in the value of silver, a problem which at present seemed to be beyond their solution, and the gravity of which it was hardly possible to exaggerate. The other was the recurrence of famine, to meet which, in the future, so far as human foresight could do so, an honest attempt had been made this year. The prospects, too, of the season were not unfavourable. Rain was in a few parts excessive, and in one or two districts of the North-West, reported as still insufficient; but, generally speaking, the prospects were very favourable, and prices slowly falling. And although he was afraid that in all parts and seasons it would be impossible to avoid local scarcity, yet it was to be hoped that after the terrible cycle of years of famine which had been gone through, Providence was now about to bestow the blessings of plenty upon the country, and thus to conduce to the prosperity and happiness of the people of India. He begged to move that the Speaker do leave the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. E. Stanhope.*)

Mr. FAWCETT, in rising to move—

"That this House regards with apprehension the present position of Indian finance, and in view of the power claimed by the Crown to employ any number of Indian Troops in all parts of Her Majesty's Dominions, except the United Kingdom, is of opinion that there is no sufficient security against the Military expenditure of India being unduly increased;"

commented upon the fact that there were but few hon. Members in the House to consider the great question of our Imperial responsibilities in India, while the Government would not venture to ask them to consider a Bill relating to Irish public-houses or English turnpikes under such circumstances. Month after month, week after week, and day after day, some hon. Members who sat on his side of the House had been taunted that they only cared for little England, and not for our great Imperial responsibilities. ["Hear, hear!"] He heard someone say "Hear, hear;" but he would wish to ask those Gentlemen how they were now about to discharge those responsibilities they had already taken upon themselves? He thought the common sense of the people of England would say that if the English Parliament and House of Commons were so hard pressed that the many important measures which had been brought in were considered thus with three-fourths of those Members who were left in London away from the House, it would be better to care for those responsibilities we had than to assume others of which very little was known. With regard to the statement of the Under Secretary of State for India, he had nothing to complain of the tone of his speech. On the contrary, he felt he was expressing the feeling of every hon. Member when he said that there were many expressions of opinion in that speech which received the cordial approval of both sides of the House. He was also willing to admit that nothing could be more lucid than the manner in which the accounts were laid before the House. He could not help saying, however, that that statement was based upon a wrong hypothesis, while the figures were calculated to mislead rather than give a correct idea of the present financial position of India. There were three cardinal positions connected with Indian finance to which he wished to draw attention—First, that the real Expenditure of India was steadily increasing in a proportion largely exceeding the growth of the Revenue, and that the deficiency thereby caused had to be made good by constant additions to the taxation of the people; secondly, that India was a poor country, that we had almost entirely exhausted every available source of taxation, and that it was impossible to further increase the amount of taxation without causing such serious discontent as would gravely affect our position in that country; and, thirdly, that quite recently certain circumstances had occurred which were likely in the future to make the Expenditure of India far more largely exceed the Revenue than it did at the present time, or in past years. The Under Secretary of State had represented the Revenue of India in the year 1877 to be £55,000,000; in 1878, £59,000,000; and the present year's Estimates represented it as £62,000,000. Such figures he (Mr. Fawcett) characterized as absolutely fallacious, and he asserted that the real net Revenue of India was certainly not one shilling more than £39,000,000; and in making that assertion he was quoting a high authority—the present Finance Minister of India, who said that the Revenue of India could not be estimated at more than £38,000,000. If that was the case, what was the use of misleading the House—of course, unintentionally — and misleading the country, and everyone who took any interest in Indian finances, by parading the figures £55,000,000, £59,000,000 and even £62,000,000? The statement which he had made perhaps required some explanation; and he would inquire how the Revenue quoted by the Under Secretary of State was made up? Why, simply by including all sorts of items, which were not in the least items of Revenue, but simply items of Account. As an instance, he would take one of the items for Revenue in the 1877 Accounts. It was — "Military receipts, £1,000,000." What was the use, he asked, of putting that item down as Revenue when, under the same heading on the other side, there was an expenditure of £17,000,000? The Revenue could easily be swelled in that manner. Then there was the item put down of "Gained by Exchange, £500,000," in reference to the depreciation of silver; while, on the other hand, there was a loss by Exchange of £2,000,000. Certain things were put down as items of Revenue, which in England were real items of Revenue, but which in India were items of loss—such as £780,000 for the Post Office, while the expenditure was £860,000, and £150,000 for Telegraphs with the expenditure at £560,000. Those items, therefore, were not actually Revenue, and should not be considered so. There were other instances of the same kind. There were in India, practically, only five items of Revenue. Revenue was derived from land, then there were Customs and Excise, then salt, then opium, and stamps. For 1877 the gross Revenue under those five heads was—from land, £19,800,000; from Customs and Excise, £5,000,000; salt, £6,250,000; opium, £9,000,000; and stamps, £2,750,000; making a total of £43,000,000. But if they took the other side of the question, it would be seen that the cost against that sum for collecting these five items was a little more than £6,000,000. In this way we found the correctness of the Estimate of the present Finance Minister of India, that the net Revenue, instead of being £55,000,000 or £62,000,000, or anything like that, was no more than £37,000,000. Unless they kept that fact in view, they would never obtain a correct view of the position of Indian finance. The yearly Expenditure exceeded the Revenue by something like £4,000,000; and the result was that they were obliged to make up the deficiency by perpetually borrowing and resorting to Exchequer Bills. The yearly expenditure upon railways was £3,000,000, and the return this year from railways was only £290,000. Then as to the irrigation works, the Government could not give the House any return on those works. On the last occasion on which he spoke on India in that House, he said that £9,000,000 had been spent on irrigation works in Bengal, every sixpence of which was put down as extraordinary Expenditure, and the Under Secretary of State had reluctantly to confess that the return on that outlay was not more than ½ per cent per annum. The Debt of India was steadily increasing at the rate of at least £4,000,000 a-year. The result of the system at present pursued by the Government of India had been to cover India with a great network of provincial and local taxation. Those taxes seldom came under the cognizance of the House; but in India he believed they had produced more discontent than Imperial taxation. It was a fact that in a single month of the present year, in February, local taxes were imposed which yielded something like £1,500,000. He complained of the course taken with reference to the salt tax. The course taken was most unjust, as it raised the duty on salt something like 40 per cent in those parts of India which were the poorest and which were just recovering from a most terrible famine. The increase of the duty in Madras and Bombay was 11 annas per maund; but Lord Hobart, who formerly was responsible for the government of Madras, refused to entertain a proposal to increase the salt tax by three annas, even at a time when that Presidency was not stricken down by famine. According to the statements made this evening, nearly 1,500,000 people had been swept away by the most fearful of all visitations. He would next bring under the notice of the House one of the most terrible things in connection with this increase of taxation. It meant taking more from the poor. The salt duty could not be increased 40 per cent without diminishing still further the incomes of the poor ryots of Madras. And what did Lord Salisbury say? And this brought into the full glare of light the inconsistency of associating with famine increased taxation. Lord Salisbury, speaking with the authority of a Secretary of State, said—

> "The mortality and suffering caused by the recent famine were not due to a want of food or to a want of means in bringing that food. There was always sufficient food; but the mortality and suffering were due to the fact that the people had not the means of buying food when it was brought to them."

And yet, after such an admission from Lord Salisbury himself, this additional taxation was imposed upon the people. With regard to the increase of the licence tax, the Under Secretary of State alleged that it had been rendered much more just, inasmuch as very small incomes were now exempted. It was not to be imposed on incomes of less than 100 rupees a-year; but this meant that income tax would be levied from people who earned only 4*s*. a-week. But there was one feature of this licence tax which the Under Secretary of State had omitted to notice, and if that was the only feature in connection with it, it absolutely condemned it. This tax was imposed to meet what was described as a great national emergency; but how was that emergency met? Why, they imposed a licence tax to which every person in the receipt of an official or professional income was most carefully and rigorously exempted from contributing a single sixpence. Hon. Members could easily understand that discontent was caused by this unfortunate system of taxation. In every large town in India indignation meetings were held to protest against this incredibly unjust scheme of taxation; and the people of India, in the last resort, called upon the House of Commons to secure for them justice in this matter. He had thus far confined his remarks to the increase of Imperial taxation. He desired, however, to direct the attention of the House to that branch of the subject which the Under Secretary of State had altogether omitted to notice. Lord Northbrook had stated that in Bengal alone, since 1870, the increase in local taxation had been £1,000,000, and the increase in local taxes throughout India during the last seven years had been no less than £3,000,000 per annum. So that, while the Imperial taxation had been increased, there had been a great rise in local taxes also. He would now consider the second branch of the inquiry to which he wished to direct the attention of the House. What did increased taxation mean in India? India was so poor, that there were scarcely any available sources of taxation beyond those which had been already taken up. India was, at least eight times as populous as England, and yet the whole amount of Customs and Excise duties was only £5,000,000, or about one-tenth of the sum raised in England. It was impossible to adduce a more conclusive proof of the poverty of India. Again, look at the Income Tax. The last time the Income Tax was imposed in India a sum of 2½*d.* per pound produced £500,000. In England a similar amount produced £5,000,000. Additional Revenue could not be raised without resorting to taxation, which was so burdensome to the people as to produce most serious discontent. Lord Mayo said, the year before he died—

> "The increase of taxation which for years has been going on in India is producing a most serious amount of discontent, and this discontent, if it continues, will be a political danger, the magnitude of which can scarcely be exaggerated."

Since these memorable words had been uttered, the increase both of Imperial and local taxation had been going on far faster in India than during Lord Mayo's time. Lord Northbrook had, on going out to India, examined into the soundness of Lord Mayo's opinion, and the result of his investigation had been to confirm every word that had fallen from Lord Mayo. Thus two successive Governors General had declared the increase of taxation to be a grave political danger. Lord Salisbury had also made an equally significant remark, when he said that there was this distinction between India and England—that there could be in England a considerable increase of taxation without in the slightest degree affecting the stability of our institutions; but such was not the case in India. These memorable words of Lord Salisbury ought to be borne in mind by every one connected with the Administration of India. It could not, or ought not to, be forgotten, that a penny wasted in the administration of Indian affairs was equally serious with a sovereign wasted in the management or mismanagement of Home affairs. But to relieve the Famine, what had been done? Why, out of nearly £9,500,000 which were spent in connection with the Famine, the Government had been obliged to borrow every single shilling with the exception of £1,000,000, and in order to obtain that £1,000,000 a licence tax had to be imposed on incomes of £10 a-year, and the salt tax had to be increased. And this £1,500,000 was not to be allowed to accumulate as a reserve for future famines; but every single sixpence of the additional taxation which was being raised was to be invested in public works, the returns of which were so uncertain that it could not be proved that the public works which were being constructed would pay half the interest on the capital which was being employed on them. It was clear that the additional amount of Revenue could not be raised in India without imposing additional taxes upon the people—taxes which would be absolutely intolerable, and which the people would be simply unable to bear, notwithstanding the jugglery which had in late years been attempted in regard to Indian taxation. Nothing could, as far as he knew, be more perilous or suicidal even than an attempt to impose additional taxation of this kind upon India—indeed, he could not but think that any proposal of the kind would prove a source of great political danger to the Indian Empire. He now came to the third position which he wished to establish, and that was that lately certain causes had come into operation which were likely to make the Expenditure of India far more largely exceed its real Revenue in the future than it had done in the past. The two causes which were contributing chiefly to this result were these—the loss by Exchange, and the increase in the Military Charges. The Under Secretary of State had remarked that the loss by Exchange was one of those misfortunes affecting the finance of India which it was impossible for them to control. He (Mr. Fawcett) admitted that they could not control that loss now; but that was all the more reason why they should make up their minds to regulate those items of Indian Expenditure which could be controlled. Even if silver should not become far more depreciated than it had been, they were likely, in future years, to lose more than they had lost in past years; because the loss by Exchange in past years they had, to a considerable extent, averted, owing to the opportunity which they had of borrowing large sums in England, and in that way diminishing the amount which had to be remitted to India. But they had exhausted their borrowing powers in England; and, consequently, every sixpence of the £17,000,000 of Home Charges would have to be remitted from India to England. What made the matter more serious was this—that the amount of the Home Charges was more likely to increase than decrease. There had been an increase during the last three years. That loss could not be met by any currency juggling. It arose from the fact that the Revenue was received in silver, and the Debt was paid in gold, and so a larger proportion of Revenue was wanted to pay the Debt in India. It was a loss that could not be avoided; but it rendered it the more imperative that we should economize the Revenues of India. Then as to the military expenditure in India, he feared that what had been done this year would give a stimulus to an increased expenditure; and it could not now be estimated at less than £17,000,000, and it even was more than that if they took into calculation the expenditure for military purposes. They were expending £30,000,000 of money at a time when there was the profoundest peace—a peace so profound that the Government could take away from India thousands of troops thousands of miles for employment in Europe. They should remember that India was a poor country—a country in which the great mass of the people earned only 4*d*. or 5*d*. a-day, and where there was no wealthy middle class, and that the population was so poor that it could not bear an expenditure of £17,000,000 for military purposes. The cause of much of the increase in that expenditure was due to the amalgamation of the Indian and English Armies, which had been done against the remonstrances and advice of every English stasesman. The strength of the Armies had not been increased by this, while the military expenditure had been augmented by £4,000,000. If we had back those £4,000,000, there would be no need for increased burdens; no need for an imposition of an Income Tax on incomes of £10 a-year; and no need for an increase of the salt tax.

The military expenditure of India had not yet come to its worst; for, on the authority of Sir John Strachey, the military expenditure had increased in India by £1,000,000 on the Home Charges, over which India had no control and was scarcely consulted, and with regard to which she had no power or remonstrance. In fact, the gravity of that fact could scarcely be over-rated; because, from what had happened that year, the military expenditure was likely to be seriously increased. It might be said that he was, in mentioning these facts, attacking the policy of Her Majesty's Government in bringing Indian troops to Europe. Nothing could be further from his intention. That matter had been disposed of, and he accepted the decision of the House upon it. What he had to advance was consistent with even an enthusiastic approval here of that policy. What he wished to show was, that that policy would injuriously affect the financial position of India. If Her Majesty's Government were to continue the policy of employing Indian troops anywhere out of the United Kingdom, there were two suppositions arising from it—either that the number would be so small that their places need not be filled up by fresh troops being raised in India, or that their number would be so large that it would not be safe to denude India of them, and that fresh levies must take their place. If India could safely spare the 7,000 men that had recently been brought to the Mediterranean, he thought she might be spared the £1,000,000 or so which they cost. But he did not think Her Majesty's Government meant to confine themselves to 7,000 men. It was said that the policy pursued had made little England a great country, and that it had been so important that Russia had turned back in alarm. But Lord Lawrence stated at the time of the Abyssinian War that India could not spare more than 12,000 troops. Then if 50,000 were required in Europe or elsewhere, they would have to raise 50,000 fresh troops in India to take their places. What would happen when the services of these Indian troops were no longer wanted in Europe? The moment they set foot again on the shores of India that country would become responsible for their support, and she could not disband or pension them without a serious inroad upon her finances. Thus by an exercise of the Prerogative, without deigning to consult those responsible for the finances of India, Her Majesty's Government might saddle India with serious financial burdens. The Indian Army henceforth was not merely to be an Army for the defence and security of India; but an Army ready at a moment's notice to serve as a Reserve for Imperial purposes. This being the case, would there not be a great temptation to maintain in India a larger Army than her own security required? In fact, reductions which had been formerly contemplated in the Indian Army were now rendered impossible. Therefore, he said it was absolutely necessary that some safeguards should be designed, besides those that already existed, in order to prevent India being treated as a mere military Reserve for Imperial purposes. Lord Northbrook had well said that the employment of Indian Troops in Europe placed Indian Charges in an entirely new position; because, Lord Northbrook asked, what were they doing? At present, if India had English troops, she had to pay for the cost of recruiting and training; but if England wanted Indian troops, she did not pay a sixpence for the recruiting or training of those troops. Was this just treatment of India? He might be asked to state what he would propose to do under the circumstances which he had described. Well, he would rather reduce the military expenditure in India than run the risk of imposing additional taxation upon India. This should be the key of their policy—this was the policy of Lord Northbrook when he filled the office of Governor General of India; and he believed it could be done without reducing the Army, but by an alteration in the formation of the Army, which would cause reduction of expenditure. If, therefore, the Army could not be reduced in India without danger, unless additional taxation was imposed, he would rather that the Army should be reduced to the smallest number than that additional taxation should be imposed. The same remark applied to public works in India. He would rather that there were more public works going on in India than was the case at present, if there was a surplus that could be so employed; but he objected to their running the risk of incurring additional taxation by borrowing money to spend on public works, which experience told them might yield a very inadequate return with which to pay the interest even on the borrowed money. The position of India in regard to public works was, in fact, the position of an embarrassed landlord who could not carry out improvements which would not be directly productive. In the present condition of India, he thought it the height of imprudence to carry out any public works which involved borrowing, and leading to increased taxation. Everyone connected with the Government of India should take this lesson to heart—that hitherto she had been too extravagantly and too expensively governed. India had been governed as if she were the richest, instead of one of the poorest countries in the world. He did not mean that the public servants in India were too well paid; but he did mean to say that India could not bear the costly Administration which she now had; and it was a monstrous injustice that £22,000 should be expended upon a State barge; £155,000 in building a country house for a governor of a Presidency, and £20,000 in furnishing it; and that these sums should come out of the pockets of the poorest people, who had to pay an additional salt duty. These were facts which should be thought of by the people of this country. He believed they would never know how economically India could be governed until they endeavoured to see how far it could be governed through Native agency. Until three years ago, so strong was the prejudice against employing Native labour that no engine-drivers were Natives; but during the last three years 150 had been employed, and the result had been a saving of £1,500 a-year, as each Native driver received only one-tenth of what the Government or company was formerly obliged to pay. The consulting engineer of the Government admitted that the Native drivers worked longer hours than Europeans, gave less trouble, and altogether did their work more satisfactorily. These facts showed that it was possible to effect great economy if we could get rid of race prejudice, and employ Natives in positions for which they were qualified. Every day he lived, and every day he devoted attention to the subject, he became more deeply impressed with the conviction that if they went on with their present policy—increasing the taxation and adding to the Debt—there was only one inevitable result, and that was a financial embarrassment which would be a grave misfortune to India, and which would bring the greatest discredit upon our own country. No one felt more strongly than he did that, in attempting to govern the vast population of our Indian Dependency, we had assumed, perhaps, the greatest responsibility—call it, if they pleased, an Imperial responsibility—which had ever been assumed by any country. If that responsibility was adequately discharged great would be our advantage and great would be our honour; but if that responsibility was neglected, great would be our shame and lasting would be our humiliation. He appealed to the English Parliament and the English people to do all in their power to secure a juster, a wiser, and a more economical administration of the finances of our great Indian Dependency.

Mr. DILLWYN seconded the Amendment. He complained that this question should be brought on within a few days of the Prorogation of Parliament, and that comparatively few Members were present on this occasion. He was aware that a great Naval Review at Spithead might account for the absence of some hon. Gentlemen; but it was unfortunate that the Review and the Indian Budget should have been fixed for the same day. Not only, however, had the Review been fixed for the same day as the Indian Budget, but the Government had offered to place a vessel at the disposal of hon. Gentlemen who wished to witness the proceedings at Spithead, as if there was not very important Business to be attended to within the House itself. He hoped that in future years the question of Indian finance would be brought forward at an earlier stage. If we were to retain India, we should take better care of its government. From the able Statement of the Under Secretary of State, he inferred that the available Revenue of India was from £55,000,000 to £61,000,000—say £58,000,000; while the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) did not make it more than £37,000,000 or£38,000,000. He trusted that in the course of the debate it would be cleared up which was the correct figure.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House regards with apprehension the present position of Indian finance, and in view of the power claimed by the Crown to employ any number of Indian Troops in all parts of Her Majesty's Dominions, except the United Kingdom, is of opinion that there is no sufficient security against the Military expenditure of India being unduly increased,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD said, he was sure he expressed the general feeling of the House, when he congratulated his hon. Friend the Under Secretary for India (Mr. E. Stanhope) on the exceedingly interesting and able Statement he had made on the finances of India. It had this peculiar merit—it was simple, clear, and not at all diffuse, considering the large field over which he had to range. He must also offer his tribute to the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) for his able handling of the subject, and the admirable colouring he threw on the picture he sketched of that great country. But he had rather, unintentionally, no doubt, misrepresented in effect the condition of the Revenue of India. He had stated the Revenue at £35,000,000, while the Under Secretary of State had put it at £55,000,000. In truth, the total Revenue was a matter of account; and the accounts were made up in a very unsatisfactory manner. According to accounts stated in a simplified form, the Revenue of India for 1876-7 was £35,700,000, and the Expenditure of the same year £36,700,000. That was the real result of the comparison. Then came what was properly distinguished as the Revenue and Expenditure for reproductive works. He hoped before they had another Indian Budget such a state of accounts would be produced as would simplify the whole aspect of Indian finance, so as no longer to lead the House into the awkward doubt whether the Revenue was £35,000,000 or £55,000,000. In regard to extraordinary Expenditure, he thought the observations of the hon. Member (Mr. Fawcett) perfectly well-founded. There was nothing more dangerous than making entries of extraordinary Expenditure without reference to their nature. Nothing ought to appear under the head of extraordinary Expenditure for productive work except that which had an immediate tendency to have productive results. He was much struck by the remark of the hon. Member, that in India taxation was so contrived as to reach the very lowliest classes, and this, too, when our own Chancellor of the Exchequer only a short time ago had relieved incomes of £150 a-year from payment of the Income Tax.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR thanked the Under Secretary of State for the very satisfactory manner in which he had given an explanation of the finances of India, with the aid of the muddle into which the transactions had been thrown, by the unwise and confusing changes in the accounts of the present period. He had in former years called attention to the former state of the accounts and the alterations which had been introduced into the present set had increased the great difficulties which previously existed. He complained of the way in which the accounts were furnished, and said it was hardly possible to make them out. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. J. G. Hubbard) very properly pointed out that it would have been very easy to show the results both of Revenue and Charges in a clear and simple form. He was compelled to try and make out for himself the actual net Revenue and Expenditure, and he found that in 1867-8 the whole net Revenue actually available was £35,856,932, and in 1874-5 it was £37,430,934. These figures represented the net results of income, after clearing away all the formal receipts which sprang out of administration—for instance, the Post Office, Mint, Telegraph, Justice, were all sources of receipts; but when the charges were lessened by the income, then the actual net receipts, or net charges, were shown. With such accounts as had been now laid before the House, it was quite impossible for Members to do justice to India; and, for his own part, he was most anxious to do justice to a country in which he had spent so many years of his life. He had nothing but kindly feeling towards Viscount Cranbrook and the Under Secretary of State; but if the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Smollett) were present, he would have used an expression with regard to these new accounts which he himself would not like to use, and which ought not to be used except in very extreme cases. But now that they had the high authority of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London to the effect that the accounts could be presented in a clear and simple form, he was sure the Under Secretary of State would, on the next occasion, place the figures before the House in a way that Members could understand them. The Under Secretary of State had mentioned that there were two causes of the irregularities and changes in the accounts—one was the railways, and the other the public works. The public works of India were, no doubt, of great importance in respect to causing confusion in representing the transactions; but that evil was caused because we had, within the past few years, divided them into "ordinary" and "extraordinary." But when we added up the expenditure on both kinds of works, hon. Members would be astounded to hear that the total spent on these works 10 years ago was nearly the same as we spent now that we had divided them into "ordinary" and "extraordinary." In 1867-8, we spent on Indian public works of all kinds £6,575,089, of which the sum of £602,462 was for the first time designated extraordinary. In 1875-6, the expenditure on them was £7,393,137, and in 1876-7 the total outlay was £6,747,054, of which one-half nearly was for ordinary, and a little more than one-half for extraordinary, works. He defied anyone to find out now what the public work expenditure was. The accounts were so entirely changed that all the tables of prior years outlay were useless for contrast with the figures in the new accounts. The Under Secretary of State had said that the taxation in India on account of salt had not been increased. He was sorry to hear that statement from the hon. Gentleman; because, while the Government lowered the duty in Bengal, they sent it up in Madras and Bombay. Bengal, where the taxation was lowest, was favoured; while in Madras and Bombay, where taxation was heaviest, the people were made to suffer from an increase of the duty. There was no part of India more heavily taxed than the Madras Presidency. The land revenue there was infinitely heavier in rating than in Bengal, and it had increased since he was in Madras. Anyone who would examine the receipts in Madras from land would find the total collected to be far in excess of that of Bengal, notwithstanding that the Madras population was a little above the half of Bengal, and the area far below that of the favoured Presidency. The stamp duties, Excise, and other taxes, had also been largely increased. He asserted that the surplus Revenue of Madras, which went into the coffers of India, was upwards of £4,000,000. He, of course, excluded from his calculation Military charges, which ought to be spread over the whole of India. Three-quarters of a million, which was spent on troops for the Burmese territory, was charged on the Madras Presidency, as was also the sum required for troops in the Central Provinces of India. Yet Madras was now heavily taxed for salt, the increased impost upon which would throw an additional burden of £300,000 on that Presidency. This salt of Madras was the only article which nature had bestowed on Madras in a bountiful manner; but the English Government had laid hold of it to obtain an income of £1,500,000. Great injustice was inflicted on the people of Madras, who were not subject to a duty on salt before the year 1805. The Mahommedan Government from whom we took the lands of Madras had dealt far more leniently to the people, in regard to leaving this necessary untaxed, than England had done. There was no part of India so heavily taxed on its land as Madras was, having regard to the extent of the area under cultivation; and, in comparison with that Presidency, the Punjaub was not much more than half as much taxed, although it had about an equal area under cultivation. The lamentable thing was that moderation in taxing the people would prove far more lucrative. That was proved by the bound which income made when the transit dues were abolished; and again when the late Lord Harris, when Governor of Madras, made important reforms in respect of the land revenue, which he greatly reduced; and it was to be regretted that the good work which that noble Lord did had hardly ever been recognized. It was much to be desired that men in the present day would follow so excellent an example. The accounts showed that the Madras land revenue at once sprang up, and would even now rise if more liberality was shown. The fact was that Madras and her proceedings were ignored by the Central Government and by the Home authorities. The Indian Government and the India Office were overrun by the Bengal officials, and he had never heard of anything but prejudice and injustice towards Madras on the part of those officials. The curse of India was that hatred against the other Presidencies shown by the civilians of Bengal. Turning to the subject of the licence tax, the hon. and gallant Member strongly condemned that impost. Formerly, under it, the smith who used the hammer, the weaver, and even the dancing girls, were taxed, and the greatest wrong and oppression were committed. It was afterwards abolished, and with that abolition came in larger receipts from other sources; but now they had it introduced again, and unhappily, as usual, the poor and needy were the classes on whom the salt and licence taxes fell. He wished to protect the poor; because he felt that if the poor turned against us in India, our rule there was impossible. A small Army could march through the whole of India if we had a contented people. It was the want of food and of supplies, as well as of that security for our communications, and that co-operation which a contented people could give us, that he feared more than anything else in India. Much had been said about what should be the strength of the Army used for the occupation of that country. For himself, he could not state what its strength should be; but he was convinced they would never be able to maintain in India a sufficient Force to put down a discontented people. Lord Canning had told him they should maintain as large and as good an Army as they could for £12,500,000; and they formerly kept at a smaller expenditure a much larger Army than they did now. He said distinctly that their present Military expenditure was capable of being reduced. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had been right in saying that they ought to look carefully at the military charges in India; but, at the same time, there were others that equally demanded attention. It was a fact which the late Finance Minister of India (Sir John Strachey) entirely ignored. It suited his purpose to raise an outcry for diminution of expenditure, but he omitted to initiate it. The military charges, however, had fallen since the year 1867-8; whereas the cost of civil administration, which in 1868 was £10,372,000, had increased in 1875-6 to £12,577,000, and this notwithstanding the statement of Sir John Strachey that these charges had been reduced by £1,500,000. He trusted that there would be a thorough investigation into both the charges, civil as well as military, and a clear and explicit statement shown of the progress of expenditure since Lord Canning's Administration. No doubt, Military charges had largely increased; but the civil expenses had augmented in a higher ratio. Next he would remark on the very rapid manner in which the Debt had increased of late, as much as £32,000,000, or very nearly that sum, having been added in the last five or six years. It was impossible for any nation to go on borrowing at that rate without getting into serious difficulties. There was, however, some difficulty in understanding the Debt accounts, owing to the changes that had recently been made in their form, and which had made them, in some cases, more or less deceptive. It was worthy of note to know that within the past 35 years great changes had taken place in the mode of accounting. It was thereby rendered impossible for anyone not in possession of the secrets of office to connect the transactions for a continuing period. It was still more remarkable that these changes in the form of entering the figures were made at periods when the finances of India were getting into disorder. The new form of accounting and the new disorder had now again occurred. It was to be hoped that, whatever happened, they would have clearer accounts for the future, and not run blindfold into financial difficulties, than which none other could be more dangerous to our safety.

Mr. MAC IVER regarded the speech of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) as a mischievous one, and distorted by Party feeling. It was unworthy of his position as an Indian reformer. In his opinion, there was no ground whatever for the blame which the hon. Member had cast upon the Government as regarded the period of the

Session at which the Indian Budget was brought forward. It was true that the House was thin; but that was not their fault. Why were not the prominent Members of the Opposition in their places? At the present moment the front Opposition Bench was, and had been nearly all the evening, wholly unoccupied. That the Indian Budget should be brought forward in a thin House was at all times to be regretted; but it was particularly so on the present occasion, because he did not remember an Indian Budget ever being expounded more clearly than it had been that night. The hon. Member for Hackney seemed to him to have used arguments of a rather clap-trap character, particularly in reference to the taxation of incomes in India. Undoubtedly the licence tax cut too low, but yet the value of money was so different that matters were not really so bad as described. Four shillings a-week, no doubt, appeared to English eyes a ridiculously small income; but in Bombay such an income enabled a native to live in comparatively easy circumstances. He fully concurred in the view which the hon. Member took in condemning exemptions from the licence tax, which was the only weak point in the statement of the Under Secretary of State. The people did not object to that tax. They objected to the exemptions, and could not see why the tax should fall exclusively upon the mercantile community. There was no doubt that at present India was passing through a crisis of depression which affected the mercantile classes; but everybody acquainted with that country was aware that that depression was of a temporary character. He endorsed the remarks of the Under Secretary of State as to the great benefits which railway communication had already conferred on India.

MR. MUNTZ thought that the speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) was one of the ablest to which he had ever listened. There was one thing which had always struck him very forcibly in connection with these debates, and that was that they were all alike. The Indian Financial Statement was made a few days before the close of the Session in a very thin House, and they were invariably told that India was in a flourishing condition; that the public works would be reproductive; and that in the long run all would be brought into good order. During all these years, however, the public Debt and the taxation had gone on increasing; and, at the present moment, the recent Return showed the internal liabilities to be £90,808,000, in addition to the Home Debt, the total amount being about £154,000,000; while in addition we were just about to make a new Loan of £10,000,000. He agreed that in many respects railways would be of vast advantage in bringing up food in cases of famine; but new public works ought not to be constructed unless there was a reasonable chance of their being reproductive. They had the high authority of Lord Napier of Magdala for saying that it would not be safe to reduce the strength of the Army in India. He (Mr. Muntz) concurred in that opinion; but he had yet to learn why we should give higher pay in India than we gave anywhere else. It was all very well to say that the Indian people were loyal and contented; but no nation could tolerate excessive taxation. A Debt could only be got rid of by increasing taxation or by lowering Expenditure. We had had famines in India, but no wars worth speaking of since we took over the Company's estate, if he might call it so. Yet the Expenditure and also the taxation had nearly doubled. The people ought to feel that the taxation was for their benefit; but as it was levied on the poorer classes, it was not wonderful that they should doubt whether the Government of India was altogether to their advantage. They had forgotten the tyranny of their old Sovereigns; they had forgotten the Mussulman domination; they had forgotten the paltry tyranny of the Rajahs; and they thought the present Government was not so advantageous to them as it might be. They came there to-night in very small numbers—he believed only nine Members were present at Prayers; and at almost any moment it would have been easy to count out the House; yet the subject they had to discuss was a most important one—the Budget of India amounting to some £50,000,000. Was it surprising if discontent existed? Some people talked of danger to India; yet that was the moment when they attacked the Vernacular Press. That was like fastening down the safety valve, and might have led to very serious consequences.

They were told of danger to India from Russia; he had no apprehension of external danger to India. The collapse of India, if it ever occurred, would be caused by internal dangers. The people, on the whole, were loyal, but they must be well-governed. If we failed to govern them well, we should lose the only title by which we held our Empire—that the people were more happy than they would be under any other form of government.

Mr. WHITWELL was of opinion, that if the cry of "India in danger" were to be raised, the feeling of Englishmen would be aroused, and nearly every hon. Member would rush to his place; but the exceptional circumstances of that day had no doubt drawn away from that House, prompted probably by a feeling of loyalty, the greater majority of hon. Members. He could not admit that the speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had been, as stated by the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Mac Iver), a dangerous speech. On the contrary, it was likely to be productive of great good. They had come to a time when it was necessary for Members to speak out their minds. India spent more than she received; hence the difficulty of her position. He was glad, therefore, to hear the Under Secretary of State declare that an equilibrium must be established, and he should not be satisfied till a surplus of £500,000 had been obtained. The hon. Gentleman had shown his usual zeal and ability in the office he had so recently undertaken; and he hoped his Administration would be successful in diminishing expenditure and avoiding increased taxation in India. He (Mr. Whitwell) believed that during the past Session the wrong policy had been adopted, and that it was a mistake to incur such a large expenditure on the military power of India.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I do not wish to enter into the questions of Indian Expenditure or Revenue; but I think it necessary, after what has fallen from several hon. Members, to say a word with regard to the circumstances of the discussion of the Indian Budget to-day. It seems to me that if some of the statements made by hon. Members go forth unchallenged. it would imply that there has been some lack of interest on Indian financial questions, not only on the part of hon. Members of the House not present to-day, but on the part of the Government in fixing this day for the discussion. In the first place, I would say that this sort of complaint, that the Indian Budget attracts but a small House, is by no means a new one, and it has been made year after year for the last 10 or 15 years, as I can personally attest; so that whenever you fix the date, whether there is a Naval Review or not, it is extremely improbable that there would be a large attendance of hon. Members in the House. However much that may be lamented, I am not at all sure that a large attendance of hon. Members on these nights is necessarily to be desired; though, of course, anyone would always be glad if hon. Members were present when all-important questions are discussed. The discussion of the Indian Budget is always conducted by those who have paid attention to and understand the intricate questions it involves, and is generally, as I am sure it has been to-night, of a very useful character. I do not know that the speech of the hon. Member for Hackney would have been more or less influential if there had been a somewhat larger attendance of hon. Members; but it ought not go forth to the world that there is any indifference at the present time to the condition of the Indian Empire, because what has happened to-night has often happened, even when the Budget has been brought forward at an earlier period by some weeks. The truth is, that upon these occasions, we know quite well that there is nothing to be substantially decided. It is not like the question of the English Budget, when we have to decide whether a particular policy shall or shall not be accepted. But it is an occasion when explanations are given and matters discussed which have their influence upon the public and the Government, and which are extremely useful in India itself. I do not believe that there is an indifference to Indian subjects in this House. No one can deny that England has very high and important interests in India, and upon questions such as these there is some cause for political danger. I think there is the keenest anxiety on the part of the country and the Government to come forward and say and do that which will tend to the security of our Indian Empire. Undoubtedly, the real and important matter is the internal administration of that Empire, and the proper administration of its finances. The hon. Member for Hackney, in the speeches he has delivered on previous occasions—and never more markedly than in his speech to-night—has done good service in calling attention to matters which are apt to be put aside as dry and uninteresting, but which really lay at the bottom of our prosperity. I do not wish to enter into any controversy with him, for my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for India will answer any questions. But we ought to keep in mind the fact, that if England administers a distant Empire like India, there is no doubt that the duty of England to that Dependency is to do what she can to civilize and develope its resources and administer the country's affairs well. The more attention is directed to Indian affairs in this country, the greater pressure will be brought upon the Government of India to do everything that is possible in the interests of the people. There is, however, an unfortunate circumstance, and that is, that the Government must be expensive. The Government of such a country as Great Britain must be much more expensive in character than a semi-civilized Power. We are called upon to do great things—to develope the resources of India; to improve its communication and its irrigation works; to stave off famine; to improve education; and do many other excellent things, and at the same time to keep a strict eye on its financial system. It is difficult to reconcile these objects; but I believe the Government of India, though it may have made mistakes here and there, has, on the whole, sedulously set itself to try as far as it could to develope the resources of India, and to maintain a fairly economical Administration. It is well to be warned against engaging too largely in public works. I have always had a great jealousy of that; and to a certain extent, when I was connected with the India Office, I took a rather re-actionary course, not liking to spend money without seeing how it was to be made productive. But the difficulties to be encountered are enormous; and though it is well that we should be warned, it is not right that if these difficulties lead us into complications we should be accused of want of interest in India if we do not exactly hit on the best way of solving the problem.

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT said, he did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been successful in showing that there was nothing objectionable in putting the Indian Budget down in the last week of the Session. No doubt, it was the common practice to take the Indian Budget very late in the Session. He remembered that during the last Government the same complaint was made. He thought this complaint had some solid grounds, for everyone must feel that such a course was productive of evil, and evil only. It would not surprise him in the least if the Vernacular Press of India were to bring the charge against the Government of doing all they could to stifle discussion as to Indian affairs. The course they had taken in regard to the Indian Budget would give ground for such a charge. What was wanted, as he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would admit, was a sound and intelligent public opinion in the country and in the House upon Indian affairs, so that the Government might be strengthened in making the great changes which no one could deny were necessary in Indian administration. He thought the Government could do a great deal to increase the interest in the Indian Budget. They had to deal with a large Revenue and a large Expenditure, not far short of the amount which formed the English Budget 30 years ago. The future of India must depend upon the way they dealt with the finances of India more than upon any other thing. He looked upon India as a country with a heavy taxation, and an amount of poverty which was appalling to reflect on. It was a country with a lavish expenditure, and with finances of such a character that an unlooked-for accident might put them into a state of embarrassment. These conditions had been enough to ruin Empires, and if such conditions existed with regard to India, nobody could doubt that that Empire might be threatened with excessive danger. It appeared to him that the spending Departments overpowered the Government. He did not suppose that since 1874 the Expenditure of India had increased in the same ratio as that of England, for since that period its increase had been altogether unlooked-for in England. But previous to 1874, for a number of years, the Expenditure of India had been increasing in a larger ratio than the Expenditure of England. That, if true, was sufficient to create uneasiness. They had a country with a Revenue which grew very slowly. They had famine of the most horrible character. It had been admitted by the Government that in Southern India something like 1,500,000 persons had died from the effects of famine in one year. What was the condition of those left alive? It appeared to him that the Government of India might learn more from the way the finances were administered in this country than appeared to be the case. They had had during the last 10 years two remarkable financial policies before the world, one being a direct contrast to the other. In the year 1868 they had a Government which undertook to check expenditure everywhere, and which in some Departments greatly diminished expenditure. Revenue grew at its ordinary pace, and the Government was enabled to remit taxation, and to do good to the whole country. At the end of its career it left £5,000,000, by which they got rid of the tax on one of the chief articles of food. In 1874, the new policy was inaugurated. They had increased expenditure, no remission of taxation, and no relief of commerce, and they were considerably in debt. It appeared to him that the Indian Government had chosen to follow the last and the worst of these examples. It was for the Indian Government to do what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had done, and check and reduce taxation as the Revenue increased. He admitted that the policy recommended by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) required a Government of high moral qualities; it required patience and courage. They must be willing to sustain unscrupulous attacks. It was not altogether an attractive policy. It would not collect unreflecting crowds in the City of London, nor would it command the adulation of a servile Press. But it would tend to make a great Empire more secure, and it would relieve human suffering. It appeared to him that the Government had, during the last two years, spent a large part of its time in fostering the delusion that India was in danger from Russia. It was the opinion of many who had spoken that night that there were greater dangers to India than any which could come from the Government of St. Petersburgh. The Government that should do anything in even a moderate degree to remove the causes of famine, to control expenditure, and wisely to direct the finances of India, would do more for the security of India than anything that could come from taking an unprofitable Island in the Mediterranean or entering into an Anglo-Turkish Convention. It was owing to the mismanagement of the finances of India that we had in that country import duties which pressed on the manufacturing industry of England when it was suffering great depression. The Under Secretary of State for India had referred to the fact that the Government had reduced the duties on coarse cotton yarns. But the Government had in this surrendered nothing, for they got nothing in the way of Revenue out of these articles. Nor had they given anything to the English manufacturing districts which had already lost the trade in these articles. What the people of Lancashire wanted was to have the duties removed from goods and yarn in which there was an extensive trade between England and India. The hon. Member for Hackney was persuaded that these duties would not be reduced without the reduction of expenditure. But if that was so, then if the Lancashire Members on the other side of the House never voted for anything that would lead to a reduction of expenditure, it seemed to him that they were taking an irrational course in the matter. The Government had given fair, but utterly deceptive, promises of reducing the duties on cotton goods. For if the Government did not take the slightest care to reduce the Indian Expenditure, these promises could only be regarded as illusory; and the next time a Lancashire deputation waited on the Government with respect to the reduction of the cotton duties, their first inquiry ought to be—When was the Expenditure to be reduced? He did not think that any Government could maintain duties contrary to the principles of Free Trade, and which depressed the manufactures of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Cheshire, if the finances of India were in a sound condition.

Mr. CHARLEY thought it was ungracious on the part of the hon. Member who had just sat down to address the Government in the manner in which he had done, when they had made a concession, which was certainly a step in the right direction—namely, the abolition of the duties upon imports to India of coarse cotton yarns and coarse cotton goods to the amount of £25,681, which must have a good effect; and he hoped they would go further, and have the duties taken off the finer goods, which were at present over-weighted. On behalf of the constituency which he represented he thanked the Government for what they had done.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER had heard it said that that House took little interest in the affairs of India; but he must deny the accuracy of that statement. The people of England and the Members of that House took a deep and growing interest in Indian affairs; and with regard to the Indian Financial Statement, no doubt, if they voted the particular items, they would find that there would be just as animated discussions on the Indian Budget as there were on the items of the Budget for England. People in talking of India, spoke of it, not as they might speak of Europe, but as they might speak of Middlesex. They forgot its vastness. It was impossible for more than a few Members of the House to appreciate the details of Indian administration; and it was, therefore, natural that there should appear to be a want of interest in them. Indeed, it would be worse for India if the House attempted to deal with them; but he protested against the conclusion that there was any lack of interest in the affairs of India when the House felt that by attending to them it could do anything to promote the welfare of that Dependency. On the whole, the government of India by a Secretary of State was satisfactory.

MR. HAYTER referred to the great increase in military expenditure. In India the charge for the Army in 1876-7 was £15,792,000, and for 1878-9 it amounted to £17,000,000—an increase in three years of £1,208,000. For the Home Army the charge which was in 1873-4 £13,203,000, was for 1878-9 £14,963,000—an increase in three years of £1,760,000, making a total increase for both Forces of £2,968,000. He could not help thinking that the military expenditure of India was very large in proportion to its total expenditure; and that the proportions of European to Native soldiers might be reduced, in consequence of the growth of railways, below the proportions laid down immediately after the Mutiny. The Under Secretary for India had stated that the whole of the railway system of that country had grown up since the year 1853; in any future struggle, therefore, the troops would not be conveyed, as in Sir Henry Havelock's advance upon Cawnpore by steamer, or compelled to march, but would be brought by railway to the desired point with much more speed and facility. He would venture to allude also to the inordinate time taken in settling the claims between the Indian and the Home Governments; for the House had only just received an Estimate, or statement of outlay, amounting to £20,000, in connection with the Abyssinian War, which occurred 10 years ago. The Indian authorities must be responsible for this delay, for it was inconceivable that it could rest with officials in England. Hitherto India had borne the cost of the soldiers that were sent out from this country, as well as the cost of the Native Army; and although it might be fair to use Indian troops in the Mauritius or Ceylon, or anywhere within reasonable distance, the distribution of the charges between this country and India ought to be revised if they were going to use Indian troops, as they had lately done, by bringing them to a Mediterranean garrison.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL desired to concur in the compliments that had been paid to the Under Secretary of State for India for the clearness of his Statement, and also for the general fairness of the views he had expressed. Although, no doubt, that Statement was somewhat coloured, both sides of the House must have been extremely gratified to hear it. It was with extreme satisfaction that he had learned that the Government had been induced to abandon the proposed increase of the salt duties. With regard to the Inland Customs salt line, while unable to take the view that it was equally necessary to do away with it in every part of India, he should be glad if this reform, which was not of a financial, but of an administrative character, were carried out. He regretted, however, that such a man as Lord

Northbrook should have committed himself to the view that there should be an increase of the salt tax; and was inclined to think that in this matter Lord Northbrook had somewhat fallen under the influence of the upper classes in Bengal, who had been continually raising the cry that if fresh taxation was to be imposed, it should be put on salt, and who did not suffer from the tax themselves, as it did not fall on the rich, but on the poor. Those people of Bengal were an extremely limited class, and their view was a selfish one. They were advocating their own interests, and not the interests of the people of India at large. He was also inclined to think that there was considerable truth in the statements which had been made as to the injustice done to the people of Madras and Bombay in the matter of the incidence of the salt tax, which pressed upon the poor people of those Provinces heavily as compared with the rich people of Bengal, who were the most lightly taxed people in the world. The total taxation had not been increased, nor was it proposed to make any increase, as far as he knew, upon the present expenditure and consequent impost. If we exercised a despotic control, and could substitute for our present civilizing system of government one of a rough-and-ready character, we might, by cutting down the salaries of our officers, and by abolishing our civilizing agencies, materially reduce our expenditure; but as that was a course which Parliament would not sanction, the only way to place the finances of the country upon a satisfactory footing was by raising a larger Revenue. He was glad, however, the Under Secretary of State had not taken that extremely sanguine view which others had done, when we used to be told that if this, that, or the other thing had been excluded, we should have had a surplus. The result, however, was, that we were continually adding to the Debt. He did not see, therefore, that there was any opportunity of reducing taxation, or of abstaining from additional imposts. With respect to public works, some of them had been removed from the ordinary to the extraordinary class, and hence there was a saving; but it was not a real saving, but only an apparent and fallacious one. Here he had to complain of Government having neglected to create a Sinking Fund to pay for the execution of those works. He agreed with the Under Secretary of State that it was necessary to make permanent provision for meeting famines; but regretted that a Special Famine Fund had not been created, and that the Fund had been mixed up with the ordinary public Revenue. It was quite right that there should be an Inquiry as to how famines should be met; but he was not satisfied with the measures taken by the Government for that end. After the Orissa Famine, a Commission, of which he was the head, was appointed to inquire into the subject. They inquired and submitted certain recommendations, which, however, were not acted upon. Subsequently, a Famine occurred in Bengal, with which it became his duty to deal. He visited the scene of the Famine, and laid down the principles on which action was to be taken. They were accepted by the Government of India, and were carried into operation. It was true, before he left India, he expressed an opinion that the Famine might have been met with less expenditure; but whatever error was committed was an error on the side of mercy and the saving of life. The result was that life was saved, and Bengal was now as prosperous as ever it had been. The recent Famine in Madras fell into the hands of those who thought that the principles followed in Bengal were wrong; and, instead of feeding the people at their homes, they required them to go long distances to public works, not only in the beginning, but the end of the Famine. The consequence was, that a great addition had been made to the Debt, and there had been an enormous mortality. He was surprised to hear the figures of the mortality given by the Under Secretary of State, for he thought it impossible to ascertain them. A large part of the duty of the Commission would be to decide which principle of dealing with famines was right and which wrong. There was an universal expression of opinion in the Indian Press that the Commission of Inquiry was audaciously packed; and, with the exception of Mr. Caird, who had not yet gone out, he agreed that that was the case. And not only was the Commission not fairly constituted, but the commencement of their proceedings had been most extraordinary. One would have thought that the first thing would have been to proceed to ascertain the facts in the Famine districts; but, instead of that, the Commission had gone to Simla to enjoy for six months the luxuries of that Indian Capua. As to the Indian Army, he did not think its numbers could be safely diminished; and though some saving might be effected by reducing the pay of the officers, much could not be done in that way. He thought we should look to the North of India as a recruiting ground to supply the deficiency of our Army at home. There was no doubt that the expense of filling our European Army was increasing day by day. Trade was abnormally and extraordinarily bad, and people were driven into the Army. He did not know whether trade would revive in this country; but if ever there should be a great revival, the number of hands in this country was not so great that we could supply that trade and the Army, and there would be extreme difficulty in supplying the wants of our Army. We might look then to the North of India as a recruiting ground. If we found our way to Indian troops relieving our overworked troops in other parts of the world—if Indian troops were employed permanently by this country, no doubt that employment would be charged as our European troops were to England. Some people apprehended that there would be a collision with the Russians on our North-Western frontier. He was very much afraid that there were symptoms of difficulties of that kind which might lead to considerable disturbance and an increase of expense in India. He feared there might be something in the reports which had come from Russia and elsewhere, that Russia was pressing forward in Central Asia; and though this seemed an unlikely time for Russia to make such a movement—for she could not but be more or less exhausted—it would appear that since England had succeeded in checking Russia in one direction, Russia was inclined to worry us in another. It was not only from Russia and Central Asia that those reports were received; but within the last few days, apparently circumstantial accounts had come from India itself. We had the announcement made that not only was a Russian Embassy being sent to Cabul, but that a Lieutenant General of high military distinction, with a large cavalcade, was also going thither as representing England. He hoped that the Under Secretary of State for India would be able to tell the House whether there was really any truth in these reports. His own opinion was that a line not of absolute demarcation, but of political influence, should be drawn between Russia and England, and that it should be an understanding between them such as was so frequently come to by the masters of hounds—that one should hunt in one county and the other hunt in another. He understood the Russian Government were perfectly willing to have made an arrangement that the Oxus should be established as the boundary of Russia, beyond which she would not attempt to go. He regretted that this arrangement had not been adopted; and thought that instead of our going to the Ameer, we should have waited until he asked for our assistance. The same observation applied to the Protectorate of Asia Minor. He approved of the Salisbury-Schouvaloff arrangement, by which the political protection of Asia Minor was to be transferred from Russia to this country; but he thought, as with Afghanistan, that it would have been much better if we had waited until the Sultan applied to us for aid instead of going to him. Believing that it was totally unnecessary that we should bind ourselves to the defence of Turkey in Asia, still on general grounds, and for the sake of humanity, it was most desirable that we should do all in our power to make Turkey in Asia a strong and independent Power. He was very desirous, having had much to do with Mohammedans, that fair play should be given them to civilize themselves and render themselves independent. Returning to the question of Indian finance and taxation, he thought they should of all things avoid all expenditure and taxation that could possibly be avoided; but, on the other hand, they should not go to the other extreme of excessive timidity and fear to raise that amount of taxation which might be necessary for the government of the people. He believed that, on the whole, the people of India were lightly taxed. He believed the taxation lately imposed by the Government of India was really necessary. His only regret was that it had been imposed in an unfair way, the burden being placed on the poor instead of the rich, who were the lightest taxed people in the world. Lord Mayo had been unfairly quoted as being wholly on the side of non-taxation. Lord Mayo was one of the justest and soundest Governors General that India had ever had. It was his duty to impose fresh taxation, and he did not shrink from the task; but he imposed it fairly. He was a man who could see both sides of the question; and when afterwards it became a question of imposing other fresh taxes or of reducing expenditure, he did use the words quoted—that an addition to the taxation of India was a great political evil and danger. With regard to the mode of raising money by loan, he thought that the present system of tender in European fashion had not been successful. It led, in fact, to excessive jobbery. He ventured to urge upon the Government whether it would not be better to raise these loans by appealing to the people at large, as was done in France, where there was an immense number of small funded holders, and this operation would give them an interest in the stability of the Government. With regard to this peculiar Loan raised in India in rupees, and paid in England in gold, he did not think the explanation of the Under Secretary of State satisfactory. It was a mere dodge, an evasion of the promise under which it was understood that no fresh loan should be raised. Practically, he should have preferred a more simple, direct, and honest method.

Mr. E. STANHOPE, in reply, thanked the House for the very kind manner in which his statement had been received. He would especially thank the hon. Member who had just sat down for the support he had given to some portions of it, which was especially valuable from his great experience. He was rather surprised at some of the statements of the hon. Member for Hackney, and he hoped his account of matters would not be accepted by the House. In the first place, he did not seem to make any allowance for the actual fact that they had an avowed surplus of £2,000,000, upon which the only substantial criticism had been that of Lord Northbrook, and he represented that they had already a surplus of equal amount. But the hon. Member for Hackney said it was not a real surplus. It was produced only by adding certain items of account. But they were added to the expenditure side also. The real fact was that some 20 years ago the Government of India used to present the net Revenue and the net Expenditure; but it was said the accounts should approximate to the form adopted in England, and the result was, the Indian accounts were now made out to approximate to the form of accounts in England. And when the hon. Member for Swansea asked what was the available Revenue of India, he would ask, in reply, what was the available Revenue of England? The fact was, a very little study of the accounts in either case would enable anyone to find what the available Revenue was. The most important part of the additions to the accounts was that relating to the productive public works, and that, he thought, would be a substantial advantage. The hon. Member for Hackney had discussed the question whether it was advisable to execute public works in India with borrowed money, and he had said that it was decidedly not desirable to do so, and that if such works were undertaken at all, they ought to be executed out of a surplus of Revenue. But that was a matter which he would not discuss in anticipation of the Report of the Committee specially appointed to consider it. But he quite agreed with some of the remarks made by the hon. Gentleman as to the inconvenience of the term "extraordinary public works." A more convenient term had now been adopted, and it was the intention of the Government of India, barring some particular cases to which he had previously referred, to devote the money they applied to such purposes only to works which would really be reproductive; so that when they borrowed money for reproductive works, those works would, in all likelihood, yield such a return as would pay the interest upon the sum borrowed. If that were carried out, the result would not be an unsatisfactory one to the finances of India. A good deal had been said about the increase of the Debt. He agreed with the hon. and gallant Member opposite (General Sir George Balfour), that it was desirable to give the particulars of that Debt with every possible clearness of detail. But it was a little bit hard that one of the Returns which the hon. and gallant

Member had criticized that night was one which was produced in consequence of a clause that had been put into the Act of last year at his own instance. He would now give the House one statement about the Indian Debt. About the time of the Mutiny the Debt was £52,000,000. The increase in the next few years, attributable almost entirely to charges arising out of that event, was £46,000,000, and from that time up to the end of last year the increase was only £36,000,000, and £30,000,000 of that had been invested in productive public works, from which they might expect, before long, to have some considerable return. Then the hon. Member for Hackney complained that, besides imposing additional general taxation, they were increasing the burdens of the people by local taxation; and he alluded to the scheme of decentralization as likely to have that effect. Now, the fact was that the scheme of decentralization had produced to the Imperial Revenue, or would in the present year produce, something like £700,000 more than they had before, without any addition whatever to local taxation. He now came to the Military charges. If the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Mr. Hayter) looked at the accounts of military receipts, he would find that the annual net charge for the Army was not much more than £15,000,000. Moreover, as he had already explained in his opening statement, in the present year the Military Expenditure was reduced by £630,000. That was a very substantial result, and one which ought in some degree to disarm criticism. He did not think that anyone, except, perhaps, the hon. Member for Hackney, had suggested in what way the Expenditure for the Army could be much reduced. But the hon. Member had adverted to the policy they had adopted in bringing Indian troops to Europe, and to the question whether the Imperial Exchequer should not contribute to a greater extent than it now did to the expenses of the Indian Army. Well, while that policy was pursued upon a small scale only, the answer was easy. Undoubtedly, the step that had been taken had effected a considerable saving to the Indian Exchequer, and as to saying that what they had done obliged the Indian Government to keep up a larger force than they otherwise would do, that was not at all the fact. It had been admitted over and over again, and by no one more than by the right hon. Member for Greenwich, that in India they must always have a surplus Force of moderate extent available for general service. At the same time, if they were to adopt the system of employing Native troops on a large scale, it might possibly become necessary to give some consideration to the question as to how far the Imperial Exchequer ought to contribute. But when the hon. Gentleman said they required more safeguards, he would like to ask him what safeguards he meant, for the hon. Gentleman had suggested none. Of course, their main object ought to be, and it would be, to reduce expenditure, and, if possible, to reduce the Military charges; and he thought the House had as full a guarantee for that as it could have in the fact that his noble Friend who now presided over the India Office was intimately acquainted with all the details of military organization, and when he came to apply his mind to the subject, he would be able to judge for himself how far that reduction could be wisely carried. But if they could not reduce expenditure, they must endeavour to put the people in a better position for enduring taxation. If they could devise a judicious system of public works which would develop the resources of the country, and only executed such works as were likely to prove remunerative, they would be placing the population of India in a better condition to bear their taxation. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had mentioned the subject of the salt duty, and had asked for further information as to the effect of the arrangement in regard to the Native States. Now, speaking on the authority of a telegram which had been received, he could say that the Government of India were firmly persuaded that the arrangement which had been made on that matter was a just and fair one, and one which would entail no hardship on the people of the Native States. With respect to the estimate of the Famine mortality, he could only give the figures he had mentioned in his previous statement, which had been prepared in the India Office, and for which they were solely responsible. He would not longer occupy the attention of the House.

Mr. HAYTER wished to explain that Sir John Strachey was his authority for the alleged increase in the expense of the Indian Army.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 59; Noes 20: Majority 39.—(Div. List, No. 277.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

East India Revenue Accounts—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved*, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the Ordinary Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1877 was £50,399,411; the Revenue from Productive Public Works, including the Net Traffic Receipts from Guaranteed Companies, was £5,596,374, making the total Revenue of India for that year £55,995,785; that the Ordinary Expenditure in India and in England, including Charges for the Collection of the Revenue, for Ordinary Public Works, and for Interest on Debt exclusive of that for Productive Public Works, was £51,430,673; the Expenditure on Productive Public Works (Working Expenses and Interest), including the payments to Guaranteed Companies for Interest and Surplus Profits, was £6,747,890, making a total Charge for that year of £58,178,563; that there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £2,182,778; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,809,284.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

## CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

### COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

## CENTRAL ASIA—REPORTED RUSSIAN ADVANCE.—OBSERVATIONS.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that since Supply had been closed, two or three matters had been suddenly brought to their notice upon which it was very important that information should be given to the country before Parliament separated. Within the last few days interrogatories on the subject had been addressed to Ministers, to which very unsatisfactory replies, or no replies at all, had been received. The hon. Member for the Eastern Division of the West Riding of Yorkshire (Mr. C. Beckett-Denison) put a Question the other day with regard to the reported advance of the Russians in Central Asia, to which no reply at all was given; and a further Question, which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) addressed to the Government on the same subject the previous day received a reply almost equally unsatisfactory. There were many of them who thought that matters in Central Asia might have continued to slumber for many years, had it not been for the manner in which the clandestine Convention entered into with Turkey had suddenly aroused feeling in Russia with regard to this country. But whatever might be the cause of the sudden activity displayed by Russia in Central Asia, there could be no doubt that there had been a movement in that quarter which was of quite a different nature to anything that had taken place for the last 10 years. In 1869, 1870, and 1873, negotiations were conducted with Russia, and it was agreed to form a neutral zone between the Dominions of England and Russia in Central Asia, that neutral zone being Afghanistan. A difference of opinion afterwards arose between the two countries as to what the boundaries of Afghanistan should be, but that difficulty was ultimately resolved. There was an agreement that no other country should seek to establish a predominating influence in Afghanistan, and that that territory should not be a country in which Russia and England should intrigue against each other, and try to get the mastery. That was the understanding; and he wished it to be explained how it was that Sir Neville Chamberlain, accompanied by a large staff of officers and a whole regiment of Lancers, was about to be sent to Afghanistan on a mission—a mission of such a character being very likely, in such a country, to lead to disturbances similar to those of 1840, if not, indeed, to a war with Russia. The Session ought not to end without some definite statement being made by the Government as to whether the facts brought before them by the papers were true or not. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made an important speech in that House on this subject, in which, referring to the debate that had taken place, he said it had been eminently satisfactory, as there had been no advocacy of a policy of annexation, or of extending the British Dominions, or of a policy of advance, in order to meet Russia midway. He spoke of feeling in favour of keeping within our own frontiers, rather than attempting to go into the country of Afghanistan. He also referred to the danger of creating suspicion in the mind of Afghanistan, and said the feeling of Englishmen of all parties was that we should keep free from the imbroglio of Afghan policy. These were distinct words used in 1869, and he should be glad to hear the circumstances which had led them to depart from that policy, if it was true that Sir Neville Chamberlain, with a regiment of Lancers, was to be sent to Cabul. There had been rumours, founded on articles which had appeared in the Russian papers, stating that an advance had taken place. An advance had, in fact, taken place in two directions; one, probably, in the direction of Merv, and the other across the Oxus, in the direction of the Province of Wakhan. In 1869, it was stated on the part of the British Government, that Wakhan was a portion of Afghanistan. Lord Clarendon, again, in 1872, addressed a despatch to the Russian Government, in which he spoke of it as being a portion of Afghanistan. Earl Granville, in 1873, made a similar statement. They had no official record of the fact that Russia accepted that view; but they found from *Hansard* that in 1873 both the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) and the Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. Grant Duff) stated in debate that the Russian Government admitted our information to be better than theirs, and agreed to accept our view. The House ought not to be left without distinct information on the subject before it separated. He also desired to ask the Government what information it could give as to Greece and the new frontier, which the Marquess of Salisbury had stated would be reasonable and moderate? He would remind the House that the word used in the Protocol was the French word *inviter*, which was a much stronger term than the word "invite," by which it had been translated, and it had been thus supposed that the Porte had been merely invited, or recommended, to rectify the Greek frontier, which it had evinced a great indisposition to do. The House could not afford to wait in such a matter, as it was probable that a Memorandum would not be officially communicated by the Porte to the Government until after Parliament had risen. If the Porte had not communicated its views to our Government, it had not been sparing in its communications to other persons. Many persons in Constantinople had seen a Memorandum expressing its views. He himself had heard of it by telegram, and our own newspapers gave hon. Members sufficient grounds for asking the Government what they knew about this subject. If they had received this Memorandum, or a telegraphic summary of its contents, the House ought to have it. If they had not received it, he feared it must have been purposely kept back with the view of the Parliamentary Session being closed before the Memorandum was communicated to the Powers. He would not go back upon the consideration of how far we pledged ourselves to Greece last year, but we did so as far as France did; and he should be sorry, indeed, if this country should stand behind France or Italy in connection with the carrying out of the arrangements made by the Congress. The Prime Minister had used words in alluding to this subject which were inconsistent with the Protocols of the Congress. He spoke of what the Congress did as being a mere recommendation to the Porte to rectify the frontiers and increase the territory of Greece; but it was more than a recommendation. It amounted to a direction on the part of the Powers. It was of vital importance that the small concessions made in the Protocols to Greece should be carried out; and he asked the Government, before the Session came to an end, to put the House in possession of all the information they had in their own hands. There was no doubt that difficulties had arisen in carrying out the settlement which this country had sanctioned with regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and also with regard to Batoum; but these were difficulties which might have been foreseen. The difficulties which had arisen in Central Asia were of great consequence to Her Majesty's Government.

MR. BOURKE said, that, though the hon. Baronet was quite within his right in bringing forward a question of this kind at this stage of the Appropriation Bill, it was not a very convenient course, because it placed the person who had to answer in this position—that he was obliged to make the best reply he could, without having the Papers before him, and without having known the questions which were to be brought before the House. The first question of the hon. Baronet—that relating to Afghanistan—related to a subject which was perhaps one of the most delicate that could be brought before the House. The hon. Baronet had alluded to the fact that some years ago an agreement was discussed between the Governments of Russia and England with regard to a neutral zone to divide the Russian possessions from India. The agreement with regard to the neutral zone never came to any satisfactory termination. He was speaking from memory, and, therefore, he hoped the House would excuse him if he did not give exactly the details of the negotiations. But, as well as he recollected, those negotiations broke down upon the question whether Afghanistan should be included in the neutral zone or not. In the negotiations it was distinctly stated that England could not agree that Afghanistan should be included in the projected neutral zone. Upon that question the whole country was perfectly united. No doubt, it would never have suited the policy of England that Afghanistan should be treated as part of the neutral zone which would separate India from Russia. Her Majesty's Government had never disguised for a moment that we had interests with regard to Afghanistan which we could not allow a foreign Power to tamper with, and that was the great reason why the negotiations with regard to the neutral zone never assumed any definite form; he apprehended that these reasons held good at the present time just as much as they did then, and we should object now as much as we did then to any interference with Afghanistan, and even more to Afghanistan being considered as part of a neutral zone. With regard to what the hon. Baronet had said as to Wakhan, he perfectly agreed with everything the hon. Baronet had said on the subject. That was one of the topics of discussion at the time, and there could be no doubt that that Province had always been looked upon by our authorities as properly belonging to Afghanistan. Certainly, it was at the time referred to, and the misunderstandings and mistakes which arose on that subject arose out of the negotiations in reference to Mr. Forsyth's mission to St. Petersburgh, and also from the Correspondence which subsequently took place. All those doubts and difficulties, indeed, arose from the fact that a map had been sent to St. Petersburgh, which was entirely erroneously drawn by the Russian authorities in Central Asia. But when it was discovered that the boundaries of Afghanistan did really include Wakhan, that plan was abandoned by the Russian authorities, who admitted the mistake. For his own part, he had never since then seen any document which shook the opinion that Wakhan was properly included in Afghanistan. The hon. Baronet had asked what information the Government had received in reference to the late Russian movements, and alluded to the question of Russians crossing the Oxus. The hon. Baronet seemed disappointed because information was not given in answer to his Question; but the Question did not invite the information referred to. He (Mr. Bourke) certainly did answer the Question as to whether the Russians had crossed the Oxus, and stated that he had not received any information to that effect. That was certainly correct, and he did not know that he could safely give any more information on that subject. The Government did not believe that the Russians had crossed the Oxus. What they might be doing in other quarters, or where the Russian Forces were, these were questions which he did not think he could be called upon to answer now. The Government had heard that a Minister of Russia had reached Cabul; but they had no information as to what the Russian Minister had stated to the Ameer, or as to what negotiations had taken place between them. It was impossible for him to say more than that. If he were to do so, it would merely be to repeat what was mere bazaar gossip, and was not founded on any official information. It was very likely that the hon. Baronet had heard that negotiations had been opened at Cabul between the Russian Minister and the Ameer; but the Government had no official means of knowing what those negotiations were. At the same time, he was quite sure that the hon. Baronet and the House believed that Her Majesty's Government were not at all indifferent to the subject. On the contrary, he did not think that a more important subject could be brought before the House, and that made him the more cautious in speaking about it. There could be no subject connected with foreign affairs that was of more importance. Our mission to Cabul would not be of the character described by the hon. Baronet; but it was such a mission to the Ameer as the Government thought suitable to the occasion. Considering the information which had reached the hon. Baronet and the public through the Press, and which had also reached the Government through the Government of India, he had no doubt Her Majesty's Government were prepared to accept the responsibility with regard to any mission they might send at this time to Cabul. He did not think he should be justified in saying more at this time; but he might add that, considering what our interests were in Afghanistan, considering the position we had always taken with regard to it, considering the negotiations of 1869 and 1872 with regard to the agreement between Russia and England, when Russia pledged her word that Afghanistan was outside the sphere of all her interests—considering all these things, he did not think the House would believe for a moment that Her Majesty's Government could look on with indifference upon what they knew was occurring in Central Asia. This was all the House could expect him to say with regard to India. Then the hon. Baronet had referred to Greece. Her Majesty's Government had, over and over again, in unmistakable terms, declared their views on that subject. Certainly the Prime Minister had never concealed what his views were with respect to Greece. He had said, over and over again, that Greece had a future; and his advice to Greece was that if any country had a future, it could afford to wait a little time. As to the views of France on the subject, he would ask the hon. Baronet whether France or any other country stated at the Congress that it was prepared to force its views on Turkey? If any Power had been prepared to insist that Turkey should give up Thessaly and Epirus, it must have been prepared also for one of two things —either to see Turkey broken up, or to go to war. That was a position for which Europe was not prepared. The hon. Baronet had mentioned a certain Memorandum, in which, it was said, the Porte had declined to agree to the recommendations of the Congress on the subject of the Greek frontier. He (Mr. Bourke) had not seen that Memorandum, and he could not agree that it was in the Foreign Office. There was no reason to think that such a Memorandum had been issued. Whether Turkey would agree or disagree it was not for him to say, but the opinion of England had been recorded in the Protocols; and if she were called upon to mediate she would mediate in accordance with the words which had fallen from the mouth of the Premier—that if Greece had a future, it could afford to wait. He had given as much information as could be expected under the circumstances. He did not think he would be justified in saying more. The Government viewed as of the utmost importance the Russian advance in Central Asia and the mission to Cabul; and if the House were to debate the subject every day from this up to Christmas, it could not impress the Government more deeply than it was impressed at the present moment with the capital importance of the subject.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT could not say that the explanation of the hon. Gentleman was very satisfactory. He could have wished that some of the sentences of the hon. Gentleman had not been of so alarming a character. The hon. Gentleman had said upon the subject of Central Asia, that it was impossible, after the events which had occurred within the last two months, for the British Government to be indifferent to Afghanistan. He did not think that statement was one which should be made unless they had been told what those events were. He (Sir William Harcourt) had never been affected by the Central Asian scare. Two years ago, the subject had been raised by the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight (Mr. Baillie Cochrane), and he thought it had then got a wet blanket which would have put out both the fire and the smoke. He referred to the speech of the Prime Minister, in which he disclaimed the imputation of being a

Russophobist, and said that there was room enough in Asia for both England and Russia. He hoped every Englishman would determine to resist any attempt on the part of Russia to attack us in our Indian Dominions. Whether or not an advance upon Afghanistan was of that character was a different question. The authority of every person who had considered the matter was opposed to our disturbing ourselves with reference to the movements of Russia in Central Asia. There was no necessity for our troubling ourselves in the least as far as that matter was concerned. With reference to the frontiers of Greece, the statement which had been made by the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was not, to his mind, satisfactory. The hon. Gentleman said that possibly recommendation or mediation would be wanted in reference to that matter; but his (Sir William Harcourt's) experience in reference to this matter led him to believe that neither recommendations nor mediation were of the least use when addressed to the Ottoman Government. On no single occasion had any recommendation had the slightest effect on that Government; nor were they ever likely to have effect, unless tendered at the point of the sword. There were recommendations and mediation on the part of the Conference of Constantinople. The Conference recommended that Bosnia should be given up to Austria; but what happened? Austria had been compelled to carry out the recommendations of the great European Powers at the point of the sword. Recommendations and mediations continued to be made for two years, until Russia unsheathed the sword, and Bulgaria was emancipated by force of the fact that a Russian Army was present on Bulgarian soil. Her Majesty's Government had recommended that Bosnia and Herzegovina should be evacuated by Turkish troops in favour of Austria; but he did not know that the resistance to the entry of Austria into those countries was not encouraged by the Porte. Further, Her Majesty's Government had recommended that Batoum should be surrendered to Russia; but did anyone believe that save by the force of the sword Russia could have entered Batoum? In short, it must be known to everyone who had studied history that the Ottoman Government had never given up anything except in compliance with force. The Plenipotentiaries who were sent from this country to the Berlin Congress claimed for themselves that they had brought back peace with honour; but, as a matter of fact, there was no fighting when the Congress commenced or closed its sittings, and there had been nothing but fighting ever since.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON believed that both France and Italy had shown a willingness to enforce the recommendations of the Congress with regard to Greece, had they been backed by England. It was now understood that Turkey had sent a Memorandum to Greece to the effect that it was not intended to carry out the recommendations of the Congress; and although Her Majesty's Government denied all knowledge of such a Memorandum, there could be little doubt that the Turkish Government were only waiting for the Prorogation of Parliament to give effect to the Memorandum. The course of the Government had not been to incite Greece to oppose Turkey, but to encourage Turkey to resist and refuse the demands of Greece.

Mr. C. BECKETT-DENISON said, he was quite aware of the danger of speaking lightly on any point affecting our political relations in Central Asia. It was now known, however, that since the middle of July last, a Russian mission of considerable importance, headed by a well known General, had been established, and was now in existence in Cabul. It was also known, though not with the same accuracy, that certain military movements had also been set on foot from various parts of the Russian Empire in the East, the object of which had not been explained by the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It was very possible that these movements were initiated at a moment when it was important to create a diversion in Central Asia, and that Russia, availing herself of every means within her power, did not scruple to set in motion these expeditions, with a view to give England occupation in the East; and if, instead of being at peace, we were now at war with Russia, he did not think we could fairly have had much cause of complaint with the course of action which Russia had taken. The question was, whether the presence in Afghanistan of Russia since the termination of the Congress in Berlin, was a hostile or a friendly act? It might be said—and no doubt it would be said—that the delegation of a mere Political Agent, though he was a resident Minister of rank, to the Court of Afghanistan, could not be regarded in any hostile sense by this country, and that we should have no cause to complain. He was not one of those who would use harsh terms towards Russia for pressing her way in Central Asia according to her own lights; nor was he at all frightened, when he raised his voice against the stealthy approach of Russia to our own frontier, at being called Russophobist. He pushed such considerations aside as unworthy of any man who thought seriously on these matters, and who knew what he was talking about. He looked upon the matter somewhat in this light. We had seen that Russia through a long series of years had gone on, by a succession of parallels, approaching her frontier nearer and nearer to that of Afghanistan; and the question was, whether what, she was about to do was sending out, as it were, another parallel in the same direction? He had very little doubt in his own mind that the objective point of the expedition was Merv; and the sooner the House awoke from its lethargy, and realized that Russia once in Merv the next point was Arat, the better it would be for the safety of this country. Khelat was already in the hands of Russia. A Russian Minister, or Political Agent, or by whatever term he might be designated, was already in Cabul; but we had no such Agent. When he read that morning that Lieutenant-General Chamberlain was to be sent out in September, he doubted that paragraph; but he was glad, from what passed that evening, to learn that that officer was a well-known general officer, in whom this country might well have confidence. He had no doubt that the aim and object of the Ameer was now, as it was that of his Predecessor, to rub the noses of England and Russia one against the other. He hoped the English Government would not permit itself to be befooled by the Ameer, or to be frightened by anything he might say or do with Russia. What we had to do was to hold a firm front by them, not to be unduly frightened, and to accept as a matter of fact the existence of the political mission of Russia as it was at Cabul; but to let the Ameer understand that there was a point beyond which we could not allow him to trifle with our interests or to annoy us. We ought to be prepared, and now more than ever. His hon. Friend (Mr. Bourke) did not insist one syllable too much upon the gravity of the occasion; and he would say this in spite of what had fallen from his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). The speeches which his hon. and learned Friend had quoted from the present Prime Minister had no reference whatever to the present state of things. The Prime Minister was speaking in those days of the emigration of Russia to Beloochistan and Bokhara, two unimportant districts, and very different, indeed, from Afghanistan. The hon. and learned Gentleman spoke, he thought, somewhat too lightly and flippantly in regard to what was called the great neutral zone. He was very well aware that that arrangement never took the form of a Convention or a Treaty; but, still, there was sufficient to be found in the documents and despatches to enable them to speak with full authority on what was the understanding with Russia. The despatch dated from St. Petersburgh, March 7, 1869, from Prince Gortchakoff to Baron Brunnow, stated that there was a zone which separated the Asiatic possessions of England and Russia, and that there was a limit imposed by nature, beyond which it would not be prudent for either Power to go. Russia, Prince Gortchakoff said, felt no apprehension of the ambitious projects of England in Central Asia, and she had a right to expect the same feeling from England. Baron Brunnow was directed to congratulate Lord Clarendon on his desire to avoid a misunderstanding, and to give him the positive assurance that His Imperial Majesty looked upon Afghanistan as beyond the limits in which Russia might be called upon to exercise her influence, and that no desire for any interference with Afghanistan entered into his intentions. These words of Prince Gortchakoff were uttered at a time when there was profound peace between England and Russia; and if this new political Mission had been undertaken at a similar time, it was probable that the sentiments found in that despatch would probably have animated the whole discussion. But we could not forget that this Mission had been decided upon at a time when the relations of the two countries were in a state of extreme tension; and it was that fact, more than anything else, which gave to the present position its gravity and importance. The conclusion he had come to was that it would be better for this country to accept the residence of a Russian Minister in Afghanistan as an accomplished fact; and that, as long as possible, we should find the means of living in peace and amity with Russia in Central Asia. But, while we did this, it was well to give Russia to understand that there were certain points, which, if brought into discussion, or attempted to be seized by Russia in her own interests, would create, he was about to say, a *casus belli* with this country, though he was adverse to using an expression of an unfriendly nature towards Russia. He did not, however, think that the cause of peace in the future would be at all promoted by keeping our policy in our sleeves, or by leaving Russia in doubt as to those points by which we should seek to protect our own interests before all other considerations.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I cannot think, Sir, that it is desirable to pursue at great length what may be called a hypothetical discussion, for, to a certain extent, any discussion of the proceedings of Russia in Central Asia at the present time must be regarded as hypothetical. The information which we have is not by any means complete, and it will be difficult to form any judgment upon it. Upon one point there is no doubt we have received information, and that is that a Russian Mission has been sent to Cabul, that it has now been there for some time, and that it is one of a character which gives it importance. Undoubtedly, the fact that such a Mission has been sent there is a matter which calls for the attention of the British Government. It has always been considered—and it was very distinctly put forward in the discussion of what has been called the neutral zone—that it would not be good policy, on the part of either Russia or England, to attempt to extend their movements into Afghanistan, and it was also said in those communications that if either party had an interest in Afghanistan it was England. I remember in one of the communications made to us by the Russian Government, it expressly stated that the Russian Government would look to England to use her influence to prevent certain troubles that might take place in Afghanistan; and, no doubt, it was always considered that England had the more special interest in that country. While for some time it has been a matter for consideration whether there should be an English Envoy at Cabul, the idea has always been discouraged, and nothing has been done in that direction; but now we hear that a Russian Mission has been sent there, I think it is a most obviously necessary step that we should send one of corresponding weight and dignity, in order that it may be seen that England has interests to look after, and that she has as much right to look after them as any other Court. It is the undoubted duty of English statesmen, and of the Indian Government, to watch what is going on in these regions; and I can assure the House that Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to their responsibilities. I do not think any good would come of a further discussion. The only information we have to give is that which has been already given; and as to the statement which has appeared in the public journals, I am not able to go into details, but I can say that the information there conveyed is substantially correct. In regard to the other question to which the hon. Baronet has drawn attention—the question of Greece—there is nothing to add to what my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has already said. We have not received any information of the character indicated, or any intimation that the Porte has refused, or intends to refuse, to give effect to the arrangements proposed at the Congress. Nobody doubts that the Porte looks with jealousy upon these arrangements; but we have not received any communication that the Porte has refused, or intends to refuse. Therefore, it is premature to discuss what may be the policy of England in the event of an occurrence which has not taken place. Undoubtedly, it is hoped that the arrangement agreed upon at the Congress will be carried into effect.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, it was quite clear that they had no definite information as to what Russia was doing in Central Asia; therefore, he thought it was not well to unduly press the Government upon that point. But what disturbed him was that they had not at present been told that the Ameer had consented to receive the Mission. All they knew was that Lord Lytton had decided to press it upon the Ameer. All the Indian statesmen of experience had earnestly dissuaded Lord Lytton from that course. They had pointed out to him that the policy was dangerous under any circumstances; but that it was a still more dangerous and difficult task, without the consent, and contrary to the wishes, of the Ameer, to force this Mission upon him. It was, in fact, worse than a dangerous policy. That was the advice which had always been given by Lord Lytton's advisers; and he must say he thoroughly agreed with it. He sincerely hoped we should not be led into great complications by the attempt to force this Mission on the unwilling Ameer of Cabul. It was true that their information was at present incomplete, and that this might be only a commercial mission; but he must venture to express his extreme regret that while we were settling greater things with Russia we did not settle this comparatively small affair, and that we had not come to some amicable arrangement with Russia in regard to the frontier of Afghanistan. A great deal had been said in regard to the neutral zone between ourselves and Russia; but he always understood that that proposal ultimately took the shape of an offer from Russia that there should be a neutral zone, defined by a line to be drawn, into which the political influence of Russia or England did not extend, and that that line should be drawn at the Upper Oxus; but that, if circumstances permitted, we should be at liberty to conquer the territory South of that line. We should then have been left to do what we liked with Afghanistan. He believed a reference to the Papers would show that the only reason why that agreement was not carried out was that if that was made the line, we should bind ourselves not to attempt to protect ourselves to the North of the Oxus. At all events, he must express his earnest hope that in this question we should come to terms with Russia in regard to Afghanistan. He hoped the matter would be settled in an amicable manner, and that the Indian finances would be spared a large amount of expenditure. In regard to Greece, he would only express his entire concurrence in what had been said by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). It was idle to suppose that Turkey would take any steps in regard to Greece unless something was done to compel her to do so.

Mr. FAWCETT did not intend to continue this debate at length; but it appeared to him that the question was one of the greatest possible importance. The wisest Indian statesman among them — Lord Lawrence — had warned them most solemnly against this step which the Government had now taken without giving any notice to the House of Commons. On the present occasion, he only desired to ask the Government whether, before Lord Lytton decided to send this Military Escort to Cabul, any communication was sent to the Secretary of State; and, if so, whether it was considered and approved by him in Council?

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, the gravity of this movement on the part of Russia could not be overrated, and he would earnestly warn the Government to be upon the alert. It was not that he had any fear of Russia, for he had always felt that if England put forth her power she could easily prevent Russia from aggrandizing herself in Central Asia. Indeed, he had always maintained that Russia had far more reason to dread the direct action of England's influence in Central Asia than England had of Russian aggression on the frontiers of India. These intrigues, no doubt, would stir up the many disaffected within India, and thereby cause us to increase our expenditure; but that was the extent of the Russian movements. When they saw, however, the Governor General of India sending the Chief of the Madras Army to Cabul, they ought to attach more importance to the movement than had been given that night. They were thereby attaching to the Ameer's intrigues a far greater importance than they deserved, and making this Chief to be one of power; whereas he was virtually a usurper, recognized by us and strengthened in his position, from which he would fall as soon as it was known that he was our enemy. There was one point which he desired to impress upon the Government, and that was this—it would be remembered that on a previous occasion, when there was reason to believe that Russian intrigues were being carried on in Afghanistan, the English Government were enabled, by sending Lord Durham to St. Petersburgh, to avoid any misunderstanding; and on the present occasion he would earnestly entreat Her Majesty's Government to put this question plainly to Russia—"Do you, or do you not, mean to interfere with our Indian frontier?" He thought the Government could not possibly be too careful in the steps they took to prevent Russia getting a footing in Afghanistan. The bold measure resorted to by Lord Palmerston in 1836-7, of demanding explanations from the Russian Government, at first brought out assurances of our mistake in supposing the existence of intrigues; but when evidence was given of their extensive existence, then came out the truth of orders disobeyed, and of the intriguers being recalled and disavowed. The like result would follow now, for the moment she knew that England was prepared to take prompt and decisive steps, Russia would desist from any course of conduct which could endanger our Indian Empire.

Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

### UNIVERSITY TESTS BILL.

*Considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

*Resolved,* That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Tests in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham, and the Colleges therein.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. FAWCETT, Mr. GOSCHEN, Mr. DODSON, and Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 305.]

### CORONERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary CROSS, Bill to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Coroners, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary CROSS, Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL, and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 303.]

### MAGISTRATES (SUMMARY JURISDICTION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary CROSS, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Summary Jurisdiction of Magistrates, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary CROSS, Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL, and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 304.]

House adjourned at half after
One o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Wednesday,* 14*th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Expiring Laws Continuance *.

*Second Reading—Committee negatived*—Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) *.

*Committee—Report*—Arranmore Polling District (Ireland) * (189); Metropolitan Commons * (199); Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) * (197).

*Third Reading* — Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland) * (200), and *passed.*

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at Six o'clock,
till To-morrow, half past
Three o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Wednesday,* 14*th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS—*Resolution* [August 13] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee—Report—Considered as amended—Third Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance [296], and *passed.*

*Third Reading*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Bishoprics [197], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn*—Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices * [281].

## *QUESTIONS.*

### PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT—PETITIONS AND PRESENTMENTS.

QUESTION.

MR. E. JENKINS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will, next Session, lay upon the Table of this House, a Return from each Archbishop and Bishop in England and Wales :—1. Of the number of Petitions, or other formal or informal presentments, received by him, complaining of illegal practices in churches or by clergymen within his diocese, since the time of the passing of "The Public Worship Regulation Act;" 2. The name of the parish ; of the clergyman and church ; the terms, nature, and number of times of complaint in each case ; the names and descriptions of complaints ; 3. The action taken thereupon ; and, in cases where no action has been taken, whether it is owing to defects in the provisions of the Law ?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS : Sir, I have not had time to communicate with the Archbishops or Bishops since Notice of this Question was put on the Paper. I do not see any objection to the Return being granted if the materials for it are in existence. If the hon. Member will move for the Return next Session, I will in the meantime make inquiries.

### POST OFFICE—SURVEYOR GENERAL'S CLERKS, EDINBURGH AND DUBLIN.

QUESTION.

SIR ARTHUR GUINNESS asked the Postmaster General, Whether the scale of pay is not higher, and the classification better, of the clerks in the Surveyor General's branch of the General Post Office in Edinburgh than that of the clerks in the corresponding department (viz. the Secretary's office) of the General Post Office in Dublin; whether it is not a fact that the duties performed by both sets of officials are identical ; and, whether, if this is so, he intends to remedy the inequality under which the Irish section of the department is labouring, by giving the clerks in the Secretary's branch of the Dublin office the classification and rate of pay accorded in Edinburgh ?

LORD JOHN MANNERS : Sir, with reference to the first Question which has been put to me, I may reply to it generally in the affirmative. As to the other parts of the interrogatory, I have simply to say that I have no power, so far as I am personally concerned, to alter or remedy the inequality complained of; but it is my intention to call the attention of the Treasury to the subject.

### ISLAND OF CYPRUS—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.—QUESTIONS.

MR. MONK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is able to inform the House what truth there is in the statement that has appeared in the "Daily News," that the unhealthiness of the troops in Cyprus is assuming serious dimensions ; that out of 150 Sappers quartered near Larnaca 57 are in the hospitals ; that the 42nd Regiment has upwards of 50 sick, and that the 101st Regiment is nearly as bad ; that the Commissariat department is suffering severely from the prevalent sickness among officers and men ; and that fever, complicated with severe diarrhœa, has attacked the sailors and marines who have been employed on shore, as well as the European and Maltese servants and interpreters ?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he can inform the House what are the most recent accounts he has received relating to the health of the troops in Cyprus ?

COLONEL STANLEY : Sir, the latest information that I have is a telegram received two days ago from Sir Garnet Wolseley, who says—

> "There is no serious illness among the troops. Some six cases are in hospital from the mild fever of the country. The men are doing well, and are likely to be on duty soon."

I have since received other telegrams from Cyprus about other business. No reference is made in them to any special degree of sickness, and therefore I am in hopes that these cases are not so severe as some people may imagine. I do not like referring to private letters ; but I have just received by this mail a letter from Sir Garnet Wolseley, in which he says—"The health of the men continues excellent, although the heat during the day is very great in the bell tents." I have also received a medical report, and although I have not been able to go through it as carefully as I could wish, there have been apparently only two fatal cases of enteric fever. I may be allowed to ask the House to remember that there are only two conditions in which a soldier is considered with respect to health. He is either fit for every duty, or he is placed on the sick list. Therefore, even a cut finger, or a common cold, or anything which prevents him from discharging every duty, would be sufficient to put him on the sick list. That may account for the apparently large number on the sick list according to some accounts. Judging from the accounts I have received, I cannot say there is any cause for anxiety.

## CENTRAL ASIA — RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN.—QUESTION.

**Mr. C. BECKETT-DENISON:** I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question which may be thought out of date after the debate which we had last night; but, as it refers to an event which may mark a new era in the history of Central Asia, I desire to put it. The Question is, Whether the Government have reason to believe that arrangements have been concluded between the Emperor of Russia and the Ameer of Affghanistan for the location of a resident Russian Minister, or Political Agent of high rank, at Câbul? In answering this Question, I trust that the Under Secretary will give to the House whatever authentic information he may possess on the subject up to the present moment.

**Mr. BOURKE:** Sir, I am afraid that I cannot give the House any further information upon the subject than I gave last night. I then stated that Her Majesty's Government were aware that a Russian Minister had arrived at Cabul; but that they did not know what negotiations had taken place between Russia and the Ameer, which had led to that Minister being sent there, and that we had not been informed of the nature of any negotiations which might still be going on between them.

## METROPOLIS—CONDITION OF LOWER THAMES STREET.—QUESTION.

**Mr. FAWCETT** asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the neglected and dirty condition in which Lower Thames Street has for some time past been permitted to remain; and whether, as the City Commissioners of Sewers have failed to give any attention to the repeated complaints that have been made to them on the subject, he can take any action in the matter?

**Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH:** Sir, in reply to the hon. Gentleman's first Question, I must say that my attention has not been called to the condition of Lower Thames Street, except by the present inquiry. As regards the second Question, in which it is assumed that the Commissioners of Sewers have failed to give attention to complaints made to them on the subject, I have received a communication from the Commissioners in which, while it is admitted that the condition of Lower Thames Street is not all that could be desired, statements are made which go far to show that it has engaged their special and serious attention. They say that they have issued instructions to their officers to pay particular attention to this street; that the police have been requested to prevent refuse being thrown into the public road; that detectives have been employed to watch offenders, who, by their evidence, have been convicted; and that the whole street is swept twice a-day, and frequently washed and sprinkled with deodorants. It is further said that the spot most complained of is immediately opposite the Custom House, to remedy which structural alterations are required, which cannot be effected without the consent of the First Commissioner of Works. That consent, however, has been obtained. With regard to his inquiry whether I can take action in the matter, I may refer the hon. Gentleman to the 49th section of the Sanitary Act, 1866, by which it is provided that in case of neglect of duty by a nuisance authority, such as are the Commissioners of Sewers in the City of London, complaint may be made to the Secretary of State—that is, as the law now stands, to the Local Government Board—who are invested with the necessary powers of dealing with such a case.

## METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES. QUESTION.

**Mr. FAWCETT** asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can promise that the Government will, next Session, introduce a measure to deal with what he lately described as the "enormously increased charges of the Metropolitan Water Companies?"

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, this is a matter of importance, and one which is connected with a very large question. I am not able at the present moment to give any positive promise on the subject; but I think the matter is one which calls for the careful consideration of the Government.

Mr. FAWCETT gave Notice that, in the event of the Government not taking any action in this matter, he should take the earliest opportunity next Session of asking the House to express its opinion in reference to it, and of moving a Resolution relating to it.

### ARMY—GOOD CONDUCT MEDALS.

### QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE DOUGLAS asked the Secretary of State for War, If he would explain why so great a time was generally allowed to elapse between the recommendation of a soldier by his Commanding Officer, for a good conduct medal and the issue of the medal to him, it in many cases not being received until after the soldier has left his regiment, whereby he is deprived of the honour and gratification of having the decoration presented to him on parade and in the presence of his comrades?

Colonel STANLEY, in reply, said, that this subject had been brought under his notice; but he was not able to give a very precise answer to the Question at the present moment. He, however, entirely agreed in the principle that a good conduct medal should, if possible, be given on parade and before a man left his regiment. The medals would be given in future on parade. They were now connected with gratuities which had to be obtained out of the public funds; and it would be necessary, when a medal was so bestowed, that it should be given without any prejudice to the gratuity which might be issued.

### TURKEY—ALLEGED OUTRAGES IN THESSALY.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can give the House any information as to the truth or falsehood of a statement, contained in a letter from Volo, dated 31st July, which has appearedin the public press, to the effect that the Turks were entrenching Armyro and Damoko, in Thessaly; that seven women and children have been killed and five wounded at Vardikoussa by Turkish troops under the Caimacam of Ellassona, and the village pillaged; and that an English Commissioner had been sent to inquire into the affair; whether the Commissioner, if sent, has reported; and whether his Report will be laid on the Table?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, I am very sorry to say that I did not see the hon. Member's Question until this morning, and the time which I have had to make all the inquiries desirable on the subject has been limited; but I have made considerable inquiries about it, and I can say that I do not find anything that can justify the statement which the hon. Member says has appeared in the public journals. With regard to the second part of the Question, which mentions an outrage by Turkish troops, I have looked through some Papers respecting a subject analogous to this. I must remind the House that this appears only to have taken place a fortnight ago, so that it is quite possible that we may not yet have received information which may eventually reach us. All I can say on the subject is that I do not find any account of an outrage of the kind mentioned by the hon. Gentleman which could justify the statement referred to in the Question. As to whether, supposing we do receive any information upon this particular alleged outrage, we should lay a Report on the subject on the Table, all I can say is that we know a great number of outrages have taken place, probably are taking place on both sides, and to present a Report on one particular outrage would be to give to the House and the country a very partial idea of what is really going on; but I do propose to lay on the Table Papers on the subject generally before the end of the Session. No doubt all the information we possess on the subject will be given in these Papers.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I gave Notice openly in the House yesterday of the Question I have asked.

Mr. BOURKE: I did not hear it.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I should now like to ask the hon. Gentleman, If it is not true that Captain Sing has been sent out as a Commissioner, and who could have sent this Commissioner if not Her Majesty's Government?

Mr. BOURKE: All I can say is that I know of no such Commissioner being sent.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Matthew Ridley.*)

[BILL 296.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. HOPWOOD, who had given Notice that he would move that the House go into Committee on the Bill that day month, said, he should not persevere in that Motion; but, at the same time, he wished to make a few observations with reference to one of the Acts it was proposed to continue by this Bill—namely, the 24 & 25 *Vict.* relating to the Salmon Fisheries—and the particular section to which he desired to call attention was the 31st, under which the Fisheries Inspectors held their appointments. When the Act was passed, in 1867, it provided that two Inspectors were appointed for the term of one year. At that time it was contemplated that the appointments should only be of short duration, and the object of their appointment was that early proceedings might, if necessary, be taken under the Act. The powers of the Inspectors were extremely limited. They were merely to be authorized to make Reports to the Secretary of State for the Home Department when called on so to do. At any rate, he knew of no other duty they had to perform, or of any powers they possessed. They had no power to prosecute anyone for breach of the Act, nor had they the power of coming to any determination of their own. All they could do was to bring any particular matter under the notice of the Home Secretary. If they were the only persons having charge of the fisheries and the duty of inspecting them, he should still think there ought to be something found for them to do in order to justify their appointment; but from the expiration of their first appointment, a Bill had been brought in annually continuing their appointment, without imposing any real duties upon them. In 1865, it was found that the existing powers as to the regulation of the fisheries were not sufficient; and a Bill was brought in under which certain Commissioners were appointed, and one of the Inspectors was sent about to examine the different weirs and engines for the destruction of salmon and the spawn of salmon; whereupon the Commissioners adjudicated in a number of cases, and there being power of appeal given to the Courts of Law, many of those who owned the engines complained of availed themselves of the right thus given, and sometimes judgment was given in their favour, and at others in favour of the Commissioners. That body of Commissioners was a useful body. In 1868 or 1869, a Bill was passed in which the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) had a great deal to do, and under that Act bodies of local conservators were to be created in different parts of the country by means of election, wherever need for such a body existed. The result of that measure was that the supervision of the fisheries had passed into local control, and there was no need for inspection; and, as far as he could judge, there had been since then little or nothing for the Inspectors to do. The usual way in cases where it was desired that appointments should be kept up for which there was no justification, was to give the persons holding such appointments something to do under another Act, and then say that they were useful public servants. One of the Inspectors had been employed as Commissioner in connection with the Deep Sea Fisheries or the Shell Fisheries; but, whatever his duties, they were quite outside the Act under which he was appointed, and he might refuse to discharge them if he liked; consequently, to say that the Inspectors were employed in duties for which they were not appointed was no justification for the renewal of their appointment under the existing Act, but was rather like making their office a sham. If it were thought necessary to retain one Inspector, he doubted whether it could be shown that both were necessary, and he should like to ask, what were the duties that those two gentlemen had been galvanized into performing over a number of years? He had put this Question the other day, but as he had not taken the course which was generally most successful in that House—that of resorting to obstruction—he had obtained no answer. He thought he had made out a case requiring the consideration of the Treasury and the Home Office, which were both interested in keeping down expenditure, and which ought to exercise some supervision over the renewal of Acts of Parliament that were only passed for a temporary purpose, but which were afterwards allowed to sleep, as this Act had been, in order that certain appointments might be perpetuated. He hoped he should be considered as having done something that would not be without its advantage in calling attention to this matter.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he must apologize to the hon. and learned Member for having accidentally omitted to answer a Question on this subject which the hon. and learned Gentleman had put to him the other evening. The hon. and learned Gentleman had asked why, if these Inspectors were approved of, an Act had not been passed to make their office permanent? He (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) could only say, in answer, that the difficulties of legislation were so great as to make it very often, in the opinion of the Government, better to retain a section in a Continuance Bill than to try to carry through Parliament a Bill embodying that section. These Inspectors had done good and important service to the country, as their Reports showed; and if they had not the full power which it might be well that they should possess, they acted under the authority of the Home Secretary, and had carried out important investigations in reference to the fresh-water fisheries in Norfolk and elsewhere, and to the oyster beds, and they had also made inquiries for the Board of Trade. No one could doubt these gentlemen were doing a good work, and his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State was decidedly of opinion that it would be impossible, with any advantage to the country, to do away with them.

Mr. WHITWELL thought the Inspectors ought to be permanently appointed, and that the system of continuing them by this Bill gave rise to the impression that they were only appointed for a temporary purpose. He wished to bear his strong testimony to the very useful services of these Inspectors in the North-West of England.

Mr. J. COWEN desired to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the present condition of the Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections Act. The Government had embodied their suggestions and ideas on this subject in a Bill that had been put down for consideration that day; but which was only put on the Paper as a matter of form. He hoped he might be permitted to say that if the House were to take the ideas of the Government as thus formulated on this subject to be their ultimate decision, they were, in his opinion, very inadequate and incomplete, and did not cover the ground at all. He thought this matter was the more pressing owing to the near approach of a General Election, and he hoped that the Government would reconsider the whole question, and embody in the Bill a more comprehensive proposal than the one at present before the House. He would add this suggestion, which he thought was worth the consideration of the Government—namely, whether it would not be a wise step to associate with each Judge appointed to try Election Petitions two, three, or four Members of Parliament, or legal gentlemen, who might act in the capacity of assistants or assessors; the Judge being judge of the law, those who were associated with him being judges of fact? He believed that some such plan would remove the difficulty that was at present experienced in having Election Petitions settled absolutely by one Judge. This suggestion was not embodied in the proposal of the Government, and he would suggest that it should be adopted, if possible, before the next General Election. Another point to which he wished to draw the attention of the Government was the very unsatisfactory state of the law with regard to employment of cabs at Elections. They all knew that at borough Elections cabs were employed, and frequently at a very large expense. They also knew that this was an illegal system, and yet it was regularly indulged in. He had occasion recently to know something of the expenses incurred in this way in borough Elections, and he thought the Government ought to do one thing or the other—either legalize the use of cabs, or make the punishment for employing them a little more stringent.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was bound to add his testimony to the admirable way in which the Inspectors of Salmon Fisheries performed their duty. He believed it would be impossible for any Secretary of State to administer the law properly without their assistance.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses *agreed to.*

On the Schedule,

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he had one word to say upon the Schedule of this Bill, although he did not propose to move the Amendment upon it of which he had given Notice. Some misunderstanding appeared to exist in reference to the duties of the Fishery Inspectors, because they were not employed in any way officially with regard to the oyster fisheries. He would not say that they might not have undertaken some duties of the kind; but the oyster fisheries were not administered under this Act of Parliament. His contention was that if these gentlemen rendered any services of this kind, they rendered them gratuitously, and that this was a state of things that ought to be put an end to. If they rendered valuable services, let them be paid for those services, and not for something else which they did not do. He would not press his Amendment.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that in consequence of the passing of the Highways Bill, it had become necessary to modify the paragraph in the Schedule which continued the Locomotive Act. He therefore moved, in line 22, to insert after the words "whole Act," the customary words "as far as not repealed."

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD said, that supposing this Bill received the Royal Assent before the other, some difficulty might arise.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he would undertake that the Highways Bill should receive the Royal Assent first.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Schedule *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered.*

*Mr. J. Cowen*

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, looking at the period of the Session, and considering that this Bill would have to pass through all its stages in the House of Lords, he would trust to the indulgence of the House to allow it to be considered and read a third time. If that were not done, the Session would be prolonged. He took that opportunity of stating that it was proposed that the House should meet to-morrow at 3 o'clock.

Mr. NEWDEGATE called the attention of the Government to what appeared to him to be an error in the reference made to the Statute 21 & 22 *Vict.* c. 50, or to the 5 & 6 *Will. IV.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

## CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

### THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

## TURKEY—MURDER OF MR. OGLE.

### RESOLUTION.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON, in rising to call attention to the failure of Mr. Consul General Fawcett to ascertain the circumstances under which Mr. C. C. Ogle, the "Times" Correspondent in Thessaly, was murdered by Turkish soldiers; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, Mr. Consul General Fawcett's Report upon Mr. C. C. Ogle's death is inconclusive, and that a fresh Commission of Inquiry ought to be instituted, composed of Englishmen only, who should be specially empowered to assure the witnesses of the protection of Her Majesty's Government,"

said: I must say that I feel some compunction in obtruding myself upon the House at this late period of the Session, and I also feel bound to apologize to the House for the length to which, in all probability, my remarks will extend. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) told me, when I complained on a former occasion that we had not had the Papers as soon as I thought we might have expected them, that the delay of which I complained was due to the fact that the

Report extended to 62 pages in length. I am afraid that I shall be obliged to go through those 62 pages, in order to justify the Resolution which I am about to move. The Resolution calls attention to the fact of the Inquiry of Consul General Fawcett into the circumstances of Mr. Ogle's murder having failed entirely to bring out the truth; and, having proved that, I shall endeavour to show that a fresh Commission of Inquiry ought to be instituted, composed only of Englishmen, and that the Commission should be specially empowered to give the witnesses, whom it may be necessary to examine, the protection of Her Majesty's Government, and to transport them to a place of safety after giving their evidence. I believe I shall be able to prove to the satisfaction of the House that each of the points included in my Motion is a matter of absolute necessity. I regret that it has fallen to my lot to call attention to this subject, because I cannot but recognize my own inability to do justice to it, and I believe thoroughly, upon the facts of the case, that if any more experienced Member had brought it before the House, he would have succeeded in doing that which I can only hope to attain. In raising this question, I desire not only to secure justice to a murdered Englishman; not only to satisfy the just wishes of the family and friends of Mr. Ogle, who feel deeply that such attention has not been paid to this case as one would expect to be paid to the murder of an Englishman by the English Government; but I wish also to see whether a great and powerful country like our own is as able and willing to protect the lives and fortunes of its citizens, no matter where they happen to reside, under the present, as under former Governments. I have no hesitation in saying that if the murder of Mr. Ogle had occurred while Lord Palmerston was in power, it would never have been passed over in the way it has been. While that noble Lord was in Office, to say "*Civis Britannicus sum*" was a real amulet of protection to Her Majesty's subjects abroad. Every country, especially every barbarous and semi-barbarous country, then felt a positive certainty, arising from experience, that England, in case of the murder of even the meanest subject of the realm, would hold a full and fair investigation, and punish the guilty as surely as light follows darkness. If Her Majesty's Government allow a murder of this kind to be neglected, as I believe I shall be able to prove it has been; if they allow it to remain not only practically uninvestigated, but coloured and distorted by a prejudiced statement of facts; if they allow the guilty to remain undesignated, I think the House will agree with me that upon them will rest the very grave responsibility of rendering more insecure in the future than in the past the safety, honour, and welfare of our citizens abroad. In making this Motion, I am anxious to give them an opportunity of relieving themselves of that responsibility.

It is necessary that I should say a few words upon the character of Mr. Charles Chaloner Ogle; because I find, in reading the Report, that both his character and conduct are impugned distinctly by Sir Austen Layard, our Ambassador at Constantinople, and Consul General Fawcett, and I must therefore defend his conduct and exhibit it in a proper light. I do not mean to say that because Mr. Ogle's character was a good one he had any greater claim to justice. On the contrary, I rely on the much higher principle that even if his character had been bad, that would have been no reason why the circumstances of his death should not have been fairly tried, and justice done to the claims of his country and his relatives. But, in point of fact, Mr. Ogle's character was thoroughly estimable. No doubt he had his faults; but, to use a French expression, they were only "*les défauts de ses qualités*." His kindness of heart was carried almost to excess. As he once said to a friend—"He could never hear anyone ask for bread and not give it." He was a friend to the poor and the oppressed of every class or clime, and he was as kind to animals as to man. In crossing a stormy arm of the sea, on a wet, and cold, and windy day, he took off his own coat and threw it over his horse. A merchant of Volo has, I am informed, bought the horse, in order to have something to "show kindness to that was Mr. Ogle's." Strong men, refugees from Bulgarini, wept when they spoke of his death, saying that he had been more than a father to them. His last act was to protect, to conduct out of harm's way, to give money and bread to defenceless and oppressed fugitive women and children from Bulgarini. His last written word was a charitable message to a friend in Volo, written only one day before his murder, to this effect—

> "Friend, pray send these nine women and children to your warehouse, and give them food at my expense. Your friend, Charles Chaloner Ogle."

These were the last recorded words of Mr. Ogle. His character was fully recognized in Greece. Two little children of Bulgarini who, not being Greeks, had no claim upon the orphan school at Athens—an institution most difficult to obtain admission into—were placed there by favour; because, as the Committee told them, the English gentleman would have wished it. Mr. Ogle was impartial, and a man of a most sincere character. He has been represented as being an ardent Anti-Turk. Nothing can be further from the truth. He recognized, as many Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House do, the good qualities which many of the Turkish people possess. No doubt, he did notice and reprobate the evil conduct of the Turkish authorities; but he cannot, with any fairness, be described as a disliker of the Turks. With reference to the insurgents, of whom he has been accused of having been an agent, he said to Madame Zabanski—

> "It is not because I am blind to the faults of these people that I hope they will succeed, but it is because I am convinced that there is no other remedy for them. I would give them freedom as I would have a child vaccinated."

I would ask if that is the language of a spy, or of a revolutionary agent? As a newspaper correspondent, his great desire was, to use his own expression, "to be true; to be exact." He would rather be silent on a subject of the deepest interest than send an account to a newspaper which was not based on reliable information, satisfactory to himself. Of this I know a remarkable instance. At the time of the murder of the Consuls at Salonica, being asked by a lady what account he was going to telegraph, he said that he had heard so many contradictory accounts that he intended to send none at all, and this was notwithstanding the fact that other newspaper correspondents were telegraphing every piece of information that came into their possession. It is too much to be feared that the very fearlessness and truth of his character, being recognized by his enemies as well as by his friends, caused him to fall a victim to the very qualities which most distinguished him. *The Times* said—

> "Mr. Ogle had tracked murder and rapine and brutal lust home to the Chief of Police of Thessaly, and denounced publicly the official miscreant."

Such conduct was very likely imprudent, but it was the conduct of a brave and gallant Englishman. Are we to condone his murder on the ground of such imprudence? The politician for whom Mr. Ogle cared most in Greece, and with whom he was most intimate, was M. Tricoupi, whose name is well-known to hon. Gentlemen. M. Tricoupi always opposed the encouragement by Greece of irregular movements in Thessaly. He hoped that more would be gained by moderation, and Mr. Ogle shared in that hope. This was well known to his friends; but a perusal of these papers, without knowledge of his character, would produce a contrary impression, and might well create a groundless prejudice against him. Mr. Ogle was energetic, studious, and able. The King of Greece made him Knight Silver Cross of the Order of the Redeemer, in recognition of the thorough knowledge which he had acquired of every branch of the social and political affairs of Greece. Probably, His Majesty hoped that Mr. Ogle would make use of his knowledge in dispelling certain mistaken opinions, prevalent in some quarters of England, upon the present state of Greece, and upon the wonderfully rapid progress which that deservedly rising country has made of late years. Well, Sir, that Mr. Ogle was held in the highest esteem by all classes in Greece is proved at once by referring to the circumstances that attended his funeral. On that occasion the shops were spontaneously closed. A vast concourse of people followed him to the grave, including representatives of every class, from the President of the Council of Ministers, and other Members of the Cabinet, the members of the Holy Synod, a gentleman-in-waiting of the King, and the Mayors of Athens and Piræus, down to the pretty weeping child of 12, who, at the last moment, placed on the top of the pile of memorial wreaths of flowers that hid his coffin, one bearing the words—"The widows and orphans of Bulgarini to him who saved them." He now sleeps in death by Admiral Canaris, the veteran hero of Greek independence. His monument is to be beside Lord Byron's; and I would ask the House, is this a man whose murder England intends to allow to remain a mystery, and will she permit the miscreants who did the deed to go undetected and unpunished?

I would now allude for a moment to some of the circumstances of Mr. Ogle's visit to Thessaly. Upon this subject, as upon too many others, an inaccurate view has been put forward in the Report to which I shall presently refer. It is quite true that when the insurrection in Thessaly first broke out, Mr. Ogle crossed the frontier as *The Times* Correspondent; but when the Volunteers were recalled, Mr. Ogle went back to Greece. That excursion had nothing to do with his last visit to Thessaly, and ought not to be confounded with it. Some time before the troubles upon Pelion came to a climax, Mr. Ogle crossed the Gulf of Volo from Amaliopolis, upon the Greek frontier, and landed upon the quay of Volo. He landed perfectly openly. His landing was within the knowledge of the authorities, as the landing of all travellers is in a Turkish town. He lived quite openly at the house of M. Zabanski, the *colporteur* of the Bible Society. His status, as *The Times* Correspondent, was equally well known to the Turkish authorities. There was no concealment of any kind whatever as to his movements. When he wanted to go to Bulgarini, he applied directly to the Caimacam of Volo for an escort. This was not the act of a man who wanted to conceal what he was about, or of a spy. We are told, in a despatch from Sir Austen Layard, that the escort was refused him; but it will be found, on referring to page 53 of the Report, that an arrangement was made between the Caimacam of Volo and the Italian Consul to send a man with him as escort. This man was examined by the Caimacam as to what happened during Mr. Ogle's visit to Bulgarini, and Mr. Ogle went afterwards, and asked—

> "Why did you question the poor Ghega who accompanied me, when, if you had sent to me, I would willingly have told you everything I did, and everything I was going to do?"

At this time the country was not in a state of actual war, although the inhabitants of the numerous villages that clothe the sides of Pelion were in a state of fitful and irregular revolt. This assertion is corroborated by Hobart Pasha, when, on March the 19th, he interviews the village Chiefs, and reads a Proclamation, in which he states—

> "The villages in the immediate neighbourhood of Volo are, if not in actual revolt against the Government, harbouring rebels in great numbers."

And he goes on to say—

> "Before resorting to coercive measures, I wish to try what conciliation can effect."

I am not at all astonished at the state of the villages. I visited Volo last autumn, and gathered information from trustworthy persons, and I know what tyranny, what misgovernment, what outrages, and what fearful exactions had goaded these Thessalian peasants out of a chronic state of smouldering discontent into active, but desultory, resistance to the Turkish rule. At this time the road to Macrinitza and the other villages was perfectly open. The insurgents came in openly to Volo to buy not only food, but ammunition, and returned as openly to their hill-side homes. Mr. Fitzgerald, the Correspondent of *The Standard*, says—

> "To act the part of a spy was unnecessary, indeed, impossible. There was nothing to spy out, evade, or conceal. No more signs of war than there would be in an English county if the military were called out to quell an armed assemblage of rioters in some such place as Merthyr Tydvil."

But, if Mr. Ogle was a spy, why was he not treated as one? Why did the Turks not arrest him, and have his conduct investigated? The answer is plain. Because they knew that there was no foundation for the charge. I have been obliged to allude at length to this part of the subject, in consequence of the *ex parte* statements listened to by Sir Austen Layard, and relied on by Consul General Fawcett. I will now refer to some of those statements. In page 1 of the Report, there is a telegram from Sir Austen Layard to the Marquess of Salisbury, in which he states—

> "Report has come from Athens that *The Times* correspondent at Volo has been killed. Porte has telegraphed for information; but nothing is known of circumstances here. It was alleged that the gentleman was aiding insurgents, and strong complaints were made to me

against him; he was warned of the danger he was running by going about from village to village. Hobart Pasha has written to me about his proceedings, stating that he was in communication with Athens."

Sir, there is not one word of proof of all these allegations against Mr. Ogle. I find next, in No. 7, page 5, a despatch from Mr. Layard to the Earl of Derby, with an inclosure of which the following is a translation:—

> "The following is a telegram which the Vali of Yanina addressed to the Prime Minister, dated the 6th (18th) of March, 1878:—'The Correspondent of *The Times* has arrived at Volo and made an application to the Italian Consul, requesting two zaptiehs and an official letter to take with him to the village of Bulgarini, in the interior of the district of Yénidge. If such a letter were given to him, the authorities would have seemed to wish to guarantee the life of the traveller in the midst of the localities infested by the Greek rebels, who had already burnt several villages which had become thereby the scene of the hostilities. To have the traveller accompanied in these places, even by several zaptiehs, would be a very dangerous proceeding. For all these reasons we have declined to comply with the request of the above-named Consulate."

But they did comply with the request, and allowed a man to accompany him, as I have already shown. There is a statement on the next page (6)—

> "This gentleman went to the insurgents of the villages, Bulgarini and Kesrick, in company of a brother of one of the insurgent Chiefs named Papa Costa, an inhabitant of Volo, native of Yénidge, and having resided at Volo for some months past. He visited the district of Yénidge, calling himself English, and a son of the Correspondent of *The Times*. He pretended that the insurgents were going to the district where other Greek insurgents would join him, to lay waste the locality. He said that the Ottoman troops were few in number, and gave information respecting fortified positions; adding that a considerable number of individuals, belonging to families of note in Greece as well as of students, were going either to put themselves at the head of, or to join the insurgents. That news has been communicated by the Sub-Governor of Yénidge. This gentleman is here to excite the people. Credible information goes to prove that the object of his journey is solely to foment disorders. It is hardly necessary to call the attention of your Highness to the fatal results which might be produced by such a seditious state of affairs, especially under existing circumstances. Consequently, I beg your Highness to have the goodness to take the necessary steps at the Embassy of Her Britannic Majesty, in order to obtain the removal from the country of this person, whose presence gives rise to inconvenience."

Well, afterwards, to show what the object of Mr. Ogle's journey was and how he carried it out, in No. 28, page 14, Mr. Layard informs the Marquess of Salisbury—

> "I telegraphed to Hobart Pasha, who is in command of the Turkish Squadron off the coast of Thessaly, and requested him to have inquiries made on the subject, and to inform me of the result. I instructed Consul Barker in the same sense. The Prime Minister, to whom I also spoke on the matter, at once sent the most stringent orders to the authorities at Volo to give every facility for a full investigation. I have received two telegrams from Hobart Pasha, who appears to think that Mr. Ogle was killed during the attack on Macrinitza, and that the Europeans and Greek sympathizers at Volo are endeavouring to give a very exaggerated version of the circumstances connected with the unfortunate gentleman's death. I have seen an English gentleman, well known here, who is just arrived from Volo. He states to me that Mr. Ogle had been killed as he was taking an active part with the insurgents, and was in the habit of exposing himself to great danger by going backwards and forwards between Volo and the villages occupied by them. He had been frequently warned not to do so. It was reported that during the attack on Macrinitza, he was seen in an advanced position, and that a Turkish officer, recognizing him as an Englishman, restrained his men from firing upon him."

Sir Austen Layard repeats a number of assertions in the same sense, with which I will not trouble the House. I will merely make the same comments upon them all—first, that they are not true; next, that the authority is not given; and third, that I shall be able to disprove them.

In No. 38, Mr. Layard, in a telegram to the Marquess of Salisbury, says—

> "Burrell's state of health prevents him going to Volo. Consul General Fawcett is ready to go if you consider it absolutely necessary."

Mr. Blunt, who began the inquiry, wished to leave. No doubt he found that the inquiry was not likely to turn out as satisfactory as he could have wished, and another official—Consul General Fawcett—was appointed, because he was considered a proper person to hold a judicial inquiry. When I come to the Report itself, I shall show what sort of an inquiry the Judge of the Supreme Court of Constantinople considered a judicial inquiry. Mr. Layard's directions to Consul General Fawcett are on page 38, inclosure 44—

> "I have directed Mr. Blunt by telegraph to have ready for you such evidence as may have already been taken on these subjects. I trust, therefore, that it will not be necessary for you to be long absent from your post, but that the inquiry will speedily be brought to an end. Considering the excitement that it appears to be

causing, both at Volo and in Greece, it is very desirable that it should not be prolonged beyond the term absolutely necessary, in your judgment, for ascertaining the truth."

That is for concealing it. [Mr. BOURKE: Where are those words?] Those are words of my own; that is what I consider to be the result that would naturally follow haste in this matter. At page 40, No. 49, Mr. Layard wrote to the Marquess of Salisbury—

> "I have the honour to inclose in original the Report addressed to me by Her Majesty's Consul General and Judge of the Supreme Court with reference to the death of Mr. Ogle. I have not had time to have translations made of the evidence taken in Greek. Should your Lordship require such translations, I will have them made if the documents are returned to me."

In that case, of course, more delay would take place. The documents would be sent from this country to Constantinople, translated, and sent back to England. I am sorry to observe that there is not in the Correspondence between Mr. Layard and the Foreign Office a single syllable of real regret, on the part of our Ambassador, for the murder of Mr. Ogle. It was of consequence at that moment to minimize the event as much as possible. Important negotiations were going on between this country and Turkey, and if an angry feeling had been raised against Turkey the negotiations might have altogether failed. There was, therefore, a natural anxiety to hush the matter up, and I am afraid that that anxiety was gratified at the expense of justice. I do not blame anybody, but I am merely endeavouring to give an explanation of the extraordinary fact of so little attention having been paid to the murder of an Englishman in Thessaly. I have noticed that there is generally a great *esprit de corps* among the gentlemen of the Press; but it is a curious fact that, at almost one and the same moment, all mention of the case in certain papers which had taken an interest in it before ceased. It would almost seem as if a *mot d'ordre* had been sent out by someone of sufficient importance that the subject of the murder of Mr. Ogle had better be dropped, and that justice to individuals must give way to political expediency. No more letters were inserted in *The Times* or in *The Standard*, which had been very fair in the matter. I challenge an explanation of this curious fact from the papers. I only wish that the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter) were present now, in order that he might say a word for his correspondent who was murdered in doing his duty so bravely.

The Blue Book teems with opinions expressed before the inquiry as to what ought to be the constitution of the desired Commission. There was a general opinion, clearly stated, that an inquiry would fail if not conducted, in the first instance, at all events, before Englishmen only, and after the safety of the lives and the property of the witnesses had been specially guaranteed by Her Majesty's Government. This is the general gist of the documents upon this branch of the subject in the Blue Book. The predictions that there would be an indisposition to give evidence, except under the specified guarantees, are justified by the fact that before the Joint Commissioners, Consul General Fawcett and Regeb Pasha, not one witness gave evidence, although plenty offered to give evidence privately and were refused. In page 2, No. 4, in a letter from Mr. Wyndham to Lord Salisbury, dated April 3rd, this statement occurs—

> "The Greek Vice Consul concludes by stating that nothing less than the presence of a Commissioner, accompanied by force, can obtain particulars, owing to the terrorism which prevails."

A similar despatch, sent by post, was received on the 13th of April, No. 22, page 12, and there is another on page 13. The next document I will refer to is on page 28, inclosure 5, No. 29, which is a *mémoire* upon the death of Mr. Ogle, written by Mr. Streit, Professor of National Law in the University of Athens. He states—

> "The man who had brought me the first information concerning the whereabouts of Ogle during the afternoon, evening, and night, subsequent to the battle, had started for the village. I commissioned a very respectable person at Volo to try to bring him to me; this person returned saying that the peasant in question was afraid to come to Volo, but had given him the list of the names of the people who had seen Ogle during the time mentioned; but he had made him promise not to divulge them unless an adequate English military force could insure their safety. The whole Consular body of Volo, the Correspondent of *The Standard*, and the Greek inhabitants of Volo are unanimously of opinion that an inquest might lead to a verification of the circumstances of the death of Ogle

by eye witnesses, if (1st) Turkish authorities were excluded; (2ndly) if the presence of an English force encouraged the witnesses to depose the truth; (3rdly) if the witnesses were carried away from Volo directly after the close of the inquest."

On page 29, you will find the reply of the Consuls to Hobart Pasha, who asked them to join him in investigating the case—

> "An inquest in the presence of Turkish officials, and without the necessary guarantee of the lives and fortunes of the witnesses, in the shape of an adequate English armed force, would turn out a mockery."

Mr. Streit's *mémoire* concludes with these words—

> "It is considered probable that the murder was committed by order of some officer of superior rank; that it would be very difficult to obtain satisfactory proof of the latter fact; but that the murder would be easily exposed if the above-mentioned measures were resorted to. Lastly, that the Turks at Volo seem highly pleased that no demonstration of English military force has up to the present been the result of the Ogle affair."

To show how afraid people were of their names being mentioned, let me refer to page 30, No. 32, a letter, to which there is this postscript—

> "Pray take care that my name does not appear; one must be under Turkish protection to know what fear means."

I know who the writer of that letter is. He is a resident in Volo; a man whose character is above suspicion. At page 36, there is an inclosure, No. 40—

> "I have been informed that in case of inquiry, the Greeks who happen to know anything will most likely be afraid to come forward and give evidence from fear of Turkish vindictiveness."

At page 38, there is a letter from Mr. Ogle, of Sevenoaks, to the Marquess of Salisbury, which states—

> "The result of the inquiry, conducted partly under the auspices of the Commander of the Turkish Forces in Thessaly, is not likely to be the conclusion of it, and the presence of the official has effectually scared witnesses away, and has not emboldened his lieutenant, Iskender Pasha, to appear as a witness. Until a preliminary investigation is made by English officials alone, and complete provision made for the safety of witnesses during the investigation and for some time after it, England will be baffled, and those who allow her to be so will be involved in consequences which even friends must deplore. Even amidst events the most momentous, it may be wise to meet a single incident with caution in view of its possible issues."

He goes on to say, at page 39, No. 47, in a letter dated the 17th of May—

> "Personal and political bias, such as would be incompatible with personal honour and official integrity, has not been ascribed, I believe, either to Mr. Blunt or to Mr. Fawcett. But what of the personal and political bias of Regeb Pasha? He is the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in Thessaly, and these are the Forces to which Mr. Ogle's assassins are supposed to belong. He himself, and his lieutenant, Iskender Pasha, have been publicly declared to be so cognizant of the subject of the inquiry, that they ought to have been called as material witnesses. He is probably the commanding officer of Major Reschid, who is distinctly denounced by John Elliott in his letter of the 8th of April (of which a copy has been forwarded to your Lordship), and is positively declared to have said to several bystanders that he would make the Correspondent Ogle's sermons cost him very dear. Such is the personal and political bias of Regeb Pasha, and so well is it known, that it has been found impossible to induce Greek and Christian witnesses to enter into his presence. Their distrust is justified by the fact, reported in to-day's journal, that three persons who had privately given information concerning the late Mr. Ogle's movements on the 29th of March last have been sent to Athens, their lives having been threatened if they return to their villages. This fact indicates also the only procedure by means of which depositions can be obtained which have been hitherto withheld."

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: At what page is that?

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: At page 8. What is the consequence of not giving effect to these recommendations in the formation of the tribunal? Why, as I said before, that no witnesses at all came before Consul General Fawcett. The Greek Consul, M. Zioti, writes to M. Delyanni at page 34, inclosure 37—

> "I am told that every possible effort is being made to form the commission charged with the investigation into Ogle's murder exclusively of persons favourable to the Turks."

A letter from Mr. Ogle to the Marquess of Salisbury, received May 7th, says—

> "Professor Streit writes (in his *mémoire*, at page 10) that he has seen two eye-witnesses of the murder of my son. I have telegraphed to M. Tricoupi, and he has telegraphed to me in reply that Professor Streit had addressed Consul General Fawcett in respect to these witnesses. I should have taken it as a matter of course that these witnesses would be summoned, protected effectually from Turkish officials, and examined in the first instance, at least, in presence of British officials only. But the fact is that up to a very recent date they had not been examined, and they never were."

Mr. Ogle then goes on to say—

> "Hitherto the inquiry has been conducted as if intended to screen the Turks, and I must ur-

> gently appeal to the Foreign Office if I care for truth and justice. All these things justify my solicitude and my distrust of the Commission as hitherto constituted. The preliminary inquiries should surely be conducted by English officials only. The Turkish witnesses are intimidated by Turkish officials; much more the witnesses who are not of the same race as those officials, and are subject to their power."

Two battles took place at Macrinitza, one on Thursday, the 28th of March, and the other on Friday, the 29th; and the assertion of Mr. Fawcett is most distinct that Mr. Ogle was murdered on the evening of the 29th, as he was returning with the insurgents from the battle of Macrinitza. Perhaps I may here quote Mr. Fawcett's statement as to the geographical position of the places I shall have occasion to mention—

> "In order to understand what follows, it is essentially necessary to have a knowledge of Volo and the neighbourhood, which I must therefore attempt to describe. Volo lies at the end of the bay of that name. Behind it, running nearly north and south, is the range of Mount Pelion, with an elevation of nearly 4,000 feet. Between the sea and the mountains there is a fertile plain about two miles and a-half wide, covered with olive and other fruit trees. Looking at the mountains behind Volo from the sea three villages are seen, the lowest or centre one being Eski or Old Volo; a little to the right, and higher up, is Portaria; to the left, perched on the steep face of the mountain, and higher up than either, is Macrinitza. This last village from top to bottom is nearly a mile long, and its streets are almost perpendicular."

I will now refer to the Report itself, at page 40, and before doing so, I should like to explain that I do not blame Her Majesty's Government for their action in this matter. If difficulties were thrown in the way of eliciting the truth, they were due, in the first instance, to the instructions which were given by Sir Austen Layard to Mr. Fawcett; and, in the second place, to a too rigid construction placed on those instructions by Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Blunt had already taken certain depositions which were submitted to Mr. Fawcett, and appended to his Report. The second Commission consisted of Mr. Fawcett, and Regeb Pasha, the commander of the Forces in Thessaly. I do not wish to impute any blame where it is not due, and I will at once give Regeb credit for his humanity. He commanded the Turkish troops at the first battle at Macrinitza, and because he spared the prisoners, and did not commit atrocities, was accused of having taken a bribe, and great dissatisfaction was expressed with him. Reschid Pasha, who commanded in the second battle of Macrinitza, carried out a very different system, and determining that he should not be accused of humanity, he treated the conquered peasants with the greatest inhumanity and cruelty. At page 40, Mr. Fawcett states—

> "I saw the Greek Consul and other persons in the place, who stated that there were individuals who could give valuable evidence as to the alleged assassination of Mr. Ogle, but also were afraid to do so lest they should be afterwards punished or maltreated by the Ottoman authorities. The Greek Consul further stated that these people required a guarantee that they would not be molested from the British Government, and also that they were prepared to give me information in private as to the matter. I informed him that I did not see how it was possible for Her Majesty's Government to give any such guarantee, and that I had no instructions to give any."

But Mr. Fawcett did not telegraph to ask if he might give such a guarantee. There is no sign in his Report that he wanted to give such a guarantee, or that he asked the permission of Her Majesty's Government to do so. I may here mention that Hobart Pasha and the Caimacam of Volo had also refused to give such a guarantee on behalf of the Turkish Government, as appears from page 17—

> "After the despatch of the English Consul's note, Hobart Pasha went to him, accompanied by the Caimacam, and proposed to have the matter of Mr. Ogle's murder inquired into by the Consular body, assisted by the Turkish authorities. Mr. Suter answered that he could not take any steps until the Turkish Government had guaranteed to the English Government the lives and goods of the witnesses. As Hobart Pasha and the Caimacam replied that they could not grant such a guarantee, the matter dropped."

There was thus a distinct refusal on the part of the Turkish authorities to give a guarantee, and a distinct refusal on the part of the English authorities. Mr. Fawcett then goes on to say—

> "For the second request, I informed him that I was officially here on a mixed Commission of English and Ottoman authorities to investigate the circumstances connected with Mr. Ogle's death, and that any information given to me privately could not form part of any Report I might make. But I told him that I would most earnestly impress on the Mutessarif at once to proclaim in the most solemn manner that all persons who could give any evidence at the coming sittings might do so in perfect safety, and that no harm should come to them."

On page 59 will be found the Proclamation, which was issued in the following words—

> "In connection with Mr. Ogle, *The Times* Correspondent, killed in the last battle of Macrinitza, any person having information of any kind, may freely and fearlessly appear and give evidence before the Commission of Inquiry sitting at the back house of Dorotheus, from 3 o'clock to-morrow, and thenceforth."

But the Caimacam had been two days before this to Macrinitza and warned the villagers of the consequence of giving evidence, as I am informed privately; and it is a fact which I hope Her Majesty's Government will take into consideration. Well, this *affiche* was put up in Greek and Turkish, and the Greek Consul having been informed of it, expressed his satisfaction at what Mr. Fawcett had done. But though he expressed satisfaction, he did not say that he considered that all had been done that was necessary, nor did he in any way modify what he had said before as to the necessity for a Government guarantee of the witnesses' safety. What followed? Mr. Fawcett says—

> "On the following morning, Regeb Pasha arrived from Larissa in time to attend the meeting. The Greek Consul, the Italian Consul, and others interested, were present. We waited a long time, but no witnesses came. I then proposed to Regeb Pasha, to which he gave his cordial assent, to put out the next day (Saturday) a further and stronger notice, in which the Pasha and myself gave our solemn personal assurance (*parole d'honneur*) that in no case should anyone suffer for any evidence they might give."

The following is the stronger Proclamation which was issued—

> "His Excellency Regeb Pasha, Governor of Thessaly, and Mr. Fawcett, Consul General in Turkey for England, the two Commissioners named by His Majesty the Sultan and Her Majesty the Queen of England to inquire into the cause of the lamentable death of the late Mr. Ogle, give public notice to all whom it may concern that everyone who can give any evidence concerning the circumstances under which Mr. Ogle met his death, is invited to come towards morning at 10 o'clock to the House of the Consul General, where the Commission sits. The two Commissioners give their solemn assurance (*parole d'honneur*) that everyone is perfectly free to come, and that no one on any account will be in any case molested or persecuted for any evidence he may have given to the said Commission."

That last sentence is important. It was, no doubt, not intended to bear the construction which the villagers put on it. It guarantees that the witnesses will not be persecuted for the evidence they may give; but it was not understood by the persons to whom it was addressed as a guarantee of immunity from persecution or molestation as insurgents. The next day, Mr. Fawcett says, he ascended the mountain and visited the scenes of the conflict, the three villages of Macrinitza, Portaria, and Eski Volo, and the exact place where the body of Mr. Ogle was found. He took with him Hassan, the cavass, who found the body, to point out the localities. He speaks of the exact place where the body of Mr. Ogle was found; but there is no proof in the whole of this book that the exact spot where the body of Mr. Ogle was found is known to this moment. Hassan asserts that he found it in a particular place; but his assertion is not corroborated, although there were plenty of people with him at the time that he asserts that he found the body; but not one of them being called, I say it is not proved where the body was found:—

> "The next day, Sunday, the 5th of May, another meeting was held, but no witnesses appeared. Mr. Fitzgerald, the Correspondent of *The Standard*, was present, and also the Greek Consul. These gentlemen said they had witnesses, but they would not come forward. I pointed out that already two witnesses had been examined from the village, and Regeb Pasha and myself having pledged our words, these people could have no excuse for keeping away. We adjourned till the next day, in the hope of their coming."

Then the last meeting was held; but, as before, no evidence was produced. The next thing Mr. Fawcett did was to consider his Report with Regeb Pasha; and if hon. Members will refer to page 43, they will see Mr. Fawcett says, he is

> "firmly persuaded that Mr. Ogle met his death among the fugitive insurgents on the hillside, on Friday, the 29th of March."

He says one person from Macrinitza gave evidence, and another from Portaria. I will comment on that evidence, and show that where it is to the point it is utterly untrustworthy. Mr. Fawcett goes on to say—

> "Nothing could be stronger than the assurances of safety Regeb Pasha and myself gave, and I have come to the conclusion that no more evidence was forthcoming, simply because none existed."

That was an infamous conclusion under

the circumstances, and I will shortly show why there was no more evidence forthcoming, though plenty existed. I will prove that there was good reason why the witnesses should be afraid to come forward and give evidence. The first Commission was composed of Mr. Blunt and Regeb Pasha, who commanded the very Forces which had been destroying and burning the villages where these poor people lived. Mr. Blunt was considered, rightly or wrongly, to be more Turkish than the Turks. The second Commission was composed of Mr. Fawcett, who was also a well-known philo-Turk. I do not say that Mr. Fawcett is unfairly partial to them; but everyone who knows him knows that he is a great lover of the Turks. He is almost as well known for his love of everything Turkish as the new Commissioner to Roumelia, the hon. Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff). The room where the Commission met was guarded by Turkish sentries; in the vestibule were Regeb's Turkish attendants, zaptiehs, Turkish soldiers, and others whom these poor people had good reason to fear, through whom they would have to run the gauntlet in coming in to give evidence, and who might well be expected to remember them and make them suffer after the Commission ended. Beside this, there is a general fear in the East of testifying to a murder or to the discovery of a body, for fear of being accused of complicity in the crime. Great endeavours had been made to keep the matter secret. In a despatch sent home by the Greek Consul, he says—

> "The Mutessariff of Larissa has been here (Volo) for the last two days. His object here is to obtain information as to the proceedings at Macrinitza. To judge by what he has effected so far, one would be inclined to think that his real object is to muster witnesses against the charge—to deny the facts stated, as the custom is in Turkey. Efforts are also being made to prove, in uniformity with the Ottoman allegation, that Ogle was killed in the course of the battle. The local authorities will have no difficulty in producing similar evidence. I am told that every possible effort is being also made to form the Commission charged with the investigation into Ogle's murder exclusively of persons favourable to the Turks."

The people understood why all these precautions were taken, and they were not stupid enough to run their heads into the noose prepared for them. I am told that in Thessaly, when a Christian has been murdered, it is the custom to imprison first the informer who gives notice of the murder, and, next, all the relatives of the murdered man. Two days before Mr. Fawcett's second Proclamation, the Caimacam of Volo had gone to Macrinitza and warned the villagers of the consequences of giving evidence. Guarantees of safety to the witnesses had been refused both by the English and Turkish Governments, and evidence was refused to be taken in private. And all this time the insurrection was still going on. After the battle of Macrinitza, a telegram from *The Times* Correspondent, dated Volo, 31st March, and published in *The Times*, April 4th, states—

> "Men, women, and children too, have been massacred at Macrinitza and Portario. Names of several are given, as Constantino Zanilieri, aged 65; C. Carvonaris, 70; N. Balambani, 75; Caterina Zitgonali, 45; George Valanages, 70."

The captain and officers of an Italian iron-clad also visited Macrinitza, and can bear testimony to the murders and shocking outrages committed there. As late as May 19th *The Times* Correspondent mentions skirmishes between Turkish soldiers and the peasantry of Pelion, whom the former were endeavouring to rob of their flocks. I think, therefore, I am justified in saying that at the time of the inquiry the insurrection was still going on, and that the witnesses would be either insurgents themselves, or people who sympathized with the insurgents, and who would render themselves liable to considerable danger by giving evidence. To get people to come forward, we ought to have assured them that they should not be molested, not for giving evidence there, but for being there at all. Besides, the word of Mr. Fawcett and Regeb Pasha would never induce Greek Christians to testify against Turks in a matter where, rightly or wrongly, grave suspicion was afloat against Amoosh Aga, the Chief of the Police of Thessaly. I would ask the House to listen while I tell them who Amoosh Aga is. He is a notorious brigand, who was imprisoned for his crimes; but, being released, after the manner of the Turks, he was made Chief of the Police of Thessaly. This man is a worthy comrade for Chefket Pasha, and has been guilty of murder, rape, torture, burning, and outrages of an unspeakable character. In March, when

Mr. Ogle was visiting Bulgarini—as detailed in *The Times* of April 4th, in the last letter but one which was printed, but not the last one which was received by that journal from Mr. Ogle—he was informed by the people of the place that some time before his arrival—

> "A number of women and children were shut up in two houses to serve the brutal lusts of the troops, who came in scores to debauch them, and not to debauch them only, but to beat and kick them, to tyrannize over them, and to outrage the very laws of nature, so that the place rang with their screams and with the brutal laughter of the fiends who revelled in those orgies."

A week before Mr. Ogle's visit the British Commissioner, Mr. Longworth, was there, and examined the people in the same house. They told him they were contented, and said nothing of these outrages. Why? They feared to tell the truth, because, as they informed Mr. Ogle, Amoosh Aga and the Caimacam were in the room. And Amoosh Aga had previously sent a corporal to warn them, "that if anyone should say a word against the authorities, he should not escape." After the skirmish at Konkonrava—a neighbouring village—on February 27th and on February 28th, Amoosh Aga sent a letter to the people of Bulgarini, telling them to send ten of their principal men to do homage, and that if they did so his soldiers should not enter their village. Having committed no crime, and taken no part in the insurrection, they willingly complied, and set out the next day—1st of March. They were seized by Amoosh Aga and his men, and brought to a spot between Bulgarini and Agia. Shepherds stood watching on the hills above—

> "The bugles sounded the halt, and here, by a brook, the wretched men were hacked almost to pieces by these cruel murderers. The bodies were then piled up like a row of wood, a row with feet this way, a row with feet that way, and branches, which had been placed beneath them, fired. The fire did not do its work completely enough to hide the crime, and when Mr. Longworth passed he saw the burned and blackened corpses;"

while Mr. Ogle, a week later, saw traces of the dreadful crime. Madame Zabanski, on page 54, speaks of Mr. Ogle's interview with Amoosh Aga, and relates how he upbraided him with his brutality, how Amoosh Aga first denied and then confessed that it was true, and prayed Mr. Ogle not to publish the outrages, and how Mr. Ogle refused to conceal them. Mr. Ogle said—

> "I have come to discover the truth; had I found that you had done no wrong, I should have written so; but, having been a witness to your crimes, I shall write about them, and everyone shall know them. Take care not to do such things again, for, if you do, I shall hear of them, and I will make them universally known."

In consequence of all this, Mr. Ogle felt certain that Amoosh Aga would some time or other make him suffer for what he had done. He said, on the day of his departure for Macrinitza—"I am sure Amoosh Aga will kill me, or will set someone to kill me." I think I have said enough to show who Amoosh Aga was. No doubt, Mr. Fawcett's and Regeb Pasha's promise would not be violated as long as they were on the spot. But Mr. Fawcett, it was well known, was leaving in a few days. Regeb Pasha was a General, and liable to be ordered away at any moment; but Amoosh Aga would remain, and who was to protect these poor people from his vengeance? They felt the full force of this, and it caused them to write under the Proclamation, in the night—

> "Turks, we know you! you shall not entrap us! Englishmen, assure us of safety, and we will give evidence! 'Slaves.'"

That their fears were fully justified was proved by the event. I read, in *The Standard* of the 13th of May—

> "It has been found necessary to send away three persons with their children who had privately given information concerning Mr. Ogle's movements on the 29th of March. They have been sent to Athens, their lives having been threatened if they return to the village. One was a woman whose husband had been killed by the Basi-Bazouks of Amoosh Aga."

I have now shown that there was evidence offered which was not received; and I will now refer to the three findings of Mr. Fawcett, which were as follows:—

> "1st. That C. C. Ogle met his death by a gunshot or bayonet wound, on Friday afternoon, the 29th of March, whilst retreating with the insurgents after the second battle of Macrinitza. 2. That he was afterwards mutilated, his head being cut off by Turkish soldiers."

Probably, in my opinion, to be taken as a proof of the murdered man's identity to the person who ordered the murder.

> "3. That his great imprudence made it extremely improbable that some casualty would happen to him."

Now, Sir, I say there is no evidence at all to show that Mr. Ogle met his death on the 29th of March, while retreating with the insurgents; but there is a large amount of evidence that he met his death the morning after the battle, when he could not be accused of taking part with the insurgents, or being guilty of any imprudence. All the depositions, which are to be found in the Blue Book, were taken before Mr. Blunt, and not before Mr. Fawcett. [These depositions—with the exception, I am told, of that of Pericles Mitrianos—were not upon oath.] What do the depositions amount to? In the first place, none of the Turkish authorities were examined, and, therefore, they could not be cross-examined. Nobody is examined who can prove anything; such evidence as there is, is, as Mr. Fawcett himself admits, in part hearsay, in great part, as I can show, unworthy of credit; while Mr. Fawcett allows that much of it is irrelevant. What is the first deposition which I shall allude to? It is that of M. Zabanski. He simply proves that Mr. Ogle was unarmed and on foot, and nothing else of importance. The second is that of Hassan, the Cavass of the Italian Consulate at Volo. This man was the main witness; but his evidence is entirely uncorroborated. He asserts that he found the body, but he could not remember what day he found it on a month afterwards. He was with a muleteer, Akilleas Kaffeggi, and a Christian of Volo, Nicolas Kazamias, as well as with two other Voliotes, whose names he forgets. He says that when he found the body they were all together, yet not one of the others is called, and not one word of his evidence is substantiated. They were, says Hassan, followed by five other men of Portaria and Macrinitza. There were other bodies of insurgents and villagers lower down, and there was also another headless corpse, appearing from its clothes to be that of a foreigner. Akilleas and his companions raised the body and carried it away. Thus, there were 10 persons present, some of whom are named; but none of them were examined in support of this man's evidence. Why was this, if not because it was feared that the other men would be unable to corroborate his story? Hassan is a member of a secret society called Becktash, composed of the most fanatical Turks; and I am informed, on good authority, that he was in constant secret communication with Regeb Pasha. Mr. Fitzgerald, of *The Standard*, gave me this information, and he most kindly authorized me to give his name. The next witness was Hussein Aga Haggi Matou. To this witness was confided the task of making public Mr. Ogle's passport, so that no Turk engaged in the battle might be connected with its discovery and called. The soldiers who brought the passport to the Pashas who gave it to Hussein Aga were not called. Then came Kostaki Markidi, who could only prove that Hussein Aga showed him the passport. Next was Jacob Vianelli, who is supposed to be an important witness; but who proves nothing material, and contradicts himself in such a manner as to render his testimony absolutely worthless. In a letter, which I will show privately to any hon. Member who would like to see it, I am informed that this man admitted to the writer that he was in the habit of sending false news for money to a Vienna journal. He confessed his fault, and promised not to repeat it. Let me call to the notice of the House the evidence of this man with regard to the permission of Hobart Pasha for him to go through the Turkish lines, about which he is cross-examined. He said, first, he gave it up to Iskender Pasha and had not got it. Then, when asked how he got back through the lines without it, he says he received it back and has it at home, and promises to bring it next day. The next day he comes without it, but says it is not material, and gives a verbal account of its contents. He again promises to produce it, but never does so. I heard of this man in Volo, when I was there last autumn, long before this affair, and was warned of his untrustworthy character. Sir, this man's testimony Mr. Fawcett considered important; but I say without hesitation that it is not to be believed. The next witness, Maulusurf, proves nothing, except that he read Mr. Ogle's passport; while the next one, Athanasion, proves no more. Pericles Mitrianos' deposition comes next, and I am glad that the Solicitor General is here to judge of the value of his testimony. He asserts, first, that he, being concealed, saw "towards the decline of the day"—that is, in an indistinct light—"a head being carried towards Macrinitza." He says the head had short hair, like his own, in fact; but he cannot well recollect about it. The hair was fair, but he could not well remember, as it was bloody. There was a moustache, but he cannot say whether there was a beard or not, the head was so bloody. Sir, a head upon a bayonet was not an uncommon sight in those days upon Pelion. There is nothing to show even that it was unlike the head of any Thessalian peasant. The hair was like Mitrianos' own in length. As to its colour, he cannot depose. Well, I say such evidence proves nothing at all, and is not worth the paper it is written on; and Mr. Blunt actually stopped the cross-examination of this witness who, on the authority of Mr. Fitzgerald, I state, was procured for Regeb Pasha by Hassan, and instructed by him. After giving his evidence, he went to Mr. Borrell's house and asked for a reward. They asked, what do you want a reward for? He answered—"Why, have I not given evidence to please the friends of Mr. Ogle?" They told him he was quite mistaken, and he replied—"At any rate, I said what Hassan told me to say." Yet great importance is given to this witness in Mr. Fawcett's Report. The evidence of Tzocanos proves nothing. He says he had never seen Mr. Ogle, but he saw a Frank riding on horseback on Friday; while Mr. Ogle is proved clearly in the depositions to have had no horse, so that the only thing he proves is that he knows nothing at all about the matter. Now, I come to page 51, the evidence of Dr. Diomedis, of Portaria, on whose evidence Mr. Fawcett strongly relies. He says—"The evidence of Diomedis is remarkable, though it is hearsay evidence." This Dr. Diomedis, after some uncorroborated evidence, supposes that Mr. Ogle was killed on Friday, and that he could not have slept at Macrinitza; because witness's sister and sister-in-law, at whose houses he had sometimes passed the night, had left the place and shut up their houses. That was no proof at all that Mr. Ogle did not sleep in some other house, or, as a Correspondent must often do, *à la belle étoile*. At page 43 of the Report, we are told that—

> "Not long before his death he got into a brawl with some soldiers, and was arrested, and brought to the Konak, and liberated with a caution to be more prudent."

Mr. Fitzgerald, in his evidence on page 50 of the Report, explains this affair, and says that Mr. Ogle told him that, on hearing the firing of muskets, he went out to see what was going on. He met some Turkish soldiers and followed them. As they advanced they saw some men who took refuge in some houses, and closed the doors. The officer who commanded the soldiers caused them to surround the houses. They then, with Mr. Ogle, approached the first house, knocked at the door, and the men opened it. As some soldiers ill-used one of the men, Mr. Ogle intervened, when the officer asked him what business he had to do so? But, as Mr. Ogle could speak no Turkish, and the officer no Greek, Mr. Ogle was arrested and taken to the Konak, to the Caimacam, who at once set him at liberty. Thus, what was really only a misunderstanding was magnified into a brawl. Mr. Fitzgerald states that the Wednesday before the battle, Mr. Ogle intended to set out for England on very important private affairs. Was it likely that in the midst of the insurrection, a spy, a revolutionary agent, would leave and go to England on private business? I should here like to quote Mr. Fitzgerald's statement with regard to what Mr. Fawcett says at page 41. He says—

> "Mr. Fawcett is decidedly in error in stating that I was misled by peasants of Drakhia, who imagined it was Mr. Ogle who passed the night in their village. I was from the first of opinion that most of the circumstantial evidence was due to the confusion of Mr. Souta's movements with Mr. Ogle's. I distinctly repudiate being in any manner a representative of Mr. Ogle's friends, beyond sympathizing with them in their grief at his loss. They entertained opinions I did not entirely share, and for which I cannot be held responsible. My admission to Mr. Fawcett was that, without satisfactory evidence to the contrary, I should be constrained to admit that Mr. Ogle was killed on the Friday; but that I knew other evidence was in existence."

This is from a private statement, but which I am willing to show any hon. Gentleman. In conclusion, Mr. Fitzgerald says—

> "I may say that from the very first inception of the inquiry under Mr. Blunt to the last lines of the Report by Mr. Fawcett, the intention to screen the Turkish authorities is evident throughout. The impression on myself, obliged to be present on the inquiry, was painful, for I felt that a prostitution of the British name was going on. It would have been better that no inquiry at all should have taken place."

That is the opinion of a gentleman who

was clearly only interested so far as the ends of justice were concerned. Next comes the evidence of Kantargi, which proves nothing, while I may say the same of Ismail Effendi's. Then the evidence of Sakellarides speaks to the passport only, while that of Madame Zabanski shows that Mr. Ogle had previously been frequently followed by Ghegas, and also by a man supposed to have been an Armenian doctor. It shows that he asked the Caimacam of Volo for an escort to Bulgarini, which was not the action of a spy or a traitor, and, by an arrangement made by the Caimacam, got one. It shows that he remonstrated with Amoosh Aga for committing gross atrocities, and that Amoosh Aga had an enmity against him for doing so. It also shows that Mr. Ogle wrote a playful letter to Hobart Pasha, which is the only foundation for the assertion in the Report that Mr. Ogle set the authorities at defiance and insulted them. I have the authority of Mr. Ogle's nearest relatives in the world for saying that Hobart Pasha thoroughly understood the letter as a joke, and that he has since written to Mr. Ogle, of Sevenoaks, speaking of the deceased in terms of the highest commendation. Then, evidence was not only refused but suppressed. The man who bought Mr. Ogle's pocket-book from a Turkish officer was never examined, and the man who was found with his stick was never examined. Then, again, at page 59, you have a letter signed Emin Bey, which purports to give a description of Mr. Ogle. But the description is not a correct one, and such as it is, it was wrung from the man who gave it—a prisoner—while he was in the jail at Larissa. I am told that there is evidence to substantiate this statement. Then, there is the discrepancy in the medical evidence, which shows some inattention; but, in any case, whether the wound which caused the death of Mr. Ogle was caused by gun or by sword, it is quite clear that the death, according to the medical evidence, took place at close quarters, and not by accident, or by a dropping fire when the insurgents were in retreat. I will only refer to one more document—that at page 60—merely to mention that it is another memorandum not signed, and proving no more than the one I have quoted.

I have now shown what has not been proved, and that evidence has been refused. I will now show what can be proved. What can be proved, if another inquiry shall be issued, is, that in the first place, Mr. Ogle was not a spy; that he was not in constant communication with the Greek Committees at Athens; that he did not come over the frontier with the insurgents; that he did not set the authorities at defiance and insult them, although such a statement was made in the Report; that he did not get into a brawl as stated by Mr. Fawcett; and that he did not meet with his death on Friday afternoon while retreating with the insurgents. I cannot, unfortunately, give the names of the witnesses who can prove these things; but I can show them to any hon. Gentleman who wishes to see them, and they have been already submitted to Lord Tenterden. These witnesses can prove that Mr. Ogle, on the 29th of March, after the capture of the first line of the insurgent's defence by the Turks, left the battle-field with A. and B. In the afternoon of Friday, when the insurgents were in general retreat, Mr. Ogle was seen near the church at Macrinitza talking to C. That makes three witnesses who had seen him after the battle. Towards sunset on the same day—Friday, March 29th—at the time when he was supposed to be killed, he is spoken to at Lukopetra, the wolf rock, whither he had come from Portaria, to which village he had conducted some poor women and children from Bulgarini, whom he met at 2 o'clock, after the battle of Macrinitza, for safety, and about whom he wrote, as I have already mentioned, to a friend, asking him to take care of them. He is spoken to here by D. E. F. G. and H., besides many others whose names I do not know. That makes eight witnesses to Mr. Ogle's movements. That same night—Friday—he slept with many fugitive villagers in the open air, on this same shoulder of Pelion called Lukopetra; whereas Mr. Fawcett says he was murdered that afternoon. On Saturday morning very early, on the 30th of March, Mr. Ogle was on his way to Macrinitza from Lukopetra, with the object, as he told witnesses, of seeing the Pasha, and endeavouring to induce him to stop the pillage of the hamlet; and it was while on this philanthropic errand that he was killed. Witnesses can be produced who depose as follows:—A man of Macrinitza named K., with another man of the same place named L., was returning to Macrinitza on the Friday evening. They saw some Turkish soldiers coming down the hill, and hid themselves, spending the whole night on the spot. About an hour before daybreak on Saturday morning, Mr. Ogle, whom they knew, passed them going towards Macrinitza along an ascending path. This is Saturday morning, a day after Mr. Fawcett declares that he was killed. At the top of this path was a rock upon which K. states that they saw three Turks on one side and six on the other. As Mr. Ogle passed, they rolled three large stones down on him but missed him. Then the Turks came down, fell on him, assassinated him, impaled his head on a bayonet, and set off towards Macrinitza. K. and L., coming forward to see more clearly, were fired on by the Turks. L. was killed and K. escaped by flight. The body of L. is probably that alluded to in Streit's *mémoire.* That makes ten witnesses; the eleventh is M., of a village on Pelion, who declares that he was sent early on Saturday morning, the 30th of March, from Lukopetra by way of Portaria to try to enter Macrinitza to get a bag containing documents which was hidden in another person's house. All the names are in my possession. Between Portaria and Macrinitza he saw Mr. Ogle, whom he knew well, having acted as guide to him the day before, going on ahead towards Macrinitza. He correctly describes Mr. Ogle's dress—and I may here remind the House that there was no satisfactory description of Mr. Ogle given by any witness before the Commissioners. He lost sight of him for a moment owing to a winding of the path, and next saw him amongst 8 or 10 Turkish soldiers. He saw them strike him with a sword or bayonet. The witness then took to flight, and was fired on, but missed. These witnesses are corroborated by two others, a woman and a boy, mentioned in Streit's *mémoire,* which is generally well worthy of attention. Mr. Streit says—

> "On Saturday, 26th April, two witnesses were brought to me—an old woman and her son—inhabitants of the village of Macrinitza; to the best of my memory, these folks assert that they were present at the time when, on Saturday, the 30th of March, in the morning, Mr. Ogle was passing through the ravine between Portaria and Macrinitza to proceed to the latter village, with the intention, expressed to the witnesses, of negotiating for the stoppage of pillage and massacres. They told me that they saw him followed at a distance by some Turkish soldiers; that they themselves were afraid and hid behind some trees; that Ogle perceived that he was being followed and turned round; that the soldiers approached, killed him, unarmed as he was, by a shot from a gun, and thrust from a bayonet, that they also killed a peasant who was near him (probably L.); 'that they cut off the heads of the two murdered men after having searched and rifled them; that they afterwards threw away the head of the peasant; that they impaled Ogle's head on a bayonet through the mouth, and set off in the direction of Macrinitza and the Turkish camp.'"

This makes three sets of witnesses who independently witnessed the death of Mr. Ogle on that Saturday morning, the 30th of March. These witnesses had been also mentioned to me quite independently some time before the publication of Mr. Fawcett's Report by a gentleman of Volo, who had seen enough of Turkish conduct to desire his name to be concealed. I knew him in Athens, and I know his brother was murdered by Turks. A Greek called Ephthemethes, who had been to America and become an American subject, and on his return to Thessaly had taken a farm from Abram Pasha, the Khedive's banker, near Larissa, and to protect whom and to convey him to his country, an American man-of-war, *The Marion,* came from Smyrna to Volo harbour, told my informant on board the steamer bound from Volo to Athens, that he knew a woman and a youth who saw Mr. Ogle murdered by 10 Turkish soldiers.

Mr. HAYTER: Will the hon. Member say if they were regular or irregular soldiers?

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I cannot say with certainty, but I think they were irregulars. These witnesses, and probably many others, would have testified before the Committee had the Government guaranteed their safety, and I firmly believe that they will do so now under the same conditions. A mixed Commission has failed, and therefore I ask that a new Commission shall be appointed of Englishmen only. The present would be a very good opportunity to show the Turks that we mean to enforce the safety of the lives of our subjects now that we are responsible for the good government of Turkey. Having undertaken that responsibility, are we to begin by allowing the murder of one of our own compatriots to remain unpunished, nay, screened, as I believe it has been in the most disgraceful way, intentionally or unintentionally? Better, far better, for the prestige of England and for the safety of the lives of British subjects residing in the East, that an inquiry had never taken place, than that such a travesty of justice had been allowed. I will read the following copy of a letter which, after setting forth the evidence I have quoted and other evidence, says—

"The evidence here set forth with the names of the witnesses is contained in a letter written in Greek by a person, whose name is given, to Mr. X., of Volo, and translated into French by a friend of his. Both letters will be placed in the hands of Lord Tenterden, if his Lordship should desire to have them in his custody. It is asserted that several persons, whose names are not given, can corroborate various parts of the evidence. We have the best authority for saying that every refugee, every person who knew anything about the late Mr. Ogle's case, has been examined by the right hon. Charilaus Tricoupi at his own house at Athens, and that, in the opinion of that gentleman, link by link, a complete chain of evidence has been formed."

Hon. Gentlemen know what weight is to be attached to such a statement from M. Tricoupi. I say I believe in the assertions of these witnesses, and corroborated as they are one by another, they carry conviction to my mind. I do not guarantee their truth—it would be very wrong of me to pretend to do so—but I demand that they shall be examined, and that their evidence shall be taken for what it is worth. But this can only be done under a guarantee that they shall be safe while they are giving evidence, and that, after giving it, they shall be removed to a place of safety, and this can only be done in the presence of an English Commissioner. There is a precedent for taking more notice of this case than has yet been taken. Hon. Members may remember the circumstances which attended the murder of Mr. Bowlby, *The Times* Correspondent, and some other Englishmen, in 1860, by the Chinese. A full account of it will be found in *The Annual Register*, 1860. At that time the lives and property of Englishmen were apparently valued more highly by the English Government. The Earl of Elgin deemed it his duty to take notice of Mr. Bowlby's high qualities in these terms—

"Mr. Bowlby was the Correspondent of *The Times*. I deplore his loss, not only because he was a highly-accomplished and well-informed gentleman, but also because from the liberal and conscientious spirit in which he addressed himself to the singularly complicated problems presented by the moral, social, and commercial condition of China, I had conceived the hope that he would be the means of diffusing sound information on many points on which it is most important for the national interest that the British public should be correctly informed."

Change the word China to Greece, and Bowlby to Ogle, and the same might now be said with justice. Lord Elgin, in a letter to Prince Kung, states—

"Until this foul deed shall have been expiated, peace between Great Britain and the existing Dynasty of China is impossible."

He goes on to say—

"What remains of the Summer Palace, which appears to be the place where several of the British captives were subjected to the grossest indignities, will be immediately levelled with the ground, this condition requiring no assent on the part of His Highness, because it will be immediately carried into effect by the Commander-in-Chief."

Those were different ways of dealing with such affairs in those days. A sum of £100,000 was also exacted as an indemnity. I ask for no indemnity; the friends and relations of Mr. Ogle ask for no indemnity; we do not ask for blood money—we ask for justice. Those murders took place when China was at war with us, and what penalties were paid! But the murder of Mr. Ogle took place when Turkey was not only at peace with us, but almost in alliance with us—almost actually under our protection. I hope I shall not have to say, as *The Times* said in a leader, on December 10, 1860—

"It is provoking to have to fear that there may be some of his countrymen whose ingenuity may possibly be exercised to excuse the crime."

The other day a debate took place in this House upon the execution on board the *Beagle* of a Native of Tanna, when the hon. and learned Attorney General said—"Human life was a sacred thing, whether it was the life of a savage or the life of one of Her Majesty's most civilized subjects." He said also—"It was right to attack savages who had murdered English subjects." We do not ask for any attack on the savages who took the sacred life of Mr. Ogle; we do not ask for summary justice to be inflicted; we ask for a new inquiry—for a fair inquiry. We say a sham inquiry is worse than no inquiry at all, and that it is a shameful mockery and, in our opinion, travesty of justice. Declaring that there are witnesses who can substantiate the truth, we claim a hearing for them. I do not go out of my way to charge complicity against the Turkish officials, although the Papers contain evidence on which such a charge could be based; but I leave that for the fresh inquiry to examine and decide. On a former occasion, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed me that

> "The Government regarded the matter as one of serious importance, and that there was not the slightest intention on their part to dally with it."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxl. 1567.]

The hon. and learned Solicitor General reminded us, in the Tanna debate, that—"In England and in all civilized communities, criminality is not confined to the person actually committing an offence, but extends to those who aid, assist, and comfort the offender." I would ask whether Mr. Fawcett's Inquiry does not aid, assist, and comfort the offenders, and will not the Government be doing the same thing if it does not grant what in fair honour and justice I demand? Perhaps I shall be told my demands are not improper, and, perhaps, even reasonable; but that it is inconvenient, in the present state of Thessaly, to institute a fresh inquiry. No doubt, it will be difficult to hold such an inquiry—it is always difficult to hold an inquiry of this kind; but the question is whether the importance of the case demands that the difficulties should be surmounted? Why should the witnesses fear more now than before? Is the state of Thessaly more disturbed now than it was at that time? Or, are we afraid that if we institute a fresh inquiry, we may discover something more than the mere facts of Mr. Ogle's death? I ask whether the inhabitants of Thessaly are treated worse now than they were when Fawcett's inquiry took place? Is this all that we have done for the Greek population of Turkey? I ask Her Majesty's Government whether they will evade a fresh inquiry into the death of a murdered Englishman in order to get rid of a difficulty? A great country should never know difficulty in such a case as this. Justice to one of her subjects should override all difficulties. Sir, is such a difficulty to be weighed for a moment against the credit of England, which is at stake in this matter?

I am happy to say I have now arrived at the end of what I have had to say, which has been a very long task for me, and, I am afraid, a disagreeable one to the House; and in thanking the House for the great patience and forbearance with which they have heard my feeble statement, I assure them that all I demand is justice—bare, stern, impartial justice. I want to vindicate the fair fame of England. I want to take away the reproach from the mouth of Europe, that she cares no longer for the fate of her children in all parts of the world. If I be asked what good results I expect to spring from a fresh inquiry into this case, I shall reply—The dead, it is too true, cannot be restored to life; no more good work will ever be done by the hands that wearied themselves in good works; wrong-doers will never again be mercilessly exposed, or the wretched comforted, by Charles Ogle; but the parents who sorrow for the untimely end of a life of bright promise, the relatives who lament that unjust aspersions should rest upon the memory of one whose actions were irreproachable, whose honour was unstained; the friends who bitterly complain that a base and cowardly assassination should be allowed unnecessarily to remain enveloped in mystery—all these can be, in some small measure, comforted in their affliction, if Her Majesty's Government will consent to have the case re-investigated, fully, fairly, and impartially. On their behalf, then, and on behalf of our country's credit among the nations of the world, I plead for justice to the blood of a murdered Englishman. I cannot imagine a demand more fair, more reasonable, or more just. I cannot imagine a request more free from the possibility of injury to any except the guilty, and I cannot bring myself to believe that such a request can ever be refused by any Government which claims to represent the generous people of England. I beg to move the Resolution which stands on the Paper in my name.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT, in rising to second the Motion, said, that if before entering that House he had felt disposed to support it, after a careful perusal of the Papers relating to the death of the late Mr. Charles Ogle, presented by the Foreign Office, he should now feel doubly urged to do so, after hearing the very full and exhaustive statement brought before them by his hon. Friend the Member for Frome. His hon. Friend had apologized to the House for undertaking to bring to its notice so important a question as that contained in his Resolution; but he (Sir Eardley Wilmot) was sure he spoke the sentiments of all who had listened to him, that the manner in which he had dealt with the subject was highly creditable to his abilities, to his regard to the memory of one whom he must call his murdered friend, and also to his sense of what was due to British justice. After the necessarily long and elaborate argument they had heard, he felt that he could not trespass upon the indulgence of the House; but still entertaining, as he did, a very strong opinion that injustice had been done to Mr. Ogle, both as regarded the circumstances under which he met his death and his conduct previously, he could not refrain from making a few observations, and in order to confine them within as small a compass as possible, he would give a brief outline of the facts of the case, and then, by a review of the principal features of the evidence upon which Mr. Fawcett was said to have based his Report, would proceed to show that that Report was most lame, inconclusive, and unsatisfactory. On Thursday, the 28th March last, the late Mr. Ogle was walking in the Promenade of Volo, in company with a little boy, the son of his landlord, M. Zabanski; and he believed that Mr. Fitzgerald, the Correspondent of *The Standard*, was with him. On that day Mr. Ogle had been expecting the steamer from Athens to arrive at Volo, and had the intention of returning in her, with the view of leaving Greece for England, in consequence of some domestic matters in his family which required his presence at home. The steamer did not arrive, and while the three persons were walking on the Volo Promenade, firing was heard in the mountains near Mount Pelion and in the neighbourhood of the town of Macrinitza. Mr. Ogle immediately proposed to go towards the quarter whence the guns were heard, and asked Mr. Fitzgerald to accompany him; but that gentleman declined, as he had a despatch ready for *The Standard*, and said he should stay at Volo, in the chance of the steamer arriving. The landlord's little boy was sent home, and Mr. Ogle went away alone, taking only the walking stick he had in his hand. So little idea had he of joining the Greek insurgents that he did not even fetch his revolver, which was hanging up in his room. From that Thursday afternoon nothing more was seen of him until his body was brought headless into Volo, and stripped of nearly every article of clothing, on the 5th April. If those who had perpetrated the atrocity thought to escape detection by stripping the body and cutting off the head, they were mistaken; for they had left a flannel shirt covered with blood upon the corpse, and when it was brought into Volo it was immediately identified by the landlady of the house where he had lodged by a similar flannel shirt being found in his wardrobe, and by a peculiar scar on the right wrist. On the Saturday afternoon, Mr. Ogle's friend, Mr. Fitzgerald, heard a rumour that something had gone wrong with him; but no precise information reached him on which he could act. The fights between the Turkish soldiers and the insurgents finished on the afternoon of Friday the 29th, when the Greeks were completely routed and fled in disorder in all directions. On Sunday the 31st March, about 1 in the afternoon, a Turk named Houssein Haggi brought some papers into Volo, and finding one among them which he could not read, being in English, he took it to the shop of Sakellerides, a jeweller, in the Market Place, and asked him to read it. Sakellerides, not being able to read it, showed it to M. Cortaki, who happened to come in, but he was not more successful; and, ultimately, they called in Sowlusuf, a Jew, who had arrived in Volo the day before from the Piræus. He read it, and ascertained it to be the passport of Mr. Ogle. It was given the same afternoon to Turkish officials, and, ultimately, to Admiral Hobart Pasha. That same evening Hobart Pasha met the daughter of Mr. Borrell, the Italian Consul, and said to her—"It is all up with your friend Ogle," or, in words described by another witness who was present—"*Ogle, c'est une affaire du passé.*" Therefore, it was quite clear that the death of Mr. Ogle was known to the Turksh authorities on that Sunday afternoon, and, indeed, according to the evidence, Mr.

Fitzgerald was told that evening by one of the Turkish officers, "that Ogle had been killed in a breastwork of the insurgents with a rifle in his hand." As the insurgents were driven from their works in the first day of the fighting, this statement was to the effect that Ogle had been killed on Thursday the 28th of March. After this a man named Hassan, a chavass or chasseur, as he (Sir Eardley Wilmot) supposed him to be, of Mr. Borrell, was sent in search of Mr. Ogle's body; but the first time without success. He did not appear to have had any assistance whatever from the Turkish Commander, who had at that time—Monday, April 1—established a military *cordon* round the mountain, as low as Portaria, and might, he (Sir Eardley Wilmot) should think, have found and delivered up the body without difficulty. Be that as it might, it was only by a second search, on the 5th April, several days after, that the body was discovered by Hassan, and one or two men who accompanied him, in a ravine between Macrinitza and Portaria, wounded in several places, headless, and rapidly decomposing, and stripped of all the clothing, except the flannel shirt above mentioned. The body was immediately brought to Volo, and identified by the landlord, Zabanski, and the friends of Mr. Ogle. Now, upon these facts, supported by certain depositions taken at Volo before Mr. Blunt, the Consul at Athens—for Mr. Fawcett, as his hon. Friend the Member for Frome had already told them, examined no witnesses himself—came to the conclusion that Mr. Ogle was killed on the Friday afternoon, as he was running away from Macrinitza with the insurgents, and that his head was cut off, and carried to the Turkish camp. He would now look at the evidence in support of this theory, first premising that it, too, was totally at variance with the statements of Reschid Pasha and Lieutenant Skender Pasha, that Ogle was killed in the breastworks, with a rifle in his hand. The most important witness, whose evidence was found in the Papers presented to the House, was Houssein Haggi, of Larissa, who deposed that he received some papers from Turkish soldiers on Friday afternoon, the 29th, and took them up to the Pashas commanding the Turkish Forces. Among these papers was Mr. Ogle's passport, which none of them could read; and they gave it back, with the other papers, to Houssein to take care of. This paper ultimately found its way to the jeweller's shop at Volo. But there was this most important fact—namely, that Houssein said he slept at Macrinitza that night, and the next day—*le lendemain*—went into Volo. Now, it was quite clear that the day Houssein went into Volo was on Sunday, 31st, and, if so, the passport was shown to the Pashas on the Saturday, and not on the Friday. But the case did not rest there; for two other witnesses, who had nothing whatever to do with the passport—two men who claimed to be with the Pashas when the papers were shown them by Houssein—namely, Kantargi and Ismail Effendi, both stated the day to be Saturday, and not Friday. The witness Houssein, therefore, did not at all substantiate Mr. Fawcett's Report. For, if Friday was the day he was before the Pashas, all Saturday was unaccounted for. Then, another witness, Dr. Diomedis, had been called, who stated that he had been told by two persons that Mr. Ogle had been seen running down a steep ravine on the second day of the fight, in the direction of Portaria; and as he had not been heard of at that place, the presumption was that he was overtaken by Turkish soldiers, killed and mutilated, his head being carried by them to Macrinitza on the point of a bayonet. But why were not these two persons called, who might have been asked if they were sure as to the identity of the person whom they saw running? If not called, what credit could be given to their story? The rest of the depositions were of a piece with the evidence he had referred to; but he really felt reluctant to trouble the House at greater length upon the details so fully and ably handled by his hon. Friend. There was one main feature in the case, which he urged most strongly. If Mr. Ogle's death was known to Hobart Pasha, to Reschid Pasha, and Skender Pasha, on Sunday, the 31st March, well known as he was to everyone in Volo and the surrounding villages; if it were true that he fell while fighting with the insurgents, why did they not return his body to his friends immediately a search was made for it? Why did they allow it to lie headless in the ravine till the 5th April, when their scouts were scouring the mountain in all directions? Why did they allow a Turkish soldier to be seen walking about in the trousers of the murdered man? These circumstances satisfied him that it was not unknown to the Turkish authorities that he had met with foul play. But when, in addition to this, they knew that he had encountered the bitter enmity of Amouss Aga, the Chief Commissioner of Police in Thessaly, whose antecedents his hon. Friend the Member for Frome had described—and God forbid they should qualify any man, except in Turkey, for a Chief Commissionership of Police—when they knew that Mr. Ogle had not only actively interfered to prevent the barbarous outrages committed by the Turks on unoffending and helpless women and children, but that he had on several occasions given the poor inhabitants of the villages money to save them from starving, they might well believe that the death of Mr. Ogle might be fairly ascribed to a deep feeling of revenge against a man so beloved and respected throughout the districts. For his friend, Mr. Fitzgerald, said he was of so noble and chivalrous a character that he would at any time have risked his life to prevent oppression and cruelty. If the theories upon which Mr. Fawcett had based his Report were unsubstantial, and called for further investigation, how much stronger was the case when, as they had learnt from his hon. Friend the Member for Frome, several witnesses could be produced who actually saw the assassination early on Saturday morning, the 30th March, when an unarmed man was set upon by Turkish soldiers, and barbarously slain, stripped, and mutilated? He (Sir Eardley Wilmot) was not aware who these witnesses were; but he had proved, without them, that the murder occurred on the Saturday, after all the fighting was over, and not on the Friday. Therefore, he (Sir Eardley Wilmot) most earnestly appealed to the Government to grant a further inquiry, and thus do justice to the reputation of this young man, whose good name had been assailed, and thus afford satisfaction to his family and relations, in whose hearts his character was more sacred even than his life. His hon. Friend had spoken of Lord Palmerston, and his readiness always to protect a British subject; but he (Sir Eardley Wilmot) well knew that his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who at that moment sat upon the Treasury Bench, had in his breast quite as noble feelings as Lord Palmerston, and if injustice had been done to an Englishman, he would be as eager and forward to see it redressed as ever Lord Palmerston had been. He, therefore, appealed to his right hon. Friend to grant a further inquiry into Mr. Ogle's death. He could not believe that a Motion so fully justified would be refused; but, if it were so, all he could say was, he should leave that House satisfied that despotism was preferable to constitutional government, and that the British Government was an empty name.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, Mr. Consul General Fawcett's Report upon Mr. C. C. Ogle's death is inconclusive, and that a fresh Commission of Inquiry ought to be instituted, composed of Englishmen only, who should be specially empowered to assure the witnesses of the protection of Her Majesty's Government,"—(*Mr. Henry Samuelson,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. BOURKE said, he was sure that no one who had heard the statement of the hon. Member for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson), or no one bearing the name of Englishman who read it could help deeply and sincerely lamenting the death of Mr. Ogle. There could be no doubt that the death of that gentleman had been accompanied by those barbarous acts of mutilation with which, unhappily, we had been made too familiar by the war which had just concluded, and at which he did not think it too much to say our common humanity shuddered. He entertained, also, no doubt that Mr. Ogle was a man of noble and intrepid spirit as well as of great intellectual vigour, and that he performed the important duties which he had to discharge with honour and fidelity. It was clear, too, from the Papers before the House, that he was ardently devoted to the Hellenic cause. He was glad, he might add, that his memory had had so able a vindicator as the hon. Member for Frome; and no one, he felt satisfied, could refuse to offer to the family of Mr. Ogle their deep sympathy in the loss which they had sustained. It was due, under all the circumstances, to him and them, that the case should be fully and fairly discussed in that House, and no one who had heard the speech of the hon. Gentleman could deny that it reflected great credit on his ability. After that speech he did not feel justified in taking up the time of the House by entering at any great length into the facts of the case. There was, however, one observation made by the hon. Gentleman which he felt it to be his duty to dwell on very briefly. He had stated that the country at the time of Mr. Ogle's death was not at war; but there could be little doubt that, for all practical purposes, a state of war prevailed. The hon. Gentleman then proceeded to say that it was impossible to obtain evidence in the case without guaranteeing the lives of those who gave it, and he criticized that part of Mr. Fawcett's Report in which he said that no such guarantee could be entered into. Now, in taking that view, Mr. Fawcett was, in his opinion, justified, not only by his instructions, but on the ground of common sense; because, unless the witnesses who gave evidence were prepared to leave the country—and there was nothing to show that they were willing to do so—or unless the British Government were prepared to occupy it in a military way, Mr. Fawcett could not give the guarantees of which the hon. Gentleman spoke. One of the charges which had been brought against the Consul General, therefore, in his opinion fell to the ground; and nobody could attribute any dereliction of duty in refusing to give the guarantee. As the House was aware, great efforts had been made by Mr. Fawcett to procure evidence; but they unfortunately failed, and no one, in his opinion, who read the Report with fairness could come to any other conclusion than that he was justified on the evidence which he was able to procure in arriving at the decision which he did. ["No, no!"] That, at all events, was his opinion; but he did not wish to enter into that question, for reasons which he would tell the House directly; but he would first remind hon. Members that Mr. Fawcett's Report had been corroborated by Mr. Blunt and by Captain Clarke.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON rose to Order. No Report by Mr. Blunt appeared in the Papers before the House.

Mr. BOURKE said, he had only just heard that such an expression of opinion on the part of Mr. Blunt had reached the Foreign Office. But upon the Papers before the House he did not think that any fault could be found with Mr. Fawcett for the proceedings which he undertook or the manner in which he acted. He believed that that gentleman brought to the performance of his duties a sincere and honest intention; and he could not see, from the evidence, that he could have come to any other conclusion than that at which he had arrived. Indeed, he might say that Her Majesty's Government were satisfied with the conduct of that gentleman, believing that he had discharged his duty in a *bonâ fide* and an honest manner. But a different class of considerations now arose, because the hon. Member for Frome had assumed the responsibility of saying that evidence could be produced which completely negatived the chief findings of Mr. Fawcett. A very grave state of affairs arose if a Member of that House took upon himself the responsibility of vouching for evidence of that character.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON said, he did not vouch for its truth. He merely vouched for its existence.

Mr. BOURKE remarked that the hon. Member, in the course of his speech, plainly said he believed that the evidence he was bringing before the House was true.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON said, there had evidently been a misunderstanding. He did not guarantee the truth of this evidence; but he demanded that it should be examined, and he did believe in its existence.

Mr. BOURKE observed, that in regard to the evidence of several persons the hon. Member vouched his own personal knowledge. There could be no doubt about that. In his speech to-day the hon. Member had not only disparaged almost all the evidence upon which Mr. Fawcett's Report was founded, but he had said that it was altogether untrue, and he had described the character of some of the witnesses as being absolutely infamous. [Mr. H. Samuelson: No!] "Infamous" was the word which the hon. Member used. Although the hon. Member did not guarantee the truth of the evidence he adduced, yet it seemed to him to be worthy of credit; and therefore Her Majesty's Government were placed, with reference to Mr. Fawcett's Report, in a different position from that which they occupied before the hon. Member's speech was delivered. The hon. Gentleman had asserted that Lord Tenterden had seen some of this evidence; but, for his own part, he could say it only came under his notice a very short time ago. He believed that Lord Tenterden also had only recently seen it, and then it was placed before them both in such a way that it was impossible to use it, because they were anxious to prevent the witnesses from getting into trouble. Consequently, no charge could be founded upon the neglect of duty by Her Majesty's Government because they did not produce this evidence, for as soon as they saw it they peceived it must fall to the ground. As, however, the hon. Member had now made that evidence public, there could be no objection to their making what use they could of it. In these circumstances, Her Majesty's Government were prepared to say that if these discrepancies—to call them by a very mild name—could be supplemented by further evidence, or if any of the evidence on which Mr. Fawcett's Report was founded could be contradicted, a fresh inquiry ought to be instituted, when the country was in such a condition that the witnesses could come forward and give their evidence. It would be impossible, however, for Her Majesty's Government to accept the hon. Member's Resolution, because it pointed to a fresh Commission of Inquiry composed exclusively of Englishmen. He was not in a position to say that he could force upon the Porte a Commission composed of Englishmen only. All he could promise was that Her Majesty's Government would do what they had done with regard to this case from the first. They would take the greatest interest in this case; they would get the very best Commissioners they could, and they would endeavour to take measures to give protection to the witnesses; though it would be impossible, in the present state of the country, to guarantee the safety of the witnesses without carrying them away to another country or occupying the Island by military force. Under these circumstances, he hoped the Resolution would be withdrawn. If the hon. Gentleman could suggest any inquiry which was not open to the objections he had urged, he believed a satisfactory arrangement might be arrived at. He regretted an expression the hon. Member had used with reference to Sir Austen Layard, which had led the House to infer that in certain instructions given to Mr. Fawcett, Sir Austen Layard had advised that the inquiry should be shortened for the purpose of concealing the truth. He hoped the hon. Member would withdraw that expression.

MR. H. SAMUELSON explained that he did not mean to impute to Sir Austen Layard a desire to conceal the truth. What he did mean by the expression was that the instructions which Sir Austen Layard gave to Mr. Fawcett were calculated, without his intending it, to have the result of concealing the truth by hurrying over the inquiry.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he was glad to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his place, because he thought the hon. Member for Frome was justified in asking the Government for a more definite and distinct statement than that just made by the Under Secretary, as to the course which it was intended to take. The effectiveness of the speech of the hon. Member had been praised; but he (Mr. W. E. Forster) thought its effectiveness was quite as much owing to the exceeding strength of the case as to the manner in which it had been brought before the House. He did not know that he had ever heard so strong a case made out for the re-opening of an inquiry. He understood that Her Majesty's Government were willing to re-open the inquiry; and the fact that Thessaly and Epirus were not yet in a state of complete tranquillity was no reason why the inquiry should not be set on foot immediately. Nor did he see the slightest reason why the British Government should not guarantee the absolute safety of the witnesses. If whoever was sent was authorized to say to the witnesses—"We guarantee that you shall not be injured either in life or goods for telling the truth, and we will take you out of the country if necessary," he did not believe that the witnesses would not be forthcoming. The very least thing Her Majesty's Government could do was to secure at any expense that these people should not suffer either in life or property. The fact that the transactions in question had taken place in that part of Turkey which, by the decisions of the Congress at Berlin, Turkey had been strongly recommended to give up to Greece, made it all the easier for the Government to take that course. There was the strongest *primâ facie* ground for believing that Mr. Ogle —a young man of great promise and the highest character — was murdered because he was telling the truth to *The Times* newspaper, and because he thereby exposed the unspeakable horrors committed by men in authority. Looking merely at the Papers, independently of what was said by his hon. Friend the Member for Frome, he was drawn most reluctantly to the conclusion that Consul General Fawcett did not sufficiently examine the case, and that there was nothing in the Papers that justified his conclusions. It might have been justifiable for him to come to the conclusion that nothing was proved one way or another; but it was to be regretted that the Representative of England, examining into the death of an Englishman, should have thought himself justified in making an accusation for which there was no warrant against Mr. Ogle's character; and he would be surprised and disappointed if the Foreign Office did not inform Mr. Fawcett that he was not justified in making that accusation. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER asked what the accusation was?] There was the strongest possible insinuation that Mr. Ogle was a spy on behalf of the Greek insurgents. The Report said—"In any other country he would have been treated as a spy and possibly shot." There was no attempt to prove in these Papers that Mr. Ogle acted imprudently, as had been asserted, even in his enthusiasm for humanity and his indignation against cruelty. Perhaps Mr. Fawcett might have thought it would be inconvenient to raise a controversy at that particular time with the Turkish Government; but such a consideration ought to have prevented the inquiry from being held, instead of causing it to be conducted as it was. He hoped that Her Majesty's Government, instead of waiting until Epirus and Thessaly were pacified, would set on foot a new inquiry at once, and that they would instruct their authorities to give every possible security that could be given to the witnesses. He had read with a great deal of pain the dispatch of Sir Austen Layard, in which it was stated it was alleged that Mr. Ogle was siding with the insurgents at the time of his death, and that he was warned of the danger into which he was running. Warned by whom? By Sir Austen Layard; because, if so, he must have had proof of the matter before the inquiry was opened. He did not think his hon. Friend the Member for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson) ought to make it an absolute condition that the Commissioners should all be Englishmen; but he was of opinion that power should be given to the Commissioners to hear evidence by themselves if they thought proper to do so. An additional reason for demanding a fresh inquiry was furnished by the relation to which Her Majesty's Government now stood with reference to the Government of Turkey. Her Majesty's Government had undertaken to take steps to reform the Turkish Government in Asia Minor, which was the same Government as ruled over these Greek Provinces. Unless Her Majesty's Government informed the Turkish Government that gentlemen who went to Turkey to report the truth to English newspapers must not be murdered, and that this country would look after them if they were murdered, any attempt at reform in the Dominions of the Porte would be an absolute mockery. All that he (Mr. W. E. Forster) asked for was that the Government should insist upon an inquiry, and that they should instruct their authorities to give every possible security to the witnesses to be examined. They had an abundance of proof that in these inquiries attempts were made to prevent the English Government from knowing what had happened; and he had no doubt it would turn out that, in the present instance, the Camaicam went about the villages warning the people not to give evidence. The case was one which demanded inquiry as much as any case could demand it, and every attempt should be made to punish the murderers; and believing that it was as true now as in Lord Palmerston's day that a British subject ought to be safe in any country, he sat down in the hope that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would inform the House that the Government were ready, both in justice to the murdered man and themselves, to order another investigation.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he entirely re-echoed the closing words of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He felt that the responsibility of protecting and safe-guarding the lives of British subjects abroad was a duty which lay upon every British Government, and he was perfectly satisfied that duty would be discharged by every British Government, whatever might be its political complexion. Englishmen ought especially to be protected when they were in countries where great agitation prevailed; and where, if they spoke truly, they might expose their lives to private vengeance or public danger. In such cases, the British Government ought to be particularly ready to extend their protection to those who were doing their duty. In the course of the discussion several remarks had been made respecting the character of the late Mr. Ogle, and it would almost seem as if there was a difference of opinion in the House on the subject. He wished, therefore, most distinctly and emphatically to say for himself—and he believed, also, on the part of the Government, and of all those who sat on that side of the House—that there existed no difference of opinion as to the character of the late Mr. Ogle. Whether he was less prudent than he ought to have been was a matter which did not at all affect his character. That he was a man of great courage and energy—that he possessed an amiable disposition, and was incapable of doing anything but what was highly honourable, had never been disputed by anyone. But that did not altogether dispose of the question at issue with regard to Consul General Fawcett's inquiry. That inquiry was as to whether Mr. Ogle lost his life in the action that was fought or in the pursuit that immediately followed it, or whether he was slain in cold blood on another day? It was in no sense a reflection on Mr. Ogle's character that it should be thought he had lost his life in the pursuit on the Friday. There was no question that he went out to see what was going on. Any man who did so exposed his life to danger, and it was quite probable that Mr. Ogle might have been unfortunate enough to lose his life in the struggle which occurred, or in the pursuit which followed it. Even if that view should be sustained, it would in no way reflect upon Mr. Ogle's character. Some injustice, he thought, had been done to Consul General Fawcett by the observations made upon him. Mr. Fawcett was a gentleman of high position, who had acted as Chief Judge at Constantinople for some years, and he was selected on this occasion because he was believed to be well qualified to conduct a judicial inquiry. Accordingly, he was sent to Volo in order to make the inquiry in the best and most solemn manner. What was he to do? He was put in communication with a Turkish authority who was associated with him in the conduct of the inquiry. Mr. Fawcett took what steps occurred to him in order to insure the bringing forward of witnesses, and there occurred in the Report a passage which the hon. Member for Frome had not read; but which, nevertheless, ought to be noticed. In describing what was done to induce witnesses to come forward, Mr. Fawcett said—

> "I informed the Greek Consul of this, who declared his satisfaction, and promised, if possible, to bring up the witnesses."

[MR. H. SAMUELSON remarked, that he had read that passage.] The hon. Member had been so fair in his comments that he probably did not omit that passage. Particular notice ought, however, to be taken of it; because it showed, not only that Consul General Fawcett did what he thought was sufficient to bring forward the witnesses, but also that the Greek Consul declared his satisfaction at what had been done. Mr. Fawcett and his associate, deciding on the evidence brought before them, came to the conclusion that Mr. Ogle was killed on the Friday in the retreat. Having read with some care the evidence as it stood, he was bound to say that, although there was not absolute and conclusive proof to that effect, yet the bearing of the testimony strongly supported the conclusion at which Mr. Fawcett arrived. When, however, the hon. Member for Frome came forward and said that there was a great deal of other evidence which could be adduced by persons whose names he did not feel at liberty to state publicly, although he would communicate them to the Government, a ground was certainly shown for further investigation. There could, consequently, be no question that it was the duty of the Government to see that the matter was properly investigated, and that there should be such an inquiry as would clear up the question as to whether such evidence as had been referred to by the hon. Member for Frome existed or not, and, if so, whether it could be relied upon. The hon. Gentleman did not guarantee that the evidence was correct, and nobody could call upon him to do so; but he said—"I do guarantee that it is tendered by persons who are really existing persons, and who, I believe, if an opportunity is afforded to them of coming forward in safety, will give evidence which will prove that Mr. Ogle was not killed on the Friday, but on a later day." In the circumstances, he had no hesitation on the part of the Government—and he spoke with the authority of Lord Salisbury—in saying that the matter was one which the Government were perfectly ready to carry further by a fresh investigation, and that they would conduct the investigation in such a manner as to give the Greek witnesses courage to come forward. Lord Salisbury's words on the subject were—

> "We would be ready to supplement the deficiencies of the evidence by a further investigation whenever the state of the country shall be such as to enable all the Greek witnesses to come forward without fear."

The Government did not mean that everything must necessarily be entirely quiet and peaceable in the country; but care must be taken that evidence was called for at a time and in a manner which would insure our being able to get the witnesses to come forward without encumbering ourselves with what had been called a guarantee of the British Government. He thought that an offer to remove witnesses whose lives were in danger would be a proper offer to make; and, of course, in such a matter, expense ought not to be considered. The matter should be further inquired into, and, in the circumstances, he trusted his hon. Friend would not think it necessary to press his Amendment to a division. In conclusion, he must express his sense of the ability and moderation with which his hon. Friend the Member for Frome had brought forward the subject.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON, on the understanding that the Government would institute the fresh inquiry as soon as possible, and that they would guarantee protection to the persons required as witnesses, begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

## TREATY OF BERLIN—ROUMANIA.

### OBSERVATIONS.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL rose to call attention to the sanction given by the Congress to the seizure by Russia of Roumanian territory contrary to the will of the people of that Country, and to the need of securing the real administrative autonomy of the provinces restored to Turkey by guarantees at least equal to those deemed necessary by the Conference at Constantinople. He maintained that a robbery had been committed upon Roumania, and that Her Majesty's Government should not have sanctioned that robbery. It would have been perfectly competent for the Government Representatives at the Congress to have told Russia that the matter was entirely outside their province. What course, he asked, did Russia take previous to the Congress? Under the Treaty made between Russia and Roumania on the 16th of April, 1877, His Imperial Majesty of All the Russias undertook to maintain and to cause to be respected the political rights of the Roumanian State as resulting from internal laws and existing Treaties, and to protect and defend the integrity of Roumania. That agreement having been made, as soon as the war was over, or before it was concluded, Russia announced her intention to seize a portion of that territory which she had guaranteed; and he regretted that Europe should have countenanced it through the Treaty of Berlin. He had always had the idea that this country should endeavour to maintain friendly relations with Russia; but the truth was—and it was well to recognize it—the Russian Government was essentially Oriental in its character, and only kept Treaties as long as they suited its purpose. It was of great importance to Russia that it should be able to say that it was acting on a European mandate in taking possession of Bessarabia. It was also matter for regret that Her Majesty's Government should have restored the provinces South of the Balkans to Turkey without requiring adequate guarantees for their good government. In this respect, Her Majesty's Government, it seemed to him, had altogether departed from the position taken by their Representative at the Conference of Constantinople. The Bulgarians, he knew, were not popular at present; but, from having passed some time among them, he could say that they had many good qualities as a people. He maintained that they ought not to be judged by the reports of Sir Austen Layard, which were of a strongly pro-Turkish character. According to trustworthy reports, the so-called Bulgarian atrocities were by no means so serious as our Ambassador at Constantinople had represented them to be. He rejoiced that a good deal had been done for the freedom of North Bulgaria; but he doubted whether it had deen done in the best way. The guarantees were not sufficient, in his opinion, and he protested against the intention which seemed to be established of allowing the people to be domineered over by the Turkish troops. It was the duty of the Government to see to that state of things, and they should have secured those ample guarantees which the Powers favoured. With respect to the provinces of Turkey in Europe not included in Eastern Roumelia, what had they to rely upon for the administrative autonomy and good government which had been promised? They had simply to rely upon the provision of the Congress of Berlin, which provided that those provinces should have Constitutions founded upon the model of the Cretan Constitution. He could not help thinking, however, that no more unfortunate model than that of Crete could have been selected. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had shown what a failure and a farce the Constitution of Crete had been. Believing, as he did, that it was out of the question to expect that the Turks would surrender any territory to the Kingdom of Greece unless they were forced to do so, his view had always been that Her Majesty's Government should have striven to provide for these provinces an effectual administrative autonomy, whereby they might eventually arrive at freedom and independence. It was time that the door was to a certain extent left open, and he trusted that Her Majesty's Government might still deal with this question in the interests of freedom. But it was none the less true that the question of the constitution of these provinces was to be referred to a European Commission, of which the Turcophile Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) was a Member; and that fact did not furnish them with any ground for a sanguine hope that liberal treatment would be extended to the Christians. He should be extremely glad to receive an assurance from Her Majesty's Government that they were resolved that the autonomy to be given to those provinces should be real.

MR. E. JENKINS thought it was hardly right that the hon. Member for Christchurch should have been attacked on the Opposition side of the House for his Turcophile propensities; because it was to be hoped that in any case he would behave like an English gentleman, and would be prepared to carry out fully the desires of Her Majesty's Government. Therefore, however sincerely his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy might have spoken in regard to that hon. Gentleman, he (Mr. E. Jenkins) was anxious that it should not be supposed that there was an unanimous feeling of distrust or suspicion on that side of the House in regard to the manner in which the hon. Member for Christchurch would discharge the terribly responsible duties which had been assigned to him. With respect to the retrocession of Bessarabia to Russia, he was bound to say that, looking at the whole facts of the case, he did not see how Her Majesty's Government could have taken any very decided stand on that question. The injustice, if any, which was thereby done was very small indeed. The cession of Bessarabia to Russia was accomplished in 1816, under the Treaty of Bucharest, and it was confirmed by a subsequent Treaty in 1827. From 1816 to 1856, Russia had possession of the whole of Bessarabia; and the object in view in taking in the latter year of this small slice of territory from Russia was simply to drive her back from the Pruth and the Danube. That might have been good policy; but, on the other hand, everyone must feel that it was no unnatural thing that Russia should desire to effect this rectification of her frontier when the opportunity arose. Then came the question of the Treaty between Russia and Roumania for preserving the territory of Roumania. In the Memorandum obtained from the

Czar by Colonel Wellesley, it was distinctly stated, if his memory served him right, that the retrocession of Bessarabia was to be one of the conditions of peace. Looking at the matter abstractly, there would not appear from the arrangement entered into by Russia and Roumania at the outset of the war to be anything dishonourable in the desire of Russia to get back this piece of territory which she lost in 1856, and for which Roumania had not shed a single drop of blood.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD said, he agreed with the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) that the appointment of the hon. Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) might be taken as an intimation that the Government was desirous of favouring Turkey as much as possible. As to Bessarabia, it might be quite natural that Russia should desire to get it back; but she should have done so with the goodwill of the country that possessed it. As it was, Russia had acted dishonourably, and violated the first principles of justice in taking Bessarabia from her Ally.

MR. A. MOORE said, he had given Notice that he should call the attention of the House to the condition of pauper children in Irish workhouses, and make a Motion on the subject; but he was quite willing to postpone it, provided the Chancellor of the Exchequer would engage to keep a House for him to-morrow. He had already put off the question to meet the convenience of the Government.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would do his best to keep a House for the hon. Gentleman.

MR. COURTNEY said, he also had a Notice on the Paper which would take only a very short time. It was on the subject of the Transvaal, and representatives from the Transvaal were now here anxious to have it discussed. He would not bring it forward now, provided the Government engaged to keep a House for him to-morrow.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would be glad to keep a House for the hon. Gentleman to-morrow if it were possible; but it should be understood that the question in which the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) was interested should have precedence of the Notice of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney). It would be very inconvenient not to take the third reading of the Appropriation Bill to-day, as in that case the House could not adjourn on Friday, and Members would be detained a day longer.

MR. ONSLOW gave Notice that he would call the attention of the House to the subject of Afghanistan to-morrow.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

## BISHOPRICS BILL.—[*Lords.*]

(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[BILL 197.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, "That the Bill be now read the third time" (Queen's *Consent* signified).

MR. E. JENKINS said, he must reiterate his protest against the measure. The more he had communication with members of the Church of England, the more convinced he was that the Bill was thoroughly unpopular with some of what he might call the most able and active section in it. The Bill was based upon this—that the State stepped into the place of the Church, created bishoprics, and then, through Her Majesty the Queen, appointed them, whether the Church wanted them or not. Such a horrible profanity and anomaly as that would not, he was sure, long be endured by the Christians of this country. He must ask the House to divide on the third reading of the Bill.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 62; Noes 20: Majority 42.—(Div. List, No. 278.)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and *passed,* without Amendment.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Thursday,* 15*th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—East India (Public Works) [No. 208]; Land Titles and Transfer [No. 209].

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading—Committee negatived — Third Reading* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Expiring Laws Continuance *, and *passed.*

*Select Committee—Report*—County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2) [No. 210].

*Third Reading* — Arranmore Polling District (Ireland) * (189); Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) *; Metropolitan Commons * (199); Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (197), and *passed.*

## CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

## EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Read $2^a$ (according to order); Committees *negatived;* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with;* Bills read $3^a$, and *passed.*

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 197.)

(*The Lord O'Hagan.*)

### THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading, read.

LORD DENMAN said, that having, in 1860, opposed and protested against the Wine Licences and Refreshment House Bill for Ireland, he might consistently express his satisfaction at this Bill being ready for its third reading; but, inasmuch as the absence of compensation had been complained of in "another place," he might remark that no compensation was granted by the Forbes-Mackenzie Act for Scotland. At the same time, it must be remembered by their Lordships that the remission of the cost of the licence of one day in seven had been offered to the holders of the six-day licences in England; and, therefore, it would seem only just to grant the remission to those who were deprived of gain by this Bill. Yet those losses might possibly be turned into gains by the receipts from the increased numbers of *bonâ fide* travellers and lodgers on Sunday. The Committee presided over by the Duke of Westminster might take this matter into their consideration, and even if they did not recommend this reduction—which the Government, he presumed, might at any time grant by an Order in Council—he felt sure that the occupants of licensed houses would be greatly benefited by the rest which they would obtain; and the landlords also might lower the rent of hotels and public-houses and refreshment houses, a step which, in one instance, was taken by himself, on the suppression of a licence on his property, with great advantage to the tenant and his neighbours, and with lively satisfaction to himself.

Bill read $3^a$ accordingly, and *passed.*

## ARMY—RECORDS OF MILITARY SERVICES.—OBSERVATIONS.

LORD STRATHNAIRN rose for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the defective state of the records of services of officers of the Army, and, in doing so, said, he was acting in perfect consistency with the principle upon which the system of keeping records of military merit was framed—a principle which he had always advocated and supported from the time that his position enabled him to do so. That principle was one that was inseparably connected with the question of rewards, for it was impossible that the one system should be administered, and the other —the record of services—be neglected. When he was in India, after the Indian Mutiny, he received instructions to re-organize the Native Army in Bengal, the great majority of which—the discipline and efficiency being undermined by the transfer of their best officers to the staff and civil employments, and the anti-military privilege of caste—broke out finally in an armed and general Mutiny. He never missed an opportunity of thanking and rewarding the brave and loyal, but small minority; and he was convinced that the best guarantee for the success of the all-important mission of re-organization of the Bengal Army was the adoption of the principle of military reward for military merit—that reward being the patronage that was at his disposal as Commander-in-Chief for India, and the merit being the tested good services of the Army which had won their spurs under historic and brilliant traditions. He foresaw that this act of military self-denial, this proof of the interest which he took in the welfare of the Army, would increase his personal influence; whilst, on the other hand, the reward for past services and the asssurance that future good service would receive the same just recompense, would encourage the officers, to whom was intrusted the particular duty of carrying out the re-organization; and therefore, in a General Order issued by him, he gave his large military patronage to the officers of the Native Army, the sole condition being that they should deserve it, and it was under this influence the re-organized Bengal Army acquired its efficiency and self-esteem. The success of that re-organization was acknowledged by the Supreme Government, by the Secretary of State for India, and other competent authorities, and also by the valuable evidence of the Native Press. In recording his departure from India, all its journals added that he had kept his word to the officers, and had invariably rewarded military merit. There could not be a better example of the results than was afforded the other day by the military bearing and the spirit of the Indian regiments at Malta, which had responded with such alacrity and such loyalty to the call of their Empress to come to the front at a very critical time. It had been observed that the system of rewards for merit had been accompanied in India by failures. Now, the last attribute that he wished to claim was that of infallibility. A system like that, no doubt, had its shortcomings; but those that had occurred could not be very serious, for he never heard what they were. Only two or three instances occurred before he left India, and they were not unnatural. In those instances, the officers deserved promotion, but were not equal to the responsibility of the higher position. The remedy was not very difficult; the officers were instructed that they would not be promoted until they had acquired more experience and discretion. A mere description of the present system of recording the services of officers would be, he ventured to think, a fitting prelude to a demand for an improved system. At present a record was kept in every regimental orderly-room of the birth, death, entry, exchange, and retirement of the officers of the regiment, with the date of any action, battle, or campaign in which they might have been engaged, with the name of the General-in-Chief commanding. That record, which was accessible to the officers, stated their distinguished services, if any, in the field, and the wounds they received, as well as any mention that was made in despatches, and any promotion an officer might have received for good conduct in the field. But a second record was kept which was of a confidential character—mainly the reports of the general officers inspecting the regiment to the Military Secretary at the Horse Guards of the character and qualifications of each regimental officer, both in the field and in barracks, tested by an examination into the manner in which they performed their various duties. These reports were satisfactory so far as they went, except that the first one for the orderly-room was often too meagre; and in regard to the reports, they frequently had to send them back in order that they might insert the good services that had not been mentioned. With regard to the inspection report, he ventured to repeat an opinion which he had given to Committees and Commissions—that they should only be confidential when they related to matters of scandal not fitted for the public eye, and he thought that it would be fairer and more for the good of the Service that the regimental officers should be encouraged by a more confidential report of their qualifications; while, on the other hand, it would be a useful warning to the careless and inefficient officer, if he knew that there was an unfavourable opinion entertained of him by his superiors. There was a third publication which professed to be a general record of the officers' services, and that was *Hart's Army List;* but its foundation and spirit were equally false, and he ventured to think that there ought to have been long since established an official and responsible record of officers' services, carefully organized and compiled. As to *Hart's Army List,* he had no doubt of that gentleman's good intention; but the compilation was a self-eulogistic voluntary work, with official symbols, but without any official recognition or status whatever. That was the sole public registry of the officers' services, and the consequence of that was that officers in possession of statements of very distinguished services were unwilling to send them to a registry which was absolutely non-official; and, indeed, in his view, it was opposed to the principles which governed all military rules and regulations that officers should, uncontrolled by any authority, send a statement of their own services to a non-official record. One proof of the objectionable tendency of such a publication was the absurdity of some of the articles which formerly appeared in *Hart's Army List*, and to some extent did now. Not long ago, a noble Friend of his, not now in the House, showed him an article, the absurdity of which was perfectly ridiculous, and which certainly caused great amusement. But there was a worse feature attending this publication than simple ridicule, because it often happened that an exaggerated account of the services of officers who had no claim whatever on the country on the ground of the performance of distinguished services appeared in *The Army List* authoritatively as having received rewards and promotion. He had said enough to show that he could not associate himself with Hart and his compilation; but if there had been a responsible military office with the declared object of receiving, and, after examination, publishing them with authority, he should have been happy to have complied with the intimation, and should have considered it greatly to the interest of the officers. But no such office was in existence, and he was himself a sufferer by this system; because, while he could not identify himself, or associate himself, with the records of *The Army List*, he was in possession of records of services in every part of the world, which were quite unknown to his superiors and to his countrymen. He therefore complained that, under the present system, there being no official record, the services of many officers altogether escaped recognition.

Viscount BURY regretted that his noble and gallant Friend had not brought this matter forward at a time when the illustrious Duke the Commander-in-Chief was able to be present; because they would have had that assistance from him which he was at all times willing to give, and which was so valuable when any military question came under the consideration of the House.

Lord STRATHNAIRN said, that he did not know that his Royal Highness (the Duke of Cambridge) could not be present to-day.

Viscount BURY gathered from the noble and gallant Lord that his complaint was two-fold. First of all, that the regimental record of services was insufficient; and next, that the other record of services which went to the Commander-in-Chief was confidential; and further, his noble and gallant Friend deprecated the voluntary records which were sent in to *The Army List.* The noble and gallant Lord said that he himself had suffered from the want of some official compilation, and he inferred from that that his services were not known in the Dominions of Her Majesty. That, however, was contrary to the fact; for everyone knew that his noble and gallant Friend was one of the most gallant soldiers of this country. At the same time, he quite sympathized with his noble and gallant Friend in his desire for an official compilation in which the services to which he had referred could be placed before the public otherwise than through the medium of *Hart's Army List.* His noble and gallant Friend, however, was quite mistaken in supposing that the record of his services was not perfectly well known to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and to the authorities of the Horse Guards. Indeed, his services had always been recognized by the fact that he had been appointed to high military commands, which he had filled both with honour to himself and great advantage to the country. It might be that an official record would be of advantage. He did not know what the terms of the noble and gallant Lord's Motion would be, and, therefore, he had had no opportunity of consulting with the Horse Guards on that point; but the noble and gallant Lord might be assured that he would take an opportunity of making inquiries and communicating with the illustrious Duke, and if any means could be adopted of obtaining a better record of the services of officers of the Army, he would take care that they should be. His noble and gallant Friend had mentioned the details of the records that were already made, and he (Viscount Bury) might refer to the medals given for good services and to the regimental orders, which, however, he admitted were not generally accessible. It was a very difficult thing for a general officer to make an absolutely perfect report; and if it were known that the reports which were made were to be made public, they would not be of that advantage to the Service that they were when they were of a confidential character, because it was obvious that matters which were mentioned in the confidential reports would certainly not be mentioned in the public reports. He did not, therefore, suppose that any alteration would be made in the nature of the confidential reports; but with regard to the other report, and to the absence of an official record in substitution of the voluntary record in *Hart's Army List,* he should be happy to bring the subject before the illustrious Duke.

Lord STRATHNAIRN expressed himself much obliged to his noble Friend, and begged to explain that he was so little aware that the illustrious Duke would be absent upon this occasion, that he had actually addressed to him a letter at the House.

House adjourned at Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past One o'clock.

* * *

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Thursday,* 15*th August,* 1878.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Newcastle under Lyme, *v.* Sir Edmund Buckley, baronet, Chiltern Hundreds.

Public Bills — *Third Reading* — Territorial Waters Jurisdiction [137], and *passed.*

*Withdrawn*—Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) [178]; Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote) * [71].

The House met at Three of the clock.

## *QUESTIONS.*

### ISLAND OF CYPRUS—THE TITHES AND TAXES.—QUESTION.

Mr. E. JENKINS (for Mr. Rylands) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true, as stated in the "Daily News," of August 12th, that the Turkish Government has forestalled the collection of the tithes and taxes in Cyprus for the current year, selling the yield to the farmers and collecting the tithes in advance; whether there is any provision in the Convention of the 4th June which meets this case; and, what steps Her Majesty's Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. BOURKE: No, Sir; we have no reason to believe that the statement quoted in the Question of the hon. Member is correct. The taxes have been collected up to the time that the Island of Cyprus were taken over by Her Majesty's Government; but there is no reason to believe that the collection of the taxes has been forestalled.

### ITALY — DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE POPE.—QUESTION.

Mr. HOLT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether a statement recently made in the newspapers, to the effect that

> "difficulties have arisen temporarily delaying the re-establishment of relations with England desired by the Vatican,"

has any foundation in fact; and, whether there have been any direct or indirect Communications between Her Majesty's Government and the Pope or his Representatives on the subject of diplomatic relations with Rome?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No, Sir; there have been no communication with the Pope or his Representatives on the subject.

### TERRITORIAL WATERS JURISDICTION BILL.—QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in accordance with the view expressed by the Attorney General last Session, any communication had been made by the Government to any foreign Government regarding the Territorial Waters Bill; and, whether any communication had been received from any foreign Government on that subject?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I understand, Sir, that there has been no communication between the Foreign Office and any foreign Governments on the subject of the Bill to which the hon. Member refers.

### INDIA—THE MISSION TO CABUL.

#### QUESTIONS.

Mr. FAWCETT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, before it was decided to send the mission to Cabul, the matter was referred to the Secretary of State for India in Council, and, if the mission has been approved of by the Secretary of State in Council, whether any Members of the Council dissented; and, if so, whether there will be any objection to lay their dissents upon the Table of the House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir; this is not a matter that would come before the Secretary of State in Council. It is one of those matters which are of the same character as those which in former times, under the old Court of Directors, went through the Secret Committee. According to the provisions of the Indian Government Act, all matters which would have gone through the Secret Committee do not go to the Secretary of State in Council, but to the Secretary of State personally; and that, Sir, is the case in this instance.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the mission which is about to be sent to Cabul under Sir Neville Chamberlain has been undertaken at the invitation or with the consent of the Ameer of Cabul; and, whether he can give the House any information as to the causes that led to the cessation of friendly communications with the Ameer in the early part of 1877, and as to the reason for our ceasing to maintain an agent at Cabul?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I have communicated with my noble Friend the Secretary of State for India, and he tells me that we do not at present know whether the Ameer has yet been asked to receive this mission. He did not invite it; but a communication will be made to him from the Indian Government proposing it. With regard to the cessation of friendly communications, that arose from the Ameer himself. It was on his part, not on ours, and it has never been fully explained by him. There were negotiations between Sir Lewis Pelly and an Envoy of the Ameer's, who died in the course of them. We have never had a European Agent at Cabul, nor have we asked for one.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered my Question. My inquiry was with regard to the Native Agent we maintained there for many years, and which we ceased to do after 1876.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am afraid I cannot give a better answer than the one I have given, which was that the cessation of friendly communications arose on the part of the Ameer, and I presume it was in connection with that that we ceased to maintain an Agent. The Agent we originally had there died at that time.

## COAL MINES—THE HOMER HILL COLLIERY ACCIDENT—CASE OF THOMAS SHAW.—QUESTION.

MR. SHERIDAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to a Petition presented to this House, and signed by many hundreds of persons living in the borough of Dudley and its neighbourhood, asking for some further inquiry on the part of the Government into the practicability of recovering the body of Thomas Shaw, which lies in a coal mine called the New Homer Hill Colliery at Cradley, Staffordshire, where he was killed in the performance of his duty; and, whether he will endeavour to give effect to the wishes of the Petitioners, and to the prayer for a speedy and searching inquiry into all the facts of the case?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the last information he had received from the Inspector on this subject was that the mine was in a dangerous state, so that it was not safe to open it. He had directed the Question of the hon. Gentleman and also a Petition he had received on the subject to be laid before the Inspector, in order that further inquiry might be made.

## RUSSIA AND TURKEY—BATOUM.
### QUESTION.

MR. HAYTER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have any information respecting the position of affairs at Batoum, specially with relation to the report contained in the "Daily News" of the 13th inst. to the following effect, viz.:

> "That Dervish Pasha has under his command 25 battalions, including one of Zeibeks. The town itself contains 12 battalions, and two field batteries. The last steamer brought 60 fresh artillery horses. The hills round the town are held by Turkish troops. One ironclad and one wooden frigate are anchored close inshore;"

and, whether the English Consul at Trebizond has informed Sir Austen Layard that the Lazes persist in declaring that they consider themselves under British protection, and that they will hoist the

British flag on the advance of the Russians against Batoum?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, we are aware that Batoum is still held by Dervish Pasha and the troops under his command; but negotiations are going on between the Turkish Government and the Russian Government for its surrender. That is all the information I can give the hon. and gallant Gentleman with regard to that part of his Question. Of course, we do not know how many troops Dervish Pasha has under his command. With regard to the latter part of the Question, I have to say that we have received a telegram respecting a Petition which the Consul at Trebizond has received from the Lazes, stating that if the Russians attacked them they would unfurl the British flag and consider themselves under British protection.

## SPAIN—CASE OF GEORGE WHITE.

### QUESTION.

Captain PIM asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will be good enough, by telegraph, immediately, to cause inquiries to be made of the authorities at Havannah, Cuba, under what circumstances George White, an English sailor, of Gravesend, was imprisoned there now upwards of five months ago; whether any charge has been formally preferred against him; whether, if so, he was confronted with his accuser, or allowed professional advice or assistance; how long the imprisonment, with or without trial, is likely to last; and if the Foreign Office will make a speedy and complete investigation into the case, with a view to the early release of George White?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, in reply to my hon. and gallant Friend, I have simply to state that we have no details with respect to this case; but we are quite certain that Her Majesty's Consul at Cuba will take all the steps that are necessary in the matter. That being so, we do not think it necessary to send a telegram as suggested by my hon. and gallant Friend; but we will forward to the proper quarter a despatch upon the subject.

## POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL — THE LORDS' AMENDMENTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MELLOR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, after this House had insisted on its disagreement to the Lords' Amendments to the Poor Law Act 1876 Amendment Bill, it would have been in accordance with the Rules of Parliament for this House to demand a free conference with the Lords regarding their Amendments to that Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I believe, Sir, that it would not have been in accordance with the Rules of Parliament that this House, after having declared that it insisted upon its disagreement to the Lords' Amendments should have demanded a free conference with the Lords regarding those Amendments. I do not, of course, profess myself to be an authority on the subject; but I understood that you, Sir, the other day distinctly laid down the law upon that point. I observe that in some of the public journals there seems to be some confusion in the report of your rulings; but I apprehend I state them correctly now—that if, in the first instance, before insisting, or instead of insisting upon disagreement to the Lords' Amendments, this House had sent back the Bill with some slight Amendments of its own, it would have been possible then to have proceeded further; but that, having once insisted upon that disagreement, it became impossible afterwards for this House to demand a free conference with the Lords.

## TURKEY—CRETE.—QUESTION.

Mr. MONK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any agreement has been entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Sultan with respect to the future Government of Crete; and, if so, whether he will inform the House as to the nature of the reforms proposed to be introduced into the Government of that island, and state what guarantee will be given that those reforms will be effectually carried out?

Mr. BOURKE: I think, Sir, I had better remind the hon. Member and the House of the paragraph in the Treaty of Berlin which refers to this Question of the reforms in Crete, as I think the House might be misled by the question of the hon. Member, for he mentions the word "agreement." It does not follow from that paragraph that any agreement should be come to between the Porte and Her Majesty's Government on the subject. The words of the paragraph in the Treaty are—

> "The Sublime Porte undertakes scrupulously to apply in the Island of Crete the organic law of 1868, whilst introducing into it the modifications that may be considered equitable."

That is the undertaking on the part of the Sublime Porte, and therefore there is no agreement between Her Majesty's Government and the Porte on the subject. We have, however, received information from Sir Austen Layard that he has had several conversations with the Grand Vizier on the subject, who had shown himself disposed to give full and fair consideration to the representation of the Cretan Assembly on the affairs of Crete.

## NAVY — THE "GANGES" TRAINING SHIP.—QUESTION.

Mr. COLE asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is true, as reported, that it is the intention of the Government to remove the "Ganges" training ship from Falmouth to Portland; and, if so, what are the reasons for such removal?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, the Admiralty have had under their consideration proposals for the removal of the ship from Falmouth; but having received memorials from the local authorities against the proposed change, they have decided to postpone any decision until after the inspection in September. The grounds for the proposed change are that the boys in the ship are nearly all London boys, Cornwall affording scarcely any; that the position itself in which the ship lies is very exposed in bad weather, and the expense of keeping her there is probably larger than it would be at Portland.

## TURKEY—ASIA MINOR—THE LAZES. QUESTIONS.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question with reference to the last part of his answer to the hon. and gallant Member for Bath (Mr. Hayter). He has said that the English Consul at Trebizond has informed Sir Austen Layard — [Mr. Bourke: I said he had received a Petition.]—that the Lazes persisted in declaring they considered themselves under British protection. I beg to point out to the hon. Gentleman that if he leaves it there, it will have a very injurious effect; because it will appear as if the English Government accepted that situation contrary to the stipulations of the Berlin Treaty; and therefore I venture to ask him, Whether the English Government have sent any answer to the telegram? Otherwise, it will appear from his answer, as it now stands, that they are encouraging the belief that the English Government is supporting the Lazes in that pretension.

Mr. BOURKE: I cannot think that my hon. and learned Friend, or anyone else, would believe for a moment that the British Government have undertaken any responsibility with regard to the Lazes. The fact that the Lazes sent a Petition to Sir Austen Layard, saying that they will unfurl the British flag on the approach of the Russians to Batoum, and consider themselves under British protection does not, in my opinion, constitute any obligation whatever on the part of the British Government.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: That is not exactly an answer to the Question of my hon. and learned Friend. I suppose no one in this House, whatever may be felt elsewhere, would, for a moment, think that the Government would accept this responsibility; but what I wish to ask is, Whether the Lazes have been informed that the responsibility will not be accepted, otherwise these poor men may be misled?

Mr. BOURKE: I must remind the House that the Question of the hon. and gallant Member for Bath (Mr. Hayter) was—

> "Whether the English Consul at Trebizond has informed Sir Austen Layard that the Lazes persist in declaring that they consider themselves under British protection, and that they will hoist the British flag on the advance of the Russians against Batoum?"

Therefore, the House will see that the answer I gave was a complete answer to the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and my hon. and learned Friend will admit, as well as the right hon. Gentleman, that the Question they have asked is a totally different Question. I think they may rest perfectly certain that Her Majesty's Government will take those steps with regard to this position which will be equally just to the Lazes and will save the Government against any misapprehension that may arise upon this subject. They will not encourage the Lazes to believe that they are under British protection; and the House may be perfectly certain that Her Majesty's Government will undertake no obligation of the character indicated by the hon. and learned Member.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I am afraid I must ask this Question. What was the date at which the information was received that the Petition had been sent from these men, and whether any answer has been sent or not?

Mr. BOURKE: It is impossible for me to answer that Question off-hand. If Notice had been given, I should have been glad to answer it. The communication was received within the last few days, but I have not got it here.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Surely, Sir, it is a very simple Question. Has any answer been sent? We will not ask any date, but simply whether any answer has been sent?

Mr. BOURKE: We have only received a telegraphic message from Sir Austen Layard stating that this Petition had been received by the Consul at Trebizond. We have not yet got the Petition itself, and, therefore, we could not have answered it.

## ISLAND OF CYPRUS—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.—QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he wished to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has any objection to communicate the figures contained in the very important statement which he made yesterday to the House with regard to the health of the British troops at Cyprus? He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) observed that those figures did not appear in any of the Reports in the morning papers to-day; but he understood that the right hon. Gentleman had said that from 180 to 190 were on the sick list, of whom 56 were attacked with fever and ague. He should also be glad to know, Whether there would be any objection on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to communicate to the Press from time to time as they arrived any statements in detail as to the health of the troops?

Colonel STANLEY, in reply, said, he wished the hon. Baronet had given him Notice of the Question. He endeavoured, as far as possible, yesterday, to give the House the fullest information in his possession in regard to the health of the troops at Cyprus, and, in so doing, he was obliged to read from Papers which had only been put into his hands after he came into the House. He gave the figures as correctly as he could; but a subsequent perusal of them led him to think that they required to be corrected by comparison; and, therefore, to prevent misconception, he thought it best to communicate with the authorities of the Press, and to request that until these figures could be verified, they should be left out. He had not referred the previous day to any private document. He found, however, that the answer he gave yesterday was substantially correct; that although there had been numerous outbreaks of fever of a mild character, there had been nothing severe, and, as a matter of fact, only three deaths had occurred since the troops landed out of a force of 7,000 men. He would be happy, as far as he could, to make public such information on that subject as reached the War Office from time to time.

## CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—IMPORTATION OF CATTLE.

### QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked the Secretary to the Treasury, When the Privy Council will issue the Orders stating from what countries cattle will be allowed to be imported into the interior?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in reply, said, he believed that those Orders had been prepared, and would be issued very shortly. He would take care to communicate with the Privy Council on the subject.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that a meeting of the Privy Council was summoned for tomorrow to prepare the issue of such Orders.

## EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE REPORTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER wished to ask a Question with regard to the Report on Educational Inspection which was issued every year. This was the first time, he thought, that the full Appendix had not been received during the Session. He should be glad to know when it was likely to be presented?

Viscount SANDON, in reply, said, he would make inquiries at the Privy Council Office, and do all he could to have the Appendix issued as soon as possible.

## TREATY OF BERLIN, ARTICLE 18—REFORMS IN TURKEY.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHITWELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the European Commission, constituted under Article 18 of the Berlin Treaty to perform certain duties in East Roumelia in three months, will, notwithstanding that limit of time, have to be prolonged, inasmuch as the Porte is bound under the 23rd Article of the Treaty to consult that Commission upon all schemes of organization which are promised to be made for Crete and various other parts of Turkey in Europe?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that the hon. Member had not quite correctly interpreted the Treaty, particularly with regard to the paragraph which he (Mr. Bourke) had already read to the House with respect to Crete. He thought that paragraph was complete in itself, and the Commission established with respect to Eastern Roumelia had nothing to do with that paragraph. With regard to the other paragraph, which applied to the other Provinces of Turkey where reforms had not been introduced, schemes of organization and reform were to be introduced under the authority of Special Commissions, which would afterwards have to report to the European Commission. It was quite true that if these Special Commissions were not in a position to report to the European Commission at the end of three months, it would be for the Powers to consider whether it was necessary to prolong that Commission.

## POST OFFICE, DUBLIN—PAY OF TELEGRAPH OFFICIALS.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'BYRNE (for Mr. Gray) asked the Postmaster General a Question, of which he had received private Notice, Whether he has received a Memorial from the Telegraph Clerks in Dublin Post Office, handed to the authorities in Dublin on the 23rd of last month, complaining of the inadequacy of their pay, and asking to be placed on the same footing as similar clerks in Manchester and Liverpool; and, if so, when a reply may be expected?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: Sir, no such Memorial has been received in London.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

## TERRITORIAL WATERS JURISDICTION BILL—[*Lords*]—[Bill 137.]

(*Mr. Solicitor General.*)

### THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Solicitor General.*)

Sir GEORGE BOWYER, in rising to move that the Bill be read the third time that day three months, said, it was one which made a most material alteration in the law of England, and which greatly affected the rights of foreign countries over a portion of the seas. He was rather surprised that such a measure should have been read a second time on the previous Saturday, when it was understood that the House was to meet solely for the purpose of discussing the Irish Sunday Closing Bill. It must have been unexpectedly read a second time on that occasion, because his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General, who had charge of the measure, was not present. He (Sir George Bowyer) had also to complain that it passed through Committee when discussion was absolutely impossible—he meant at 3 o'clock in the morning. They were now upon the third reading; and he thought the House would allow him, very briefly, to state certain points of law, which, he thought, ought to be considered by the House before the Bill was passed. In doing so, he would endeavour to take up as little time as was compatible with the importance of the subject. He would divide what he had to say under two heads. First, he should show that the Bill was not necessary; and, secondly, he would endeavour to show that the Bill was a contravention of the law of nations, and was unnecessary, because the law of England, as it stood at present, was fully sufficient without any fresh legislation. He would begin by stating what the law of England on the high seas now was. That portion of the sea between high and low water mark, when not covered with water, was within the jurisdiction of the ordinary coroner; and all that portion of tidal ports, estuaries, and rivers, which was partly inclosed by the territory of England, was within the counties to which it belonged, and was a portion of the realm of England. Beyond the low water mark, and over the whole of the high seas, there was the jurisdiction of the High Court of Admiralty; and offences committed at sea were triable by the Court of Admiralty and the Central Criminal Court. Speaking generally, this was the chief jurisdiction of the Court of Admiralty. The Court of Admiralty, of course, had jurisdiction over all British ships and also in cases of piracy, which were offences against all nations. But the Admiralty Court had never claimed jurisdiction over foreign ships outside those parts of the sea which were partly inclosed by land, and which he had described. He said that the jurisdiction already vested in the Admiralty was fully sufficient to punish all offences committed on the high seas—that was to say, below high water mark—and therefore the Bill was unnecessary. He should be told, perhaps, that the *Franconia* case rendered it necessary that some legislation should take place. That he positively denied. What was the case? It was one of collision between an English and a foreign ship on the high seas—that was to say, within three miles of the English shore; and therefore, under the ordinary law of nations, would be within the international jurisdiction of the country off whose coast it occurred. In that collision an Englishman lost his life, and the captain of the *Franconia* was indicted for, and convicted of, manslaughter. A point, however, was reserved for the Court for Crown Cases Reserved, and the majority of the Judges held that the conviction was bad. He was now told that, on account of the decision, some legislation was necessary—that it showed a defect in the law of England—that it showed a wrong which wanted remedying, as offences might be committed which England could not punish. He entirely differed from such an opinion. If a Frenchman killed an Englishman in Calais, the offence would not be within the cognizance of the law of England, and the Frenchman could not be tried in England, even if brought here. Then it might just as well be argued that the state of the law in that instance was a reason for bringing in the Bill for the purpose of extending English jurisdiction to Calais, or the whole of the French coast, as to say it was necessary to make an alteration because of the *Franconia* case. Instead of, in such cases, trying to extend the law of England, the proper course to pursue was to represent to a foreign country that a British subject had been injured out of the jurisdiction of the English Courts, and call upon the foreign country to deal with the person who committed the offence. It was a well-known principle of International Law that if a citizen of one country committed an offence against a citizen of another, and which could not be considered by the Courts of the country to which the injured person belonged, that was a reason for applying to the Government of the country to which the offender belonged, and requiring the Government to see that he was properly punished. If justice were refused in a case of that sort, that would be a sufficient justification for war. Let the House look at the *Franconia* case. After the conviction had been quashed in England, he believed the captain was tried in Germany, and his impression was that he was convicted. But what was complained of was that he could not be convicted in England. He (Sir George Bowyer) agreed that he ought not to have been, and he insisted that the proper remedy in the case was by representation to the German Government, and not by proceeding in the English Courts. Wherever the English Courts ought to have jurisdiction on the high seas the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court was fully adequate for such cases; and where the criminal law of England did not apply now, there should be no alteration made, as proposed by the Bill; but recourse should be had to the country to which the offender belonged. He maintained that the law was perfectly clear. From time immemorial the law of England had been as he had stated it, and he could not conceive how in 1878 it was only just found out that it was insufficient, and that fresh legislation was necessary. Having disposed of that question, having shown that the law of England was at present fully adequate for the administration of justice on the high seas, he came to his second point, which was that the Bill was inconsistent with the law of nations, and with the rights of foreign countries. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) brought in a Bill which, in substance, was the same as that now before the House, and in a debate which took place on the Bill the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General spoke. He found, in *Hansard*, that the hon. and learned Gentleman was reported as follows:—

> "He admitted that owing to the state of the law, it had been declared by the Court of Appeal, it might be desirable to legislate on this subject; but he thought that before such legislation was embarked upon, it would be wise and politic to consult the principal States of Europe."

In a subsequent part of the speech, quoting again from *Hansard*, he found the hon. and learned Gentleman said—

> "He thought that before we embarked upon legislation it was essential that there should be some sort of agreement among the principal nations of the world with regard to the subject."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxiii. 1402.]

No doubt, the hon. and learned Gentleman saw very clearly that the Bill was one which might be held to infringe the rights of foreign subjects and the liberties of the seas, and therefore he said it ought to be a matter of international arrangement before England attempted to make a law which would be binding upon foreigners. He was ready to admit that there was a general concurrence amongst the nations of Europe that the three-mile zone was within the jurisdiction of the country off whose shores the ships then were. But the question was what that jurisdiction consisted of, and what the nature of that jurisdiction was. That jurisdiction was of a very peculiar nature, and not such as was sought to introduced by this Bill. It was not such jurisdiction as existed in the country, or as might be exercised in ships lying in ports, or creeks, or other partially inclosed portions of the sea. It was such a jurisdiction as might be exercised on the high seas—that was to say, the jurisdiction of the Court of Admiralty which existed now, and which had always been found sufficient for the purposes intended. That jurisdiction must be taken and interpreted as subject to the rights of other countries, and as subject to the freedom of the sea. According to the law of England, every foreigner who was in this country owed what was called a qualified allegiance to the Crown. He owed that allegiance in consideration of the protection which he received from the Crown while he was in this country. If the present Bill passed, it must follow that the crew of every foreign ship passing within three miles of the shore would hold that qualified allegiance to the Crown. It could not be said that the Crown gave them any protection, and yet they would be in the same position as if they were within the realm of England. No doubt, every country had jurisdiction over the seas so far as was necessary for the defence and security of its dominions; but it did not appear that the jurisdiction which this Bill created over foreign ships and foreigners on board them was necessary for the defence and security of the realm. If it could be shown that the defence and security of the realm required that the Courts of England should have criminal jurisdiction over the ships of foreign countries and the subjects of foreign countries on board them, he should then say his hon. and learned Friend had made out a case, and he would offer no opposition to the Bill. But could it be said that if, on board a foreign ship passing within the three-mile zone, a foreign sailor committed murder, the defence and security of England required that the offender should be tried by the law of England? Certainly not; and the real remedy for such an offence was that the man should be tried in his own country. There was a principle established that on the high seas every foreign ship was ex-territorial—that was to say, the persons on board were governed by the law of the mother country. That being so, he said there was no authority, and he defied his hon. and learned Friend to show any authority of International Law, much less of the law of England, to support the jurisdiction sought to be created by the Bill before the House. He would call the attention of the House to what was said on this subject by the Lord Chief Baron in the Court for Crown Cases Reserved, in reference to the *Franconia* case. The Lord Chief Baron said—

> "The right to seize and try in England for an offence committed on the high seas by the foreign commander of a foreign vessel, can, in my opinion, no more exist than the right to seize and try in England any foreigner for an act done in his own country."

Of course the House would not for a moment entertain the idea of passing a law making a man who had committed an offence against a British subject in Calais liable to be tried in England, and yet the Lord Chief Baron said that was exactly the same as trying a foreigner for an offence committed on the high seas on board a foreign ship. If an Englishman and a Frenchman fought a duel in France, and the Englishman was killed, there was no jurisdiction to try the Frenchman in England for duelling. He would only be liable to his own country. The same, if a fatal fight occurred on board a ship within the three-mile zone. The only course to pursue if an Englishman was killed would be for the English Government to make a representation to the French Ambassador, and the man who killed the other would be dealt with by the law of his own country. The Lord Chief Justice laid down very much the same principle as the Lord Chief Baron. The Lord Chief Justice said that by the law of every nation, a ship, when on the high seas, carried the law of its own nation with it; and his Lordship showed that, in such cases as that of the *Franconia*, the three-mile zone was part of the high seas. His Lordship added that the right contended for—that was to say, the jurisdiction of the Courts of England over foreigners and foreign ships—never was the subject of any International Treaty, and there never was a Treaty which gave England the jurisdiction which the Bill before the House would give. Well, as part of his argument against the Bill, he must refer to an answer given to him by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He asked the right hon. Gentleman, whether any communication of the contents of the Bill had been made to foreign Governments, or *vice versâ?* He was told that no communication had been made to, and no communication had been received from, any nation on the subject. He (Sir George Bowyer) considered that a serious matter for the attention of the House. Here it was proposed to give the Courts of England common law jurisdiction over foreigners and foreign ships within the three-mile zone, as they were passing along, exactly the same as if those foreigners were on shore in England. Could the Government legislate in that way? Could they pass a Bill binding upon foreigners? He questioned whether foreigners would acquiesce in or submit to such a law. The Lord Chief Justice of England had said that even if we legislated for the three-mile zone, the law would not be binding upon the foreigner; and he (Sir George Bowyer) thought there was great danger and inconvenience in passing a law which, after all, people would not be liable to. We could pass laws for English people, but we made a mistake in trying to deal with foreigners. The Bill would actually make the three-mile zone British territory—as much as any county in England—and that being so, England could even, under the Bill, prevent foreign ships passing within the three-mile zone. But if we did that, it would be a gross violation of the liberties of the seas, and every nation in the world would protest against it. He had no doubt that if a case came before any of the Courts under the Bill, that they would say the effect of it was to make the three-mile zone English territory. The three-mile zone was a considerable portion of the sea, and to deprive foreign countries of the use of such a portion would never be tolerated. Were we prepared to allow the same jurisdiction in the case of other countries all over the world? Were we prepared to allow, even in the case of China, that a British ship, going within three miles of the shore, was liable to the laws of the country, and for some offence, real or pretended, an Englishman might be dealt with by the laws of the country? We had no right to make any distinction in these matters between civilized France and China or Japan. It might be either of them, and the law given by consent to one country must be meted out to all alike; because, for certain, if England claimed jurisdiction over foreign ships within three miles, foreign countries would do the same over British ships. But he was told that no prosecution was to be commenced under the Bill save with the authority of the Secretary of State, and that was supposed to be an answer to the difficulties he had urged. It seemed to him, to say the least, a novel way to legislate—to pass an important Act, and then say the Secretary of State should consent to everything done under the Act. Was it right or proper that the House should relegate its authority to the Secretary of State, give him the power to do that which was wrong, and then say he acted on his own responsibility, and might take proceedings or leave them alone, as he pleased? If the thing was wrong, the Secretary of State ought to have no authority; and if the Bill provided that which was in accordance with the law of England and the law of nations, let it be passed without any discretion vested in the Secretary of State. But the House must be careful not to pass an Act which was a contravention of the law of nations and of the liberty and freedom of the seas, and then say no harm would be done, as the Secretary of State was to have a veto under the Bill, and nothing could be done without his consent. This was a law affecting third parties—foreign countries—and he insisted that no discretion ought, in such a matter, to be given to the Secretary of State. Then there was another point under the Bill, with which he must trouble the House, as it was one of great importance. He had given his opinion on the point to his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General; but he did not agree with him, nor did the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor), who coincided with the Solicitor General. Of course, he (Sir George Bowyer) had the deepest respect for the opinion of his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor, and for that of his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General; but, at the same time, he must confess that his opinion remained unchanged. He had come to the conclusion that the provisions of the Bill would include foreign ships of war as well as merchant ships. A ship of war was exterritorial everywhere; because, if a vessel of war was in a British port, and an offence was committed on board her, the law of England would have no authority over the offender. The offence so committed on board a foreign ship of war must be dealt with by the law of that country and not by the law of England. What did the Bill provide?—

> "Any offence committed by a person, whether he is or is not a subject of Her Majesty, on the open sea, within the territorial waters of Her Majesty's Dominions, is an offence within the jurisdiction of the Admiral, although it may have been committed on board or by means of a foreign ship."

His impression was that the clause would include a foreign ship of any kind, whether it be a man-of-war or merchant ship. He found, by the Interpretation Clause, that "offence" was defined as any offence within the law of England, and ship as every description of ship. What could be wider than that? And as to a foreign ship, it was defined as "any ship which is not a British ship." Could anything wider be conceived? A foreign ship of war was not a British ship, and, therefore, it must come within the meaning of the Act. He could not see how his hon. and learned Friend could get out of the difficulty. If he entered into any argument on the point, notwitstanding his legal acumen, he would not alter his (Sir George Bowyer's) opinion. He had consulted his noble and learned Friend (Lord O'Hagan), who was one of the highest authorities on the matter, and his noble and learned Friend had said it was quite clear that a ship of war belonging to a foreign Power would be included within the meaning of the Act. That being so, he thought he was justified in mentioning these objections to the Bill to the House; and he hoped, after hearing what the hon. and learned Solicitor General had to say on behalf of the measure, that the House would agree to his Amendment. The hon. and learned Baronet concluded by moving the rejection of the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Sir George Bowyer.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Hardinge Giffard) said, that the hon. and learned Baronet had had an opportunity of fully explaining his views on this subject the other night, when he (the Solicitor General) believed he had used the same observations that he had done on the present occasion.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER: The case came on at 3 o'clock in the morning, and there were only seven persons present.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Hardinge Giffard) said, although that might be the case, it was not his intention to detain the House by any lengthened statement in reply to his hon. and learned Friend. He would only say that the Bill was urgently demanded, that it was a very simple one, and it was rendered necessary in consequence of the decision of the Court for the Consideration of Crown Cases Reserved in the *Franconia* case. He (the Solicitor General) had had to argue that case before that Court for several days, and probably the House would not desire that he should repeat his arguments to them at this period of the Session. The conviction in that case was quashed by a majority of 1; but Mr. Justice Lush pointed out that Parliament had full powers to legislate with regard to offences committed within the three-mile zone. The measure did not interfere with the principles of International Law in the smallest degree; on the contrary, its object and effect would be to bring their municipal institutions into harmony with International Law, and enable them to exercise a jurisdiction which was absolutely necessary for the safety of the inhabitants of this country. By the decision in the *Franconia* case, which must now be accepted as the law of England, the waters washing the shores of this country below low water mark must be taken to be out of their jurisdiction, and consequently the life and honour of any British subject bathing at the sea side—say, of a schoolgirl at Brighton or elsewhere—would be at the mercy of any foreigner on board a foreign ship who chose to take it. But the hon. and learned Member for Wexford had said that in such cases we must apply diplomatically to the country of which the foreigner was a subject, and get that country diplomatically to interfere. Anyone who had paid attention to the decision in the *Franconia* case would see that a foreigner committing a crime one inch below low water mark was out of the jurisdiction of this country. In order to create a jurisdiction, the person committing a crime in the neighbourhood of these shores must be a subject of this country; and the Bill had, therefore, been introduced for the purpose of affording proper protection to British subjects. As to the remark that foreign nations would interfere if this Bill passed, he held in his hand instructions which had been given by the German Government to the commander of a gunboat to take into custody any person not a German who ventured to fish within a distance of three miles from territory of the North German Confederation. That was a proof that that country claimed, like every other, the jurisdiction that was to be made unmistakeable by the Bill This Bill would effect a proper and wholesome alteration of the law, and considering that the noble and learned Lords who had discussed the question in the Upper House had expressed their opinions very strongly in its favour, he was surprised that his hon. and learned Friend should have stated that it violated all principles of International Law.

Mr. MUNTZ apprehended that the passing of the Bill might lead to serious difficulties and complications between this country and foreign Powers; but, at the same time, he thought that some measure should be passed on this subject. The only redeeming feature in the measure, and one he hoped which would be strictly observed, was the provision enacting that no action with regard to the Bill would be taken without the sanction of one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State.

Dr. KENEALY said, that it was much to be lamented that the hon. and learned Solicitor General had not condescended to answer the powerful legal arguments of the hon. and learned Baronet the Member for Wexford (Sir George Bowyer). Nobody could suppose that it was from want of skill or ability. His silence, therefore, remained without explanation. He had, indeed, spoken a few words, but had not in the least grappled with the subject; apparently taken it for granted, as had been so often done on the Treasury Benches, that to bring in a Bill was enough, and that it would be carried through the House, no matter what was said against it. He (Dr. Kenealy) begged very briefly to put the matter before the House as it presented itself to his mind. From time immemorial the law as to the three-mile zone had existed, and not a single instance had been cited where the law had worked any inconvenience. By the comity of nations, if any wrong was done within that zone, for which our own law did not provide, it had only to be referred to the foreign Kingdom of which the wrong-doer was a subject, and the wrong was redressed as a matter of course. In the case of the *Franconia*, it had been stated by the hon. and learned Baronet and not denied, that the sailor who by the law of England was acquitted here for want of jurisdiction, had been tried, convicted, and punished by his own tribunals; and that had always, as he (Dr. Kenealy) understood, been so, and, no doubt, would continue. That being the state of things, of what possible use was that new law? Laws were passed to provide against wrongs; but here there had always been a remedy afforded by foreign States. It was not wise to load the Statute Book with laws that were not needed. The Government, however, seemed to have set their hearts upon that new measure. They passed the second reading at 3 o'clock in the morning, when only seven hon. Members were present; and now they would hardly discuss it, on the plea, of which he did not see the force, that despatch was requisite. He (Dr. Kenealy) was wholly opposed to legislation conducted on such principles. The hon. and learned Solicitor General had offered, as almost the sole apology for his Bill, that Mr. Justice Lush had thrown out some suggestion to that effect, when the case was argued before the full Court. But Mr. Justice Lush could not be regarded as being responsible for that particular measure, which he had probably never seen; and whose provisions might at any time involve them in dangerous complications with foreign States. The hon. and learned Baronet had proved unanswerably that the words "foreign ship" included a ship of war. No legal tribunal could decide otherwise, if the matter were before them. They would decide according to reason and the English language, and shift all responsibility from themselves by throwing it on to this House. Let them suppose, then, an outrage on an English subject, a breach of criminal law, committed by a sailor on board a Russian or United States ship of war, within the three-mile zone. Were they prepared to board that ship of war, and arrest the foreign sailor by force? That was what that Statute authorized them to do. He viewed with apprehension the difficulties into which they might plunge, if they were to carry out such a provision. Yet the hon. and learned Solicitor General had not even alluded to that dangerous possibility. He regretted that the hon. and learned Baronet had promised not to divide the House; if he had done so, he (Dr. Kenealy) should certainly have voted with him.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was quite at a loss to understand upon what sort of a foundation the hon. and learned Baronet (Sir George Bowyer) made an objection to the Bill. The Bill was simple enough, and he believed that any person who had read any International Law would know that it would carry out principles perfectly well settled, and on which no doubt ever existed in the mind of any international lawyer. The effect of the decision in the *Franconia* case was not that the jurisdiction did not exist, but that there had not been a proper machinery created by our municipal laws to carry it out, and this Bill was merely intended to cure that defect. He did not believe that any nation in the world had ever entertained the smallest doubt as to its jurisdiction within the three-mile limit.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* without Amendment.

## CRIMINAL CODE (INDICTABLE OFFENCES) BILL.—[BILL 178.]

(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Secretary Cross.*)

### COMMITTEE. ORDER DISCHARGED. BILL WITHDRAWN.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he understood that it was intended to discharge the Order for going into Committee on this Bill; but, before that was done, he wished to make a few remarks with reference to the Notice given by the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James). It was understood that if the Bill were withdrawn, the Government would refer it to a Royal Commission. That was a course which he thought everybody highly approved. Speaking for himself, he did, and he hoped the Commission would be one whose recommendations might be confidently accepted. The codification of the Criminal Law not only embraced legal questions, but dealt with a number of questions which involved political principles of the highest importance—such as matters relating to religion—

Sabbath observance, the law of conspiracy affecting labour, and many others. It was unnecessary for him to bear his testimony to the admirable work which his friend, Sir Fitzjames Stephen, had accomplished in the draft Bill before the House. Nobody respected that gentleman's ability, or rated it more highly than he did; but in a work of that character they must have the help of different minds; it must be looked at from various points of view, and not exclusively in a legal aspect. In the case of the Common Law Procedure Act, great benefit was gained from having distinguished laymen like Mr. Henley and Sir James Graham on the Commission. In the present instance, he would warn the Government that if they persisted in constituting a purely legal Commission, they would entirely fail in the object they had in view—namely, of inducing Parliament to accept that Bill without discussion, and they would next Session be as far as they were now from any chance of passing it.

Mr. HOPWOOD also impressed upon the Government the absolute necessity of having a Commission large enough to necessary; for without that it would be represent every view, even lay views, if hopeless to pass any such measure as this. It was due to the working men of the country that the Bill had first been drawn up. They were in favour of getting the measure soon; but he was doubtful whether they would be satisfied with the Commission as it was proposed to be constituted.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER also thought that the Commission ought to be wide enough to include men of different views. Instead of that, however, the Commission was to consist of two Judges and the author of the Code himself, Sir Fitzjames Stephen. The Judges would have to do with their judicial duties, and the author of the Code, instead of being a Member of the Commission and voting in reference to the Code, should have appeared as a witness before the Commission. If they wanted men to do useful work, they ought to pay them for it. The Commission ought to have the undivided attention of one or more persons experienced in the practice of the Criminal Law. With regard to the question of the Criminal Court of Appeal, it was proposed to take three Judges from the Common Law Courts to constitute that Court of Appeal. Now, the Judges of the Common Law Courts were already over-worked; and if they wanted a Court of Appeal, they ought to have Judges who had nothing to do but to hear appeals.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Hardinge Giffard) said, that Mr. Justice Barry was to be added to the Commission in addition to the other gentlemen mentioned. The observations which had been made by the hon. and learned Gentlemen in that discussion would receive due consideration; but as to Sir Fitzjames Stephen, whether he appeared as a witness before the Commission, or as a Member of it, his opinion would receive great attention. No doubt, the absence from the Commission of the Lord Chief Justice of England might have been observed. It might naturally have been thought that Sir Alexander Cockburn should have been at the head of the Commission; but it was found that the public duties which he had to discharge were inconsistent with the continuous work which this Commission would have to discharge, seeing that it would sit at the beginning of November and proceed *de die in diem* until its work was completed. The appropriate task of the Commission would be that of getting the Bill into "ship-shape" order that it might be presentable to Parliament. The wide questions mentioned by the hon. and learned Gentleman would be properly discussed by Parliament. Parliament would be saved by the Commission from having a number of technical Amendments barring the progress of the Bill; but he did not see why Parliament should abrogate its functions with regard to the questions embraced by the Bill. He begged to move the discharge of the Order for going into Committee on the Bill.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the Government would never succeed in carrying the Bill next Session, unless they considerably modified the Commission in the direction suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford. He, therefore, hoped they would give effect to the suggestions that had been thrown out.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order for Committee read and *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

## PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Bourke.*)

## NAVY—H.M.S. "EURYDICE."

### OBSERVATIONS.

Lord CHARLES BERESFORD rose to call attention to the circumstances attending the raising of H.M.S. "Eurydice."

Captain PIM asked, if the noble Lord was in Order in referring to this subject, seeing that a court martial was about to sit upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the noble Lord was quite in Order.

Lord CHARLES BERESFORD said, he was extremely sorry to detain the House, even for one minute, at that late period of the Session; but the subject he wished to speak about was really so important a matter to the Navy generally that he must ask the House kindly to listen to him for a moment. He had been purposely keeping the matter back till the vessel should be floated; but it was obvious there could be no further delay. The universal feeling, both at home and abroad, was, first of all, that the naval people had been much longer than they ought to have been about the raising of the ship; and, secondly, that a private firm could have done the work much better and quicker. It was to defend the naval authorities against those accusations that he brought the subject forward; for they naturally felt very sore upon the point, as, in fact, did the whole Service. The point the court martial had to inquire into was the loss of the vessel, and did not not touch the one he was bringing before the House—namely, the raising of it—therefore, the slur would remain all the same. The *Eurydice* went down on March 24. Almost immediately it was decided to raise her, and the Press started the theory it was a very easy matter. Any amount of suggestions were offered by many people, nearly all theories. The Admiralty left the whole matter in the hands of the Dockyard Admiral at Portsmouth (Admiral Foley), and gave him an order to raise the vessel. He called together all the heads of Departments at his disposal at the Yard—namely, the Chief Constructor, the Master Attendants, the Chief Engineer, and others. The matter was talked over, most carefully considered, and thought out. The Admiral decided on a plan of lifting her with jewels and toggles; and from that day to this, with the exception of the first temporary lighter trial, the plan had remained exactly the same in every particular. Since the first attempt was made, there had been 17 failures, and what did a failure mean? A failure meant detaching the wreck from the lifting vessels altogether, all the pendents and purchases to be brought to afresh for putting down again—in fact, the whole of the laborious and delicate plan to be re-commenced. It was enough to break all their hearts, everything to be got ready so often. Everything was calculated most accurately; but it wanted one thing to make certain success — fine weather. On no single occasion did they get fine weather till she came out of the hole. The whole of the delay was simply an accident of weather. The wreck lay about three-and-a-half miles from the shore, in mid-ocean, in 75 feet of water, in a tideway that only ceased running one way or the other for 27 minutes each turn. The tide ran at the rate of 5 knots an hour. The divers who had to place the toggles and jewels could, consequently, only work 54 minutes out of the 24 hours, and that only with the weather permitting. The tide rise was only 12 feet, and the hole the ship had made was 12 feet, so she had to be actually lifted from the ground over 12 feet to clear her from the bank she had made. This was done by sinking the lifting vessels. The draught of the lifting vessels had to be increased 4 feet, and after pinning down and pumping them dry, the difficulties were enormous. They had 400 tons to lift over 12 feet to raise her out of her bed, and they were entirely dependent upon the weather, as she was in the open sea. The slightest breeze, not even a fresh one, would cause a swell, and as there were four vessels employed as lifters, it would raise one before the other, so that the immense strain would not come equally among them, and something must part, either pendent, purchase, or toggle. Therefore it was imperative to have quite calm weather and a perfectly smooth sea. He had now, he hoped, shown that the *Eurydice* could not have been raised out of her bed one minute before she was. After once getting her out of her bed, it was easy enough to float her along by shifts and shortening the pendents; but even after she was in 22 feet of water in Sandown Bay bad luck nearly overtook them again, as a gale sprung up from the southward and eastward, which, if it had continued, must have broken her up. The Admiral lifted her again and brought her round to St. Helen's, which made a total distance of six miles. The last part of the distance she was carried; she must have weighed nearly 600 tons, as she was more than half out of the water. Naval officers considered that the raising of this ship was one of the most remarkable things ever accomplished. A wreck had never before been raised in 12 fathoms of water with a five-knot tide. Now, as to the point as to whether a private firm could have raised the wreck, which was generally preached as a better and a quicker expedient. The wreck was within 11 miles of the largest and best found Dockyard in the world, the Admiralty had at their command not only the Admiral and all his most experienced officials and heads of Departments, but everything that could possibly be wanted, both in skill and appliances. The total value of the plant that was used, and without which the *Eurydice* would be now where she foundered, he made out to be over £150,000. There were six tugs, a steam lighter, four lighters, two corvettes, four coal hulks, and 230 men, all under discipline, consisting of fitters, shipwrights, riggers, seamen, engineers, and divers, all working under their different heads of Departments under the Admiral. What private firm or six private firms could have placed such a plant on the spot? There was no narrow-mindedness in the matter either; as in the most important matter of all—that was, the divers—out of the seven employed—and they were the men who really brought the wreck to the surface—three were from the private firm of Siebe and Gorman, so that, in the only matter there might have been a doubt about, men were used foreign to the Service. He was there himself nearly all the time from the day the wreck was first lifted till yesterday, and he could testify to the immense difficulites, the laborious, and even revolting, work the officers and men engaged had to go through. There was no doubt that a popular sentiment prevailed in favour of endeavouring to raise the ship which rendered it absolutely necessary that everything should be done by the authorities to get her up; when once it was undertaken, it became a national anxiety that it should be raised. One word about the loss of the unfortunate ship. It was generally believed that it was caused by want of seamanship. He ventured to say it would have occurred to any man under the same circumstances. Captain Hare, poor fellow, was one of the best seamen England had. He was specially picked for his duties on that account; while, with regard to what had been said as to the rest of the officers not being so good as they might have been, they were also all picked men. Then, again, it was said that the ship was crowding on too much sail; but as the ship was under the lee of the land the squall was never seen, else the usual precautions would have been taken, such as letting go sheets and halliards. She was hove at once upon her beam ends, and the men could not get up from the lee scuppers to let go the necessary ropes. A good deal had been said about the lee ports being open and too much sail on the ship. The lee ports were always left open in a smooth sea. It was the weather ports that were closed, as the wash and spray all came from the windward side. Any officer would have cracked on also under the circumstances with a smooth sea and a falling glass, and his port close by. Captain Hare wanted to drop his anchor before the gale came on, and before night set in, instead of beating about all night in such a dangerous locality. He (Lord Charles Beresford) had his own idea as to why the sail was not shortened before. To speak plainly, the very painful affair was a pure accident, just as much as would have been the running off the line of an express train. The deck clock was stopped at one minute to 4. The ship's company were piped to supper at seven bells. They never in the Navy turned the men up in their meal hours. He himself, as officer of the watch, had lost spars and sails by holding on a few minutes because the men had not finished their time. The men were at supper, as would be seen by their mess traps and the tea leaves in the basins, and all the bodies were in their right rig. Captain Hare meant, he believed, to turn the hands up, and shorten sail at 4 o'clock. The few minutes lost the ship, in his opinion. The squall, an awfully heavy one, struck her, and she took a tremendous quantity of water over her lee gunwale. It hove her under water. She was going at a great pace, and he believed she sailed to the bottom; she certainly was moving at a great pace when she struck the bottom, as her false keel was astern of herself on the bottom. He himself saw the bits and the belaying pins, and not one single rope was let go. He was sorry to hear, a few nights ago, a slur cast upon Captain Hare by the hon. Member for Falmouth (Mr. D. Jenkins). He could assure the hon. Member, although there was no doubt that what he had said he felt to be in the performance of his duty, that his observations would cause far more pain to the old messmates and shipmates of Captain Hare that he would ever know. From his own personal experience, he (Lord Charles Beresford) could state that Captain Hare was a splendid seaman; there could be no better; nor was there one who had more consideration for his men or for the lives the Admiralty intrusted to his keeping—in fact, it was, in a roundabout way, his kindness to them that really prevented him turning the hands up before their time, and so the ship foundered before he could do anything.

MR. D. JENKINS said, he was very far from intending to give any just offence to anyone in the observations he had made on this subject. He had brought forward the matter simply from a sense of public duty. He must, therefore, express his regret that anything he said had wounded the feelings of any officer in Her Majesty's Navy. Nothing was further from his intention than to express any direct opinion on the immediate cause of the catastrophe. He agreed in most that had been said by the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Charles Beresford); but having carefully listened to his remarks, he could not understand how the accident could have occurred under the circumstances he had related to the House; and he adhered to the opinion that Captain Hare was not on deck at the time the squall struck the *Eurydice*, nor was any experienced officer there at the time. He had been shipwrecked himself on two occasions, and each time he had found his recollection of what had happened to be so confused, that it was in no way to be relied on. He, therefore, thought that the two sailors who were saved, and who had said Captain Hare was on deck, were mistaken. The primary cause of the loss of the ship was, he believed, that she was not sufficiently ballasted when she left Portsmouth Dockyard on her last voyage. They depended exclusively on water ballast, and the ship was notoriously a very crank one. Unless she was sailed with the greatest skill and caution, in carrying canvas disaster was sure to follow. He only hoped, upon investigation, it would be found by the court martial that he (Mr. D. Jenkins) was in error, and that the ship was an inevitable loss through perils of the sea; but he was certainly of a contrary opinion.

MR. BENETT-STANFORD believed that the cost of raising the *Eurydice* would very far exceed the value of her carcase, and he thought it would have been much better, and certainly much less painful to the feelings of friends, if she had been blown up and the bodies collected before they were in the state in which they were discovered. With regard to any blame which might be thrown on Captain Hare and the other officers, he trusted that the public would reserve their judgment till after the court martial. He believed no blame attached to anyone, least of all to Captain Hare.

DR. KENEALY said, that the Admiralty ought to feel deeply indebted to the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Charles Beresford), who had come forward to whitewash its numerous officials. The Admiralty itself, like the unfortunate ship, had got into "a hole," and the noble and gallant Lord, with all the courage and chivalry of his country, was working hard to drag them out of it. He thought, however, that the whole of the proceedings connected with the *Eurydice* had been disgraceful to the Admiralty, and were not calculated to raise their Navy in the eyes of foreign nations. What were the facts? At 3 or 4 o'clock, on a bright afternoon in the month of March, the *Eurydice*, sailing within sight of land, all of a sudden went to the bottom with 500 men on board. She was not alone on the waters; there were many other vessels around her; but no accident happened to any one of them. Sailors in those ships, landsmen in the Island, saw her, and wondered what she was about. She was loaded with sails; all her ports were open. The weather had been squally, and almost everyone anticipated danger for the ship. Only those who were on board seemed fool-hardy, and defied the elements. Well, she sank. And what then happened? The noble and gallant Lord had told them, and he was willing to accept his version, though there was a different impression abroad. The Portsmouth officials met, and all agreed upon the proper and best mode of raising the sunken ship. But a whole month passed before they actually did, or even attempted to do, anything. During this time, the ship made for herself that 12-foot hole, of which the noble and gallant Lord had so plaintively told them in his elaborate speech. Was not that a proof of the greatest negligence? Could anything, in fact, be worse? An attempt had been made to account for, or defend it, on the plea that the winds and waves and hurricanes were so prevalent that nothing could be done. He himself had no personal knowledge of the locality; but he had spoken with several naval men, and all ridiculed the idea of the continual bad weather which it was pretended prevailed in Sandown Bay. He himself did not believe in the existence of typhoons all the summer round, in that particular bay, though if he were to credit the Admiralty reports that appeared in the papers, there was hardly ever anything else. But did the misconduct of the Admiralty end there? By no means. After a considerable lapse of time, the officials set to work, and all their hawsers snapped like threads. Now, the Admiralty had all the means and appliances of England at their back. They received unlimited sums of money; yet it would seem that they had no hawsers of any value when they thus failed on trial. What would foreign nations think of them, or of their Navy, when they learned these things? Five months and more had passed, and they had accomplished hardly anything, but to pull the ship to pieces; and hence the tales of storms and tornadoes, which in his judgment were merely fables, invented to cover our shame at failure. Allusion had been made to Captain Hare, and he did not wish to say anything against him. He had been praised highly as an almost perfect officer; and this must, of course, be accepted, for it was a well-known historical fact that jobbery, corruption, nepotism, and ignorance had never prevailed at the Admiralty. It was an Establishment with which all who were connected were absolutely without fault. This thing, however, he could not avoid saying—that all the mercantile captains who were making for land at the time when the *Eurydice* went down, saw danger before them, and made ready to meet it. Forewarned, they were also forearmed; but Captain Hare alone failed to see danger, or to take precaution. He sailed along in a stiff wind with all his ports open. In the tropics, it was usual to have all ports open, for the sake of air; but surely to do so last March, on the coast of England, was wholly rash and reckless! It was like the conduct of the Portsmouth officials in raising the wreck, who sought to drag her out of "the hole" by attaching toggles to the masts—which they pulled out in no time. This was as if they sought to remove a house, *en bloc*, by attaching hawsers to the chimnies. They had now raised the ship, at an expense, perhaps, of £15,000; and when she was broken up, as she must be, for fire-wood, she would not fetch £150. He considered that a public scandal, and a national disgrace.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I am sure, Sir, the House will acknowledge that honour and credit are due to the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Charles Beresford) for the spirit in which he has spoken of this lamentable catastrophe. I feel, notwithstanding the remarks of hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the work which has been done by the authorities at Portsmouth is a work which reflects great credit upon them. It was a work of extreme difficulty, the like of which had not been attempted by any men, or any body of men, possessing resources at all approaching to those of the Admiralty. As to the time that has been occupied in raising the *Eurydice*, the House will probably remember there was a case in which a ship went down in smooth water in the harbour of Holyhead, the depth being nine fathoms, or 54 feet. The

*Edith* was the property of the London and North-Western Railway Company, which possesses resources second only to those of the Government, and was not hampered by routine, or any other considerations, as to the use of the best means to raise the vessel; and yet it took the Company two years to raise it. I refer to this, because the hon. Member opposite (Dr. Kenealy) has stated that he had no personal knowledge, and I am sure he would not wish to make a misrepresentation of the facts; but he has spoken in a manner which he will probably regret when he becomes acquainted with them. No person who had a knowledge of what he was speaking about could have used the terms the hon. Member has. It is not a fact that hawsers have given way, nor that sailors who really have a knowledge of what they are speaking have used the term which the hon. Gentleman has made use of. I wish to say that we do thoroughly and cordially appreciate the work which has been done in the Dockyard; it is a work which has been accomplished under circumstances which have been unusual. Although there have been no typhoons, there have been very high winds at the Isle of Wight, and it is a fact that divers, who are used to work of this kind, and whose lives are of some value, and those who employ them, did think there was danger, and we did not think it necessary to insist on the divers going down when the state of the sea would have endangered their lives, and added to the catastrophe we all deplore. Persons who are competent to express an opinion, and who know the circumstances, admit that the work could not have been done more rapidly. It is not a work which is undertaken every day; it is not a usual thing to raise ships from the bottom of the sea; and I hope, so long as I am at the Admiralty, I may never have such a task to undertake again. As to the question whether the vessel should have been raised or not, I could not have undertaken the responsibility of blowing it up with the remains of gallant men in it. There was a universal feeling that we ought to make the attempt to raise it; it might be called a mere sentiment; but, whatever it was, I think, out of regard for the friends and relatives of the deceased in a grievous national misfortune, that it ought to have been complied with, and we cannot say that the labour and the money spent in raising the vessel have been thrown away. It is probably a fact that the vessel will be worth less than the money spent in raising it; but the feeling which has been satisfied deserves consideration on the part of this House; and I believe I have done no more than my duty in sanctioning the expense. I heard the remarks of the hon. Member for Falmouth (Mr. D. Jenkins) with pain. I cannot believe that anyone would desire to cast a slur on Captain Hare; but there cannot be a doubt that the remarks which fell from him would have that effect upon the minds of some men. We have it on the best authority that Captain Hare was on deck when the ship was struck; it certainly was his duty to be; and there is no ground for saying he was not where he ought to have been at such a time and in such circumstances. [Mr. D. JENKINS: I said in charge of the deck.] I think the captain must have been in charge of the deck at the time. It would be his duty to be there, and to suppose that he was not there is to suppose something exceedingly injurious to his reputation. I endeavour to avoid expressing any opinion at all on the circumstances of the disaster. It is our duty to investigate them in the best way we can by a competent court of naval officers, and we have waited until we have the ship up to find out precisely the position she was in when she was struck. I, therefore, do not think it right to express any opinion either as to the officers or the circumstances themselves; but I repeat, with the most complete confidence, I am justified by his service as a whole, by all who knew Captain Hare, in asserting that, up to the time of this accident, he was an officer on whom the most complete reliance could be placed—a man of great ability, knowledge, judgment, and discretion in the handling of his ship and in dealing with men. Rightly or wrongly, he was selected by my Predecessor—rightly, as I believe—because he had peculiar qualities for dealing with boys. When I had the pleasure of seeing him, six months before the accident, I was struck with the great intelligence he displayed, with the happy condition of the ship, and with the most cordial relations which appeared to exist between him and the officers. So far as

I know, no ship ever left these shores with a better crew, with a more experienced captain, or with better men qualified to work together in the training of seamen.

## POOR LAW (IRELAND)—PAUPER CHILDREN IN WORKHOUSES — INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

### OBSERVATIONS.

MR. ARTHUR MOORE, in rising to draw attention to the condition of Pauper Children in Irish Workhouses, and to the necessity of taking steps to improve their condition, especially in the matter of industrial training, said, that a Report had recently been presented to the Government, and he presumed they would take action on that Report during the Recess. In "another place," a noble Lord introduced a Bill in which he was much interested, which related to the Commission. He presumed that some consideration would be given to the matter during the Recess, and that was why he now troubled the House with a few facts. He did not wish to attack existing Boards of Guardians. His belief was that in Ireland the Boards of Guardians did their duty as fairly as they could, and he had always found them willing to do all they could for the children. The fact was that thousands of children were distributed in small numbers through the Irish workhouses. The effects of that system were these. He believed that under the present system of workhouses, self-respect and self-reliance were destroyed, and that idleness and debasement and a lowering of the moral tone were the results. Before he proceeded further, he must admit that there was a great difference in the workhouses in Ireland. He believed that some were upon the whole pretty well managed; but he was sorry to say, from his own experience as one who had watched the question somewhat closely, that there were very great difficulties to contend with, which, he hoped, in time would be removed. He wished to draw attention to the history of these Irish workhouses. The first thing that happened when a man entered was that he was supplied with a suit of clothes, and they might read a mile off, on his jacket or on his cap "pauper" of such-and-such an Union. This was an unnecessary aggravation. He believed it did not exist in this country, and it was very objectionable to the lower classes who were obliged from poverty to seek those places. The pauper was then thrust into a common bath used by many, and, judging from the amount of opthalmia that prevailed, it was fair to infer that many came out not so well as when they went in. The pauper was fed from a common plate with many others, and he had seen them without any plate at all. In some workhouses, he believed, there still existed the practice of requiring them to drink out of a vessel chained to the table, as if they were robbers. They were kept a little short of starvation; they could not be allowed to starve, because the Guardians would render themselves amenable to the law; but short of that, the means of life were dealt out in a most niggardly way. In some workhouses, indeed, the food was so bad that it could not be of any service to the children. At some of the workhouses, he had heard that it was the custom to turn the children out at the early age of 10 years, when the harvest came on, to any farmer who would take them and give them their food. They would stay with him a short time until he did not care to keep them any longer, and then they would go to some other farm. They spent the winter in the workhouse, and endeavoured to re-learn what they knew before; so that really no one had any care or regard for them, and there was no practical supervision over them when they were out of the workhouse. He knew that, theoretically, the relieving officer was supposed to exercise supervision; but he knew also that, practically, those overworked officers could not exercise any supervision. The child returned to the workhouse, where, he feared, the system that prevailed would not contribute much to his welfare. It was a system where there was no proper supervision, where they mixed and mingled a number of boys and men, and where the examples were such that they might corrupt the whole lives of these boys. It was, therefore, perfectly necessary to have proper supervision. On one occasion a small boy, seven years old, had been severely flogged. He was brought before the Guardians, who could not discover by any means who had flogged that boy. He might have committed some offence, and he might have deserved it; but the Guardians ought to have had some knowledge of who had performed that punishment on the boy. It was done in the middle of the night, and no information could be got on the subject. The reason of that was that the whole supervision of these boys, in common with the teaching, was left to one man who, when wearied and exhausted by the work of the day, was unfit for the supervision of them at night. Under these circumstances, they ought to give an industrial training to these children to fit them for their future life. He had looked in every direction, but he found that in no sense were boys and girls in Irish workhouses prepared in any way for their future. Six might be learning the trade of a shoemaker and two tailoring, making 2, 3, or 4 per cent. He had no hesitation in saying that industrial training did not exist. He did not see why this system should prevail. It was nothing short of a penal system; it was not relief. He considered the whole system was a mistaken one. He could well understand that the system should be made disagreeable to the adult pauper who was an idle vagabond; but in the case of a child, pauperism was his misfortune rather than his fault. There was another side to this question that was thoroughly recognized by the naval authorities, and that was the absolute necessity for the separation of children from adult paupers. Another of the evils of Irish workhouses was this—that a great many of these young children were contaminated from mixing with adult paupers. In many cases their parents were quite unfit to associate with them. He would read three or four lines from the able Report of Mr. Lentaigne, himself a Guardian of the poor since 1838, and Inspector of Reformatories and Industrial Schools, whose name would be received with respect on all questions connected with destitution. Speaking to the Statistical Society in 1877, he said—

> "My knowledge of the working of the Poor Law, since its introduction into this part of the United Kingdom, has convinced me that the cheerless gloom, and degrading influences and habits found in the great majority of our workhouses, are not surroundings proper for the reclamation and training of those children whose infant life has been contaminated and passed in the haunts of vice.
>
> "The pauper, whose adversity or misuse of life has driven him to end his days in a workhouse, is not the proper companion or instructor to form the character of youth. Broken down by adversity or degraded by vice, to him should not be intrusted the duty of imprinting on the weak but impressible mind of childhood a spirit of industry. He is unfit for such an office, and can never teach youth to do otherwise than to cling to charity for support. To prevent the vagrant and friendless child from degenerating into the criminal, far other and higher influences must be brought to bear, and no system short of that pursued in the Irish schools can ultimately be successful."

It was not alone in Ireland that this opinion prevailed. A few weeks ago a most valuable Report was presented to the English Local Government Board by Mr. Henley, Local Government Board Inspector. He was sent out to America to learn what was done for the pauper children in that country. The first State he visited was the State of Massachusetts. He said—

> "The children of this school are by law not treated as paupers, though they come from the pauper classes."

He would read two or three more short extracts as to the necessity for separation. Mr. Henley said—

> "The Legislature of New York, on the 24th of April, 1875, passed an Act to provide for the better care of pauper and destitute children, which made it illegal to commit any child over 3 and under 16 years of age to any poorhouse, unless such child be an unteachable idiot, an epileptic, or paralytic, or be otherwise defective, diseased, or deformed, so as to render it unfit for family care. But such children were to be sent to some orphan asylum, or other charitable or reformatory institution as now provided for by law. And the officers charged with the support and relief of indigent persons were to cause the removal of all children between the ages of 3 and 16, not exempted as above, from their respective poorhouses, on or before the 1st of January, 1876, and to provide for their support and care in families, orphan asylums, or other appropriate institutions, as now provided for by law. This Act was passed at the suggestion of the New York State Charities Aid Association. The reasons which influenced them are stated in the first annual Report of the Committee of this Association on Children, from which I will make a quotation—
>
> 'The fact that the door of a poorhouse must be open to every person in need of its shelter makes it easy to see that it can be no fit place to bring up a child, for it is impossible to separate the different classes of its inmates. The children of a tramp and casual lodger cannot be kept apart from the resident children, and girls just growing from childhood are exposed to bad language and worse example from the vicious of their own sex, who are too often but little older than themselves.'

"To the same effect as the above quotations is the following, referring to Massachusetts, from the twelfth Report of the Board of State Charities:—

'That the best poorhouse is but a bad place for children, no right thinking person will deny. The fact that they have been in such an institution tells against them whenever they go out. The enforced association with older inmates tends to corrupt them and nurture in them vicious habits. It breaks down their sense of self-respect and lessens their sense of self-dependence. Their minds are plastic and easily moulded. They naturally and inevitably come to look upon themselves as a class set apart for support at the public expense. Pauperism breeds pauperism. Through these children, who pass two or three or half-a-dozen years in the poorhouse, the line of pauperism is sure to be extended into the next century. From among them the ranks of the criminal classes are certain to be largely recruited, the road from the almshouse to the prison being one that is easily found.'"

He was not an advocate for detaining the House by copious extracts from Blue Books; but these were so entirely pertinent, that he might be excused for making them. He had spoken of the contamination from mixing the young with the adult classes. Another fact had come across his experience, which would hardly be credited when he mentioned it in that House, and which only need be mentioned to be put an end to. In some of the workhouses, women of the lowest class were employed as select nurses in the hospital. It was not the woman who had one or two illegitimate children; she was sent out to harvest. But it was she who had so many illegitimate children that she had to keep near them all day to attend to them. She was retained, when all other able-bodied paupers were turned out; and to her hands old men and children, and the sick members of the brave Irish Constabulary, who had no other hospital, were committed. In some workhouses, when children arrived at the age of 15, and owing to delicacy, or some other reason, had to stay in the workhouse, they were transferred to the elder ward, where every sense of decency they might have was soon wiped out through their being brought in contact with the vilest paupers. Every temptation was held out to them, by designing emissaries of their own sex, to apply for their discharge at as early an age as the rules would permit, and, when at liberty, without friends to advise or help them, without skilled knowledge to earn an independent livelihood, their ruin was speedily completed. He met with a most extraordinary instance in a rural workhouse. Three years ago, the Guardians of a certain Union made their inspection of that Union, and found it necessary to turn out a great many old and young, on the ground of their being able to earn their own living, instead of being a burden to the nation. Amongst them, they turned out three girls 15 or 16 years of age. These three girls went straight away to the house of the Roman Catholic priest and asked him to get them work, something to enable them to earn their livelihood. He said that was rather short notice; but if they would give him a little time, he would do the best he could. They left the priest's house and applied themselves to infamy and vice, and they remained common prostitutes in the streets for the last 13 years. A friend of his happened to go to a certain Board of Guardians in the North of Ireland. While he was seated in a room, 12 girls came into the room, all of whom were seeking the shelter of the house during their confinement. He trusted these cases were exceptional; but there was one thing quite certain, and that was —whereas, when boys were sent to a reformatory or industrial school, the results of those schools were tabulated; but with the Guardians, the moment the door was closed on an unfortunate child, their responsibility was then at an end. Why should not Guardians be called upon to furnish Returns? He held in his hand two letters; one was from the Chairman of a Board of Guardians in Ireland, who, speaking of his own Union, said that as a general rule, the children brought up in the Union workhouse did not turn out well; they had a tendency to crime of various kinds. That was a gentleman of good position, Chairman of the Union, and a wealthy gentleman. In another letter, a Roman Catholic clergyman, who had been connected with workhouses for 25 years, wrote that he had not known more than half-a-dozen children brought up in workhouses turn out well, and that they were idle, indolent, and unwilling to earn their bread by honest sweat. Now, he would appeal to his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) to take some steps to stop this, what he might call, waste of national strength. The existing practice was something like going to a shop to buy an article that they did not want, because it was at a low price.

He had the honour of introducing a Bill on this subject. Eighteen Boards of Guardians in Ireland petitioned in favour of that Bill. He did not say it was a satisfactory measure. He looked for something much better; but this Bill drew attention to the facts, and showed that some change was required. A resolution was sent from the Roscommon Board of Guardians, which ran thus—

> "That this Board, without committing itself to an expression of opinion as to the merits of Mr. Moore's Bill, desires to put on record that it considers that children who are dependent on public funds for their daily support are by right entitled to such industrial training as is calculated to make them useful members of society in after life; and that it further considers that their retention in workhouses, subjected necessarily to association of a more or less intimate character with persons whose lives, from a social point of view, have proved failures, is calculated to exercise a prejudicial effect on their future career."

This brought him to the two points he wished the House to see. What he asked was, for the Government to support the system of separation of the young from the adult paupers. It would be all very well if they could get a voluntary committee of ladies to carry out internal inspection. That was an admirable system, and he believed that when inspection was properly carried out the Boards would derive considerable benefit. What he asked the Government to do was what had been done in the United States, and what had been done to a less extent in England—namely, to establish large district schools, and take the children out of workhouses, and give them an industrial training. Under present circumstances, a grand opportunity was offered to the Government. Such a change would lead to the amalgamation of Unions and to some reduction in the number of workhouses. Accommodation was provided in Irish workhouses for 147,000; while the average number of paupers was 143,000. This gave as much accommodation as was necessary. In Connaught there was four or five times as much accommodation as was necessary, and in Ulster four times exactly. In a district of the county of Cavan there was eight times as much accommodation as was required. In another workhouse there was 10 times as much as was necessary. The workhouse in the county of Donegal had exactly 15 times as much accommodation as was necessary. These workhouses were kept open at great expense. In the workhouse at Ballycastle the average number on the list was 12 boys and 13 girls; they had to keep a heavy staff for 25 children. It was a monstrous waste of expenditure. In another workhouse there were six boys last year and 11 girls, making a total of 17. In the whole county of Monaghan there were 80 boys distributed over four workhouses. Then, he came to the county of Tyrone, where they had seven workhouses for 150 boys. He would not detain the House by going through the whole of the Return; but what he wanted to ask was that they should collect, in reasonable numbers, of course, the children in those industrial schools, and should give them the same opportunities for learning trades that he had seen given in the industrial schools of the English Metropolis. Let them be prepared for the Army and Navy; a very large contingent of the band boys in the Army were now furnished from the district schools, and he believed in that way a very large number of children were rendered useful members of society. Then, he should like to see the entire penal system abolished. He would treat the children as if they were Christians. Let them have amusements; make them happy and contented, and keep them until they were 15 or 16. They would never be content to fall back upon the old workhouse, after having experienced the happiness and comfort of those district schools. He believed that the most beneficial results would be attained. He would now come to the question of expense, and, in dealing with it, he should be very short. He did not think that the Guardians in Ireland would object to some increase of expenditure, if they saw a good result obtained from it. There might be some additional expense, but he did not think it would be very great. It had been calculated that the amalgamation of Unions would create a saving of £60,000 a-year. He did not know whether these figures were quite correct; but, nevertheless, there would be a very considerable saving. He had estimated the whole cost of bringing up these children on a different system. At present they were costing 2*s.* 11½*d.*

per week per head, and he believed that for 2*s.* per week per head additional, they could be brought up on the system he advocated. That would entail an additional expenditure of £67,000 upon the 13,000 children now in the workhouses. But he believed that the question was one far above expense. He believed the real way to look at it was this—they had a grave obligation laid upon them with regard to these children, and the real question was—Were they discharging that responsibility well, either on behalf of the children themselves, or on behalf of the country of which they were members? He thought he had said enough to show that, so far as the children themselves were concerned, much more might be done. He believed that for the country it would not be a little thing if these children could be made producers as well as consumers, instead of being as they now were, consumers alone; and he believed it would be an economy in the long run to teach these children some means of earning their own livelihood. He appealed upon these grounds to the hon. Gentlemen present, and to the Government, to rescue these children from the career of idleness and worthlessness, if not misery and crime, into which they were going, and to take them by the hand and lead them into paths of honour and self-reliance, and make them a strength to their country instead of a weakness.

Major O'BEIRNE supported the appeal made by the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore). He thought that a fine field for recruiting for the Army and Navy was to be found among the pauper boys; but he must express the hope that if the Government agreed to direct their attention to the point raised by his hon. Friend, they would be careful to prevent any tampering with the religion of the children, which he knew had taken place, in some instances, with Catholic boys.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, he believed the House was under an obligation to the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) for the very able manner in which he had brought that very important question before it. Anyone who took as much interest in the pauper children of Ireland as the hon. Member deserved well of his country, for the extreme importance of the subject could not be over-rated; but it should never be lost sight of that Boards of Guardians were the parties who on the whole had control in this matter, and they could only have suggestions made to them. He ventured to hope that some of the extreme cases mentioned by the hon. Member were altogether exceptional in the administration of the Poor Law system, and that the attention he had directed to the matter would have a beneficial effect. The only Department over which the Government had any control was the Local Government Board, who, after examination, he thought it would be found had certainly not neglected the moral, physical, and educational welfare of the workhouse children. They had always desired that the children should have proper recreation and employment; and in the instructions given to the Inspectors they had directed that special attention should be paid to their condition, and every Inspector, on going the rounds of the workhouses, had to report to the Board how the children were employed, and how many of them were occupied in the various trades. It was also the duty of the Inspectors to see to the girls as well. The House would perceive, therefore, that the Local Government Board did everything in their power to alleviate the condition of the workhouse children; though, of course, if a child was obliged to go into the workhouse, it could not be expected that he would have the same comfort and excellent surroundings of other children. In one of the largest Unions in Ireland—the North Dublin Union—it had been found that a very large percentage of the children brought up there were readily and rapidly absorbed into the general population of the country, and engaged in proper and suitable employments. In very few instances had it come to the notice of the authorities that those children, when so absorbed, had misconducted themselves. The whole question—and especially that of industrial schools—was very important; but in the vast majority of cases it seemed impossible to exclude the children from all communication with the adult paupers, considering that in nine cases out of ten the parents of the children were in the workhouse with them. The Local Government Board had always given the closest and most anxious attention to the subject, and he had no doubt they would continue to do so.

## SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—THE CORRESPONDENCE.

### OBSERVATIONS.

MR. COURTNEY, in rising to call attention to the recent Correspondence between the Transvaal Delegates and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, apologized to the House for bringing the matter forward at that period, and said: There are reasons why I think my course is inevitable, and why I have been unable before this evening to introduce my Motion to the House. In the first place, we have been unable to discuss this question of the Transvaal; because, until yesterday, the Papers on the subject were not printed and in the hands of Members. Had we had the pleasure of receiving them before, I should have hoped we might have discussed the matter at greater length, and in the presence of more Members. I may be asked, why we are not content with the circulation of these Papers? but I am sorry to observe that the journals who have taken any notice of these Papers have contented themselves with printing an extract, or extracts, from the answer of the Colonial Secretary, and have not given their readers any idea of the outside views of the question; so that, if we depended upon that alone, the country would get a very inadequate view of the situation. I think it will always be admitted that the question has gained importance from the fact that the Delegates have come over to this country to lay their case before Parliament; and that it would be, to say the least, impolitic, if they were to be allowed to go back to their own country saying that they were obliged to go back without having any discussion of their grievances in the Houses of Parliament. It would be desirable, on account of the relations between them and ourselves, that there should be some reference to the subject in the House of Commons; and although I promised I would be as brief as I possibly could in introducing my view of the case, I think I should be neglecting altogether my duty if I showed any unwillingness to enter upon a consideration of the question. Now, I do not propose to re-open the exciting controversies that occupied us last year. I do not propose to enter into the fundamental questions of policy which are at the bottom of the action taken last year; but I wish to direct attention to the actual state of things as now existing in the Transvaal, and to ask hon. Members to inquire of themselves what ought to be done in the present state of affairs? In April last year the Transvaal territory was re-annexed to England. I say re-annexed, because, at the Sand River Convention of 1852, we claimed then to exercise control over it. But by the Convention, which was ratified by those whom we may call the ancestors of the present Government, we acknowledged the independence of the Transvaal. But this annexation was justified on these grounds. It was said that the Government of this country was, in the highest degree, dangerous to its neighbours; that the Natives of the territories contiguous to the Transvaal had discovered, for the first time, the feebleness of the Government of the Transvaal; and that it was, therefore, dangerous to our Colonies at the Cape that the Transvaal Government should be allowed to exist in that state of feebleness. Now, as to the question of Sir Theophilus Shepstone. In the Commission given to him authorizing him, under certain conditions, to proclaim the annexation of the Transvaal, he was told to do it with the concurrence of certain authorities. The Lord High Commissioner at the Cape was to be satisfied of the concurrence of the inhabitants of the Transvaal themselves. Well, he did not obtain any formal act of sanction from the Lord High Commissioner, and he had no proof to offer that the inhabitants of the Transvaal themselves were friendly to the annexation; but he certainly assumed that they were thus friendly. Without that the annexation was incomplete, and the first thing that ought to have been cleared up was the action of the inhabitants of the Transvaal. Well, last year a Deputation came over from the Transvaal to see the Earl of Carnarvon, to remonstrate upon what had been done, and to beg that it might be undone. They saw the Earl of Carnarvon, who received them in the most friendly manner, showing them that the Act could not be revoked; but expressing his strong opinion that it was approved by the inhabitants of the Transvaal. He did not assert that that was the condition upon which his approbation of the Act depended, or that if it were disproved he would be content to give backto the inhabitants of the Transvaal their independence. But he did strongly assert that the inhabitants of the Transvaal were willing to assent to the annexation. Well, Sir, the Delegates who came over here were taken aback by that declaration. They themselves were firmly persuaded of the contrary; and when the Earl of Carnarvon offered them some kind of evidence in establishment of his case, they did not know what to do. At all events, they did not complete the instructions given to them when they left the Transvaal. They did not go to other Powers, as they had been desired to do if they failed in England. They went back to the Transvaal, and there reported the result of their mission. Well, when they got back, they were received with some sort of anger, and even suspicion. I rather think there was a feeling among the Dutch inhabitants of the Transvaal that their Delegates had deserted their duty. They could not understand how it was possible for Delegates to come over here and honestly fulfil their duty, and could have failed of success. In fact, there was some sort of belief that the Delegates had been bought over. There was a good deal of anger and suspicion felt; and I think that is an element which must be taken into account in forming a view of the present condition of the Transvaal territory. Well, the Delegates, I think, had no great difficulty in removing that suspicion; but it was at once resolved to take steps to disprove that assertion which the Earl of Carnarvon had made, and upon which he relied strongly, though he did not make it a condition upon which the annexation had depended. They took steps, by canvassing their countrymen and acting by means of a Memorial to the present Secretary of State, to show that, so far from there being a majority in favour of annexation, the vast preponderance of feeling was strongly against annexation. The Delegates met their countrymen, reported the condition of affairs, and, after a discussion, it was resolved to get up the Memorial. Of course, it was necessary that it should be circulated throughout the Transvaal, in order to obtain the signatures of the Dutch farmers. Thereupon the Administrator —Sir Theophilus Shepstone—issued a Proclamation, which shows, I think, in a very marked light, the attitude of his mind in regard to the administration of this country. I should have thought it would have been the clear right of the inhabitants of the Transvaal to have got up such a Memorial, so as to have represented what their views and wishes were. There is no allegation at present of their taking any steps beyond that of demonstrating their views. There is no suggestion of any action of a hostile nature being contemplated in order to enforce their demands. But Sir Theophilus Shepstone issues a Proclamation, which begins with this Preamble:—

> "Whereas the return from Europe of the Transvaal Deputation has been made the occasion, by designing persons, of creating and fostering agitation and alarm by imposing upon the credulity and ignorance of the quietly disposed inhabitants of this country, and of endeavouring, by the illegal use or assumption of authority—such as banding together of themselves into committees for the purpose of misleading the public, and coercing individuals by false representations, threats, and seditious utterances—to cause disturbances in the land, and to bring misfortune upon an innocent people,"

The grammar of the Proclamation is a little obscure. There are the beginnings of a number of sentences, and no endings. But the Proclamation goes a little further—

> "And, whereas the setting on foot of the said Memorial and other documents was promoted by a spirit of sedition, and their obvious object at the time known by those who permitted it to be; Now, therefore, I do call upon, enjoin, and strictly charge all peaceably disposed and orderly persons to aid the officers of the Government in maintaining order, and in bringing to justice the seditious agitators who have endeavoured, and are still endeavouring, to mislead the people of the Transvaal to commit a breach of the public peace and acts of sedition against Her Majesty's Government, thereby bringing serious misfortune upon the country and its inhabitants; And I do further hereby warn all such mischievous and evil-disposed persons as may be found to be fomenting or instigating any such unlawful agitation, and who, by threats, seditious words, whether spoken, written, or printed, or by any other means, are engaged in inciting the people of this country to acts of disloyalty, sedition, resistance to or rebellion against the

Government, that they are hereby made and held liable, and subject, under the law and this my Proclamation, to imprisonment, fine, and such other and further punishments as the law may direct."

Now, Sir, I will pass on to the result which ensued. It is to be found in page 9—

> "To us were handed over 157 distinct Memorials, of which 125 were signed by enfranchised burghers, who were against the annexation, and thus against British rule, and 31 signed by enfranchised burghers of the South African Republic, who were in favour of annexation, and therefore satisfied with British rule; while we have found one Memorial signed by enfranchised burghers of the South African Republic, who were against annexation, but further signed as a true copy. On the 125 distinct Memorials handed over to us signed against the annexation, we have found 6,591 signatures; on the 31 Memorials signed for the annexation, 587 signatures; while on the Memorial signed as a true copy, 85 signatures were found."

Well, there you have 125 Memorials against annexation, and 31 for it—say, a majority of about 4 to 1. To the 125 distinct Memorials which are against annexation, we have 6,591 signatures; while to the 31 Memorials in favour of annexation, there are only 587 signatures. So that the actual signatures against annexation are in a majority of nearly 12 to 1. It must be added that the 6,591 signatures are those of the adult males of the Transvaal—the total number of adult males in the Transvaal being 8,000. Thus, out of a total of 8,000, you have nearly 6,600 declaring their total unwillingness to annexation. Well, Sir, that being the case, those Memorials were sent over here to the Colonial Office, and the Colonial Secretary has given a reply to them. In that reply, I understand the right hon. Gentleman threw away altogether this question of the proportions. I admitted last year that the Earl of Carnarvon stated that he would make the annexation dependent upon the consent of the majority; but when it was no longer possible to maintain it on that ground, it was thrown over, and the annexation was justified for other reasons. The prospect is very vague and uncertain, when you come to consider what is to be the future of your government of this country you have annexed; for you have 6,600 adult males out of a total population of 8,000 adult males, strongly protesting against annexation. The other ground on which the annexation is justified is stated to be that the weakness of the Transvaal was an encouragement to the Native tribes in the adjoining territories to assume a warlike attitude, not only to the Transvaal, but to the English Settlements. To those allegations the inhabitants of the Transvaal have given a very firm and, I confess, for my own part, I think, a very conclusive reply. I do not propose to go through it; but I wish I could persuade hon. Members to look through it, for I think then they would agree with me, that a strong case is made out against the position of those who advocated annexation. But that has reference to a point of policy which I do not wish now to re-open. I am still of opinion that that policy was wrong; but I desire now to go to the more practical question of what is now to be done. In 1852, the English Government, in a very solemn way, recognized the independence of the Boers of the Transvaal, and allowed them to manage their own affairs. That was not done rashly, but after a great amount of consideration of the policy to be adopted. I was looking the other day at a speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), in 1852, in which he said—

> "Our policy in South Africa has been one of changes, as a sick man changes from side to side, in the endeavour to find relief."

In 1852, after a long period of vacillation, the Government of the Earl of Derby recognized the propriety of drawing the line in South Africa, and respecting the independence of those on the other side of the line, so as to keep a State interposed between ourselves and the uncivilized inhabitants of the territories beyond. That was recognized as our best policy, and was adopted until 1877, when it was entirely reversed. The Delegates who come before us now, bringing this protest from twelve-thirteenths of the inhabitants, wind up the Letter which they have sent to the Secretary of State by setting forth and protesting against divers grievances. They say—

> "We know that as a subject-people who have been deprived of their independence by such means, there will be before us many years of bitter heartburnings, of ill-feeling, of desertion of homes, and of wild and objectless wanderings; while, on the other hand, with justice

> and with freedom, there is every reason to hope that the Transvaal may join hand-in-hand with the neighbouring States and Colonies to work together for mutual prosperity and happiness, and for the extension of civilization and Christianity into the far interior."

I beg to draw the attention of hon. Members to the future which these men hold out for the Transvaal. That is a future of which many of them have had a precisely similar experience, and the memory of it is fresh with them. They went into the Orange River Territory, and we followed them there; and they then went into the Transvaal, which we have now re-annexed. In reference to the prospect which this Memorial now holds out, as to still further emigration, I will read what Sir Harry Smith wrote to Earl Grey, 30 years ago, with regard to the Boers—

> "On my arrival at the foot of the Drachensberg Mountains, I was almost paralyzed to witness the whole of the population, with few exceptions, emigrating. Rains on this side of the mountains are tropical, and now prevail, and these families were exposed to a state of misery which I never before saw equalled, except in Massena's invasion of Portugal, when the whole of the population of that part of the seat of war abandoned their homes and fled—the scene here was truly heartrending."

That was 30 years ago, and the lads that then took part in that immigration are now the adult males of the Transvaal territory; while the younger men have had the story of that immigration told them and now realize the truth of it, and entertain feelings of animosity towards the English nation. They have now revived in them this grievance, for they have again the prospect of being driven out into the wilderness. If I could convey to hon. Members here anything of the impression which I have derived from intercourse with the inhabitants of the Transvaal territory, I think they would be impressed, as I have been, with the very serious nature of the future before these people. The Delegates have come here to appeal to your justice and your sense of humanity; but it does not appear that they have a very hopeful prospect, but will have to go back with feelings of gloom and of oppression. The gloom is caused by the thought of what may happen in the Transvaal if they are forced to leave that territory. They remember the anger and rage which was excited last year among their fellow Boers; and when they go back the same feeling of anger will be again excited, only to a greater extent. Probably they will resolve once more to take themselves unto the wilderness. These are men with whom it is difficult for us altogether to sympathize. Their education and their position are so entirely different from our own; they are so like our ancestors of many years ago. They are honest, healthy men—simple in manner and simple in their mode of life—resolved to go forth into the wilderness, if they must go, in defence of their rights. It struck me that a typical illustration of the tone of these men and of the two Delegates who have been sent over to England, was to be seen in the parting words addressed to those Delegates, that they might, like Joshua, the son of Nun—

> "Be strong and of a good courage, for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I sware unto them; and I will be with thee."

They have already received some grounds for apprehension; but I must read something more to enable the House to form a true idea of what the actual condition of the Transvaal now is. There has been another Memorial, I may mention, which has been drawn up in the Transvaal and laid before Parliament, coming from those who were strongly in favour of annexation. Most of the Memorialists were English settlers who had strayed over the Border, and who would make a considerable profit in the event of annexation. The Memorial is, therefore, from men who are not averse to British Sovereignty; but are strongly averse to the way in which British Sovereignty has been maintained. I will now read something to show what British Sovereignty in the Transvaal now is. The Memorial begins by saying—

> "Upon the faith of which [the Proclamation and Address of Sir Theophilus Shepstone of 12th April, 1877] and in order to avoid civil strife and confusion, many of your Petitioners assisted or acquiesced in the annexation and military occupation of the late Republic. . . . That it was distinctly promised to your Petitioners by Sir Theophilus Shepstone when he deprived them of their independence that in view of an alleged inherent weakness of the Republic, the British Government would afford the inhabitants of the State that security and protection which they were unable to obtain by themselves; that all legal Courts of Justice in existence at the time of the annexation should be continued; that the Transvaal should remain a

separate Government with its own laws and Legislature; that the laws then in force should be retained until altered by competent legislative authority; that all private *bonâ fide* rights to property guaranteed by the late Government and all *bonâ fide* concessions and contracts should be honourably maintained and respected;"

And, furthermore—

"That, as soon as it might be convenient, some of Her Majesty's troops would enter this country, although they were not to do so to coerce the people; but to show those by whom they were surrounded that with the changes in the form of ruling the country, would also come a great and necessary accession of strength to enable Her Majesty's Government to discharge the obligations it had undertaken."

They go on to say—

"That in direct violation of the aforesaid promises, upon the strength of which the inhabitants of the late Republic were willing to give a peaceable trial to the new order of things, your Petitioners find that after twelve months' experience of the Government of Theophilus Shepstone, the following are among the most prominent of his breaches of faith:—That, in the first place, he has utterly failed to give to the people the promised protection against the Natives, and is even now compelled to call for Volunteers to do the work which ought to be done by the Imperial troops in the settlement of the still pending Secocoeni revolt, for the suppression of which it was stated that the mere entry of British troops into this country was sufficient. And your Petitioners say generally, as regards the Native question, that the present position of the country is far more critical than under the old *régime.* That, in violation of the promise to retain all legal Courts of Justice at the time of annexation, Sir Theophilus has, by arbitrary Proclamation, abolished the system of trial by jury as exemplified in the old Courts of Landdrost and Heemraden of this country, and instituted a new High Court and a totally unfamiliar system of legal procedure, administered under the supervision of only one Judge in place of a bench of three (as agreed upon by the late Government), and in disregard of the acceptance of office of a second, if not a third Judge; and your Petitioners further complain that the duties of the civil gaol officials and of the civil police, even on the floor of the High Court itself, have been usurped by the military authorities, under orders of the Administrator. That the Legislature (Volksraad) of this territory has been dissolved, and no deliberative Representative Assembly of any kind substituted for it, although promised in his Excellency's Proclamation of 12th April, 1877. That the laws of the country are being altered by mere Government Proclamation or Notice, and this without any prospect of the granting of any political Constitution to the country. That with reference to the promised non-coercion by the British troops or authorities, your Petitioners respectively complain that at a meeting which was held at Pretoria on the return of their Commissioners, Messrs. Paul Kruger and Jorissen, from Europe, certain artillery was trained upon the meeting, and the troops were held in readiness to overawe the meeting."

This is a Memorial, be it remembered, from those who are not disinclined to annexation, and it plainly shows that at present there exists in the Transvaal a system of despotism such as ought not to exist. It is a most material question for your consideration what you will do with the Transvaal if it is recognized as a necessity that the authorities should have despotic power, and that the Commissioner may, of his own free will, make and unmake laws and keep the whole country in subjection, and may dispose of the rights of property and liberties of the people, in what may be the well-considered determination of his own breast, but which may be but the mere result of a whim? That is the man who announced that the people of the Transvaal were not within their right in getting up a Memorial. It is the undoubted right of every competent person in a free State to memorialize the Government; but Sir Theophilus Shepstone warned the inhabitants of the Transvaal that they would be guilty of seditious acts if, in some Petition or other, they manifested their dissatisfaction with the annexation. The question for Her Majesty's Government to consider is, what will be the future of a country you have annexed, in which you find 6,600 adult males out of a population of 8,000 repudiating your authority, and your High Commissioner, so inflated with a sense of his position, that he is of his own will abolishing the legislative and financial systems, and bringing the whole country to such a state of irritation that it is only retained in your grasp by the power of the High Commissioner? If we conduct the government of a territory in that manner, it will inevitably become, not only a troublesome, but a most burdensome and most costly task. For the mere sake of economy, you must wish that the revenues of a country should pay for the costs of its government; but the condition into which you have reduced the Transvaal hardly renders that feasible at present. What would be the nature of the government of the Transvaal, even if all the inhabitants of the Transvaal were contented with it? Let hon. Members consider that problem. The extent of territory in the Transvaal is about the size of France, with a population of 8,000 adult males. They are so scattered about the country that, with the exception of a few villages and large parts containing about 200 inhabitants each, the farms are distant from one another 10, 20, or 30 miles. That is a country which can exist without almost any Government, if it is left alone. The Transvaal did so exist; and in the Memorial presented to the right hon. Gentleman, it is stated that for many years it practically existed without any Government. If undisturbed, all that has to be done in such a country is to keep order and repress robbery. And in a population of that kind the amount of disorder and robbery is not great. Those matters were easily looked after by the Boers, and the country practically existed without any Government at all. But if you take that country into your own hands and make it an English Colony, you have to give it a scientific form of government, and even if the inhabitants were perfectly willing subjects, you have to keep up an organization totally disproportionate to the end proposed. In fact, it would be impossible, on the part of any Government, to organize the government of this part of Africa according to English ideas, even if the inhabitants of the territory were willing to accept it. The United States, who have tried this sort of thing over and over again, would never have undertaken the task we have set ourselves in South Africa. You have sent out, as Commissioner, Mr. Sergeaunt, to make a Report upon the financial condition of the Transvaal. Where is the Report? It has not been laid before Parliament.

**Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH**: That Report will be presented to Parliament with the next batch of Papers relating to the subject of the Transvaal.

**Mr. COURTNEY**: I am glad to hear that, because we shall then be able to estimate for ourselves what probability there is that the Colony will pay its own expenses. When it is before us, I am satisfied that it will show us that the government of the Colony must be exceedingly expensive; and, indeed, that it is impossible to govern the Transvaal out of its own resources, if you are going to govern it on the same footing as though it were an English Colony. And that would be the case, even if the people of the Transvaal were willing that you should govern, and lent you all the assistance in their power. But you have, on the contrary, the assurance that they are unwilling that you should govern them. Out of the 8,000 males in the territory, 6,600 have protested against your going there. On this point, let me read to you an extract from a pamphlet, which was printed for private circulation, which a friend—I do not quite know who, at this moment—sent me yesterday. It is a most admirable paper, and it contains the materials for a speech that was never delivered, collected by the late Sir William Molesworth, who devoted his great powers, in a large measure, to the consideration of the method of governing our Colonies, especially those of South Africa. In 1852, Sir William Molesworth did make a speech, in which he gave expression to some of the ideas set forth in this pamphlet; but these materials were collected for a speech which he conceived in 1854, and proposed to deliver in Parliament, in approbation of Lord Derby's policy of abandoning the Orange River Territory. In the course of his argument, he entered into the consideration of what would be the expense of governing that territory. In adverting to the probable cost of governing the Colony, he says—

> "When I consider that 100,000 warlike savages inhabit the mountain fastnesses of the Orange River Territory; that its frontier is open for 400 miles to the incursions of the Zoolahs, and other fierce Tribes of the great South African race; that there are, beyond the Vaal, 20,000 independent Boers, sympathizing with their 10,000 disaffected kinsmen in the Orange River Territory; when I reflect upon the difficulty of procuring succour from the distant military posts of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, I feel convinced that Sir George Cathcart has not over-estimated, at 2,000 men, the military force which would be required to retain possession of the Orange River Territory. I should also observe that this estimate was made by Sir George Cathcart before we had learnt, from experience, the surprising efficiency of the Basuto Cavalry, both in number and equipments. Let us next consider the cost of maintaining a body of 2,000 troops in the interior of South Africa. In addition to the ordinary military expenditure, we should have, in the first instance, to provide barracks for them. But building in the Orange River Territory is excessively expensive—three or four times as much as in this country—for the territory is destitute of materials for building, scarcely a stick of timber grows on it. The cheapest wood used is the Norway pine, which is brought 400 miles, from the nearest seaport, over a country without roads; and when buildings are erected, they soon become dilapidated, their walls decaying under the ravages of ants, which swarm in all the soil and through all the flooring. Secondly, we should have to import into the

Orange River Territory all military stores, clothing, and every commodity required for the use of the soldiers, with the exception only of beef, mutton, and grain. The cost of conveying goods to the Orange River Territory is very great, for they have to be brought, either from Port Elizabeth or from the Cape of Good Hope, in waggons, each of them drawn by a span of 14 oxen. The journey from Port Elizabeth occupies, at least, six weeks, and from Cape Town, at least, two months. To add to the difficulty of these journeys, during the dry season, water near the road is scarce, and wood, either dry or green, sufficient to boil a camp-kettle, must, at all times, be carried for distances of several days' journey; and in seasons of drought, which are of common occurrence, the country is impassable. For instance, the surgeon in charge of a detatchment at Bloen Fontein was, for a year, very short of medicines, in consequence of the drought rendering the country so impassable that the periodical consignment of these supplies remained, for many months, at a distance of 150 miles, without a possibility of his getting them conveyed to Bloen Fontein. For these reasons, I am convinced that I have not overestimated, at £200,000 a-year, the cost of maintaining a body of 2,000 troops in the Orange River Territory; one-fourth of them to be Cavalry. At this rate of expenditure, the Orange River Territory would cost us about £20 per head per annum for every person of European descent in it; and about £400 per head, per annum, for every British settler. No wonder that these gentlemen, both store-keepers and land-jobbers, are so vehement in their assertions that the honour of England requires us to retain possession of the Orange River Territory. In all probability, the military expenditure would decuple their trade."

Now, that is just our position with regard to the Transvaal. These figures might apply equally well to that territory; and, indeed, the case of the Transvaal is even more striking, because that territory is further off than the Orange River Settlement, and the difficulty of governing it would be correspondingly greater. I ask—"How do you propose to work out the problem of governing the Transvaal from its own resources?" The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in his reply to the Delegates from the Transvaal, merely gave them the advice to return home, and keep quiet, and accept the situation. I have already shown the state of feeling in the Transvaal, and there is much to show that if the Delegates are dismissed with a few smooth words, while, practically, they obtain nothing, it will be difficult to appease those feelings, and to repress the disaffection, which we have good reason to believe exists throughout the territory. I have already admitted fully that if it is absolutely necessary to do so to protect ourselves, we are justified in annexing this territory by the doctrine which holds good in politics as well as in morals—that extreme necessity justifies all things. That doctrine, however, ought to be acted upon with extreme caution, because it involves the sacrifice of others for our own benefit; and if we are going to sacrifice the Transvaal for our own benefit, we should make some allowance for the feelings of the inhabitants, and stretch a point in their favour if we can possibly do so. When you compel a householder to give up possession of his house, you give him a bonus for turning him out; but in this case, when you take possession of territory against the will of the inhabitants, you appear to be willing to give them nothing but soft and empty words, and to do nothing to prevent the ripening of that danger, the elements of which at present exist in the Transvaal. I have myself seen the Delegates from that territory, and I confess that I was very much impressed by the way in which they stated the position in which they were placed. I asked them whether there was any possibility of coming to an agreement on this very important question; but they informed me that they had no authority to accept any terms of settlement, and that they had a difficulty in understanding why England should not withdraw from the steps which she had taken, and recognize the independence of the Transvaal. Of course, they have a difficulty in understanding that; but those who keep their minds free on this question must see that for us to withdraw the step, and to re-establish the independence of the Transvaal, would be scarcely practicable—and, indeed, I myself should almost shrink from recommending Her Majesty's Advisers to restore the independence of the Transvaal which has been taken away; but, at the same time, I think that we should give the Delegates some message which they might take back to those who sent them, which would remove the elements of disaffection to which I have alluded. We have told the inhabitants of this territory that we were obliged to undertake its control in order to maintain peace in South Africa, and we say that the misgovernment or the weak government of the Transvaal was a danger not only to themselves, but to us, which we were bound to guard against at any cost. Now, if we could take the necessary steps to insure peace in South Africa, and, at the same time, satisfy the aspirations of the inhabitants of the Transvaal for freedom and for self-government, I hope that we shall see gradually disappear from their minds the idea of a forcible attempt to re-assert their independence, which, at present, is undoubtedly simmering in the territory. The Delegates appeared to believe in the possibility of our recognizing their independence, and of our entering into an offensive and defensive alliance with them. That, of course, I feel is an impossibility. There is, however, a plan which appears to me to be worthy of consideration. We want to secure peace, and, at the same time, we ought to give the inhabitants as much freedom and self-government as possible. It occurs to me that something of this kind might be agreed upon. Why not say to these men who have been sent over to this country as Representatives of the Transvaal—"You are bent upon having your own institutions and self-government; but, at the same time, we must be protected against the danger which may spring from your quarrels with your neighbours, or with the Natives; and, therefore, we propose that troops under English command should be stationed at two or three points, where they would be able to operate most conveniently, and that the Transvaal should pay a certain proportion of the expense of keeping those troops, upon the understanding that the legitimate desire for freedom on the part of the inhabitants of that territory should be satisfied." We should not wish to throw the whole expense of keeping those troops upon the Transvaal, because they would be stationed in the territory not only for their own benefit, but for ours. Neither would it be necessary that those troops should consist of Her Majesty's Regular troops. They might be a force locally raised, but under the command of the Lord High Commissioner. If some proposal of this kind were made so that it might be discussed, we might fairly hope that the relations between this country and the Transvaal might be placed on such a footing, that while we might be secured against all the danger which was apprehended, the inhabitants of the territory might, at the same time, be made contensed with their position. If the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies were to say a word in this direction to the Delegates before they depart, which would give those who sent them a fair hope that local autonomy would be conceded, things might easily be put straight, and the inhabitants might be satisfied; but to send the Delegates back with no more than the Letter before us will be to prepare a great deal of trouble for ourselves in the future. I cannot help thinking that some plan of this kind might be adopted, and that it would lead to excellent results. I am bound, however, to say that there is another consideration that we cannot overlook. You have at present as Special Commissioner and Administrator of the Government of the Transvaal, Sir Theophilus Shepstone. Sir Theophilus Shepstone is described as being an indispensable man. But he has been discredited by his actions in that part of the world, as no public man has been discredited before, upon questions involving precisely the same issue as those before us; and it was he who pursuaded Lord Carnarvon to adopt the line of policy which led to the annexation of the Transvaal. I have heard it said that an indispensable man is one who ought to be at once dispensed with; and my opinion is, that unless you get rid of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, you will have no peace in South Africa. This is the man who is raising the passions which are making their presence felt in the Transvaal. In the Notice of Motion which I gave yesterday, I stated that it was my intention to conclude with a Motion to the effect that it is desirable that steps should be taken to restore local autonomy in the Transvaal Territory. That Motion does not appear in the Paper today; but by way of putting upon record my views on this subject, I propose, if it is in accordance with the Rules of the House; to make a Motion, although, of course, I shall not put the House to the trouble of dividing upon the question. I, therefore, beg to conclude by moving—

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that steps shall be taken to restore local autonomy to the Transvaal."

Mr. SPEAKER: As the Question before the House is the adjournment of the House, no Amendment can be moved, except one having reference to the time at which the House shall meet.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I quite admit that a question of this importance is one that ought to be discussed in this House, and I also freely acquit the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) of all blame in not bringing forward this subject at an earlier period of the Session. But I think that he has trespassed to a great extent upon the patience and the forbearance of the House by the manner in which he has brought this subject under their notice. I do, however, trust that what has passed this evening will have this good effect—that it will convince those gentlemen who are now in this country as Delegates from the Transvaal, that even at this period of the Session, and under existing circumstances, the House of Commons, or at least that portion of it which is left in London, is willing to give to their case the best possible attention. The hon. Member for Liskeard appears to have based all his argument upon the objection he has always entertained to the annexation of the Transvaal. But that matter was fully discussed, and was finally decided, last year; and it seems to me that it was not only unnecessary, but even absolutely mischievous, that it should be again raised this evening by the hon. Member. In my judgment, the greater portion of his speech can only have the effect of exciting hopes in the minds of the Delegates and of those whom they represent which it is utterly wrong to excite, because it is absolutely impossible that they can be gratified. And the line that the hon. Member for Liskeard has taken is the more to be deprecated, because, not only does he know perfectly well that when the question of the annexation of the Transvaal was discussed, he was one of the very few hon. Members in this House who did not agree in the wisdom and propriety of that policy; but he must also be aware that if he were now to propose that we should recede from the policy we have pursued, he would scarcely find another hon. Member who would agree with him on the subject. It has been admitted, almost unanimously, that the annexation of the Transvaal was a necessary step for us to take. I entirely agree that it is a step which entailed a grave and serious responsibility upon this country, which ought not to have been taken, unless it was absolutely necessary, and which we did take most reluctantly. I freely admit that there are difficulties before us in the matter, though I think that they have been exaggerated by the hon. Member for Liskeard—if, indeed, some have not been entirely invented by those from whom he derived his information. In the first place, I must say that there was nothing whatever in Lord Carnarvon's expression of opinion last year, either in "another place," or in his conversations with the Delegates from the Transvaal, which could justify the latter in assuming that the question of the annexation of that territory could be submitted to a vote of the majority of the people. The Delegates, however, appear to have conveyed that impression on their return; but it was utterly without foundation; and it is to be regretted that they had not a little more moral courage, and did not state what they must have known was the case—that the question of annexation was one which had been decided by Lord Carnarvon, and could not be re-opened. That decision of Lord Carnarvon met with the practically unanimous approval of the people of this country; and any idea that the annexation was to be subject to the popular vote of the inhabitants of the Transvaal, or could be affected by signatures to a Memorial, was one which Lord Carnarvon could not have entertained for a moment. The Delegates, as the hon. Member for Liskeard says, have returned to this country with this Memorial. That is the sole new fact in the case. In my reply to the Memorial, I stated some reasons to which the hon. Member for Liskeard did not refer, to show why I was unable to attach the importance which the Delegates did to the number of signatures to that Memorial. The hon. Member has animadverted upon the line of action taken by Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and upon the terms of the Proclamation which he issued. It is not my office to defend the grammar of the Proclamation, or even the precise terms in which it is couched; but I must say that, looking at the condition of the whole of South Africa at the time, and at the danger of disturbance on the frontiers, I think that Sir Theophilus Shepstone was justified in adopting the principles of action upon which his Proclamation is based, and the result was, that certain persons to whom the Proclamation was addressed saw the danger of the course they were pursuing, and desisted from it. Well, the Memorial was signed, as the hon. Member states, by a considerable number of the inhabitants of the Transvaal, and it has been brought over to this country and has been presented to me, and I have replied to it in the Letter which is now upon the Table of the House. I do not want to go through the Letter, neither do I wish upon this occasion to re-open the whole history of our South African Colonies. In that Letter, however, I felt it to be my duty to enter into the arguments which the Delegates brought forward in support of their request for the re-establishment of the independence of the Transvaal. I will only say, with regard to this matter, that when the hon. Member for Liskeard refers to the policy which was adopted in 1852, and suggests that it should be reverted to, that the events which have occurred since then have most clearly proved that that policy was wrong and dangerous, and it is for that reason that it was reversed by my Predecessor in Office last year. The hon. Member for Liskeard appeared to suggest that it was possible that the people of the Transvaal should be, what he calls, left to themselves. But the result of adopting such a course was the condition of things that was fully discussed last year, and which was well known to the House. The hon. Member says of my reply that it does nothing but advise, in vague and smooth words, the people of the Transvaal to be quiet. I will just venture to read to the House the last two paragraphs of that reply, because I think they will show that I have not met this request on the part of the Delegates from the Transvaal by empty words; but have expressed my anxiety that, as far as possible, the policy which we have adopted, and which the hon. Member himself appears to think must now be followed, shall be carried out in a manner that will conduce to the prosperity and to the welfare of the Colony. I say—

> "I gladly leave this subject in order to assure you of the warm interest felt by Her Majesty's Government in the moral and material welfare of the Transvaal, and their desire to promote it by every means in their power. I am anxious to secure your co-operation, and that of those on whose behalf you have addressed me, in an endeavour to arrive at some full and satisfactory understanding respecting the future of your country; and especially as to the principles upon which it may be possible to base a Constitutional and Administrative system which may preserve many of the most valued institutions of the Transvaal, under the protection and supervision afforded by the Queen's Sovereignty.
>
> "The people of the Province were clearly informed by Sir Theophilus Shepstone, in his Proclamation, that 'the Transvaal would remain a separate Government, with its own Laws and Legislature; and that it was the wish of Her Most Gracious Majesty that it should enjoy the fullest legislative privileges compatible with the circumstances of the country and the intelligence of its people.' You are aware that the present system of government, though continued, in consequence of the unsettled state of the country, for a longer term than had been contemplated, is altogether temporary and provisional."

The hon. Member has referred to the personal action of Sir Theophilus Shepstone. I do not intend now to enter upon the particular charges which are contained in passages which he has quoted from the Memorial addressed, not to me, but to Sir Bartle Frere, and which the latter believes to be entirely without foundation. I am at present merely dealing with the opinions which I have myself expressed. I go on to say—

> "It is the desire of Her Majesty's Government that no time shall be lost in carrying out the promises given in the Proclamation, so as to satisfy the wishes of those who deprecate any avoidable departure from the old Constitution of the country; whether it will be in their power to proceed at once with that policy depends in a great measure upon you, and upon all over whom you have influence. I earnestly recommend you, and those on whose behalf you act, to turn your attention from that which is impossible to those much-needed reforms and undertakings on the necessity of which all are agreed, and to co-operate loyally and heartily with Her Majesty's Government in concerting such measures as may make the Transvaal a prosperous, contented, and self-supporting country."

If I were to emulate the length of the hon. Member's speech, I could say nothing more than is included in the words I have read. It was necessary, for reasons fully stated last year, to extend the Sovereignty of the Queen over this territory. It is necessary to retain control over the Native policy there pursued—that necessity exists in the interest of the whole of South Africa—I may say, in the interest of the whole of the

White and Native races. But, saving Imperial questions, and matters directly connected with them, I am as anxious as the hon. Gentleman the Member for Liskeard can be, that the people of the Transvaal shall manage their own affairs. I will devote—indeed, I have already devoted—much serious consideration to the manner in which that may best be done. I have instructed Sir Bartle Frere to visit that part of South Africa, and, in concert with Sir Theophilus Shepstone, to suggest to me a mode by which that object may be carried out; and I will only say, in conclusion, that if the Delegates, when they return to the Transvaal, will co-operate with the Government here, and with the Government in South Africa, in regard to this matter, they will find that, subject to the points which I have named, it is our great anxiety to deal with them and with their country so as to give them, as fully as possible, that self-government which they desire.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at Eight o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS,

*Friday*, 16*th August*, 1878.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Royal Assent*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 65]; Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 64]; Intermediate Education (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 66]; Idiots, &c. (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 60]; Contagious Diseases (Animals) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 74]; Foreign Jurisdiction [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 67]; Statute Law Revision [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 79]; Education (Scotland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 78]; Marriages (Fiji) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 61]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 62]; Prison (Officers' Superannuation [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 63]; Highways [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 77]; Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 58]; Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 59]; Bishoprics [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 68]; Territorial Waters Jurisdiction [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 73]; Telegraphs [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 76]; Arranmore Polling District (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 75]; Metropolitan Commons [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 71]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 72]; Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 69]; Expiring Laws Continuance [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 70]; Inclosure Provisional Orders [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxxxiii]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxxxi]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxxxii].

## PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that Her Majesty had been pleased to grant two several Commissions, one for declaring Her Royal Assent to several Acts agreed upon by both Houses of Parliament, and the other for proroguing the Parliament:—And the LORDS COMMISSIONERS—namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR; The LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Duke of Richmond and Gordon); The LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Duke of Northumberland); The LORD CHAMBERLAIN OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Marquess of Hertford); and The LORD SKELMERSDALE—being in their Robes, and seated on a Form between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the COMMONS being come, with their Speaker, and the Commission to that purpose being read, the ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills.

Then THE LORD CHANCELLOR, pursuant to Her Majesty's Command, *delivered* HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH, as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"WHEN, in a critical condition of public affairs, you assembled at the commencement of the year, I pointed out to you that, in the interests of my Empire, precautions might become necessary, for which I appealed to your liberality to provide. At the same time I assured you that no efforts in the cause of peace should be wanting on my part.

"Your response was not ambiguous, and contributed largely to a pacific solution of the difficulties which then existed. The terms of agreement between Russia and the Porte, so far as they affected pre-existing Treaties, were, after an interval of discussion, submitted to a Congress of the Powers; and their councils have resulted in a peace which I am thankful to believe is satisfactory and likely to be durable. The Ottoman Empire has not emerged from a disastrous war without severe loss; but the arrangements which have been made, while favourable to the subjects of the Porte, have secured to it a position of independence which can be upheld against aggression.

"I have concluded a Defensive Convention with the Sultan, which has been laid before you. It gives, as regards his Asiatic Empire, a more distinct expression to the engagements which in principle I, together with other Powers, accepted in 1856, but of which the form has not been found practically effectual. The Sultan has, on the other hand, bound himself to adopt and carry into effect the measures necessary for securing the good government of those Provinces. In order to promote the objects of this Agreement, I have undertaken the occupation and administration of the Island of Cyprus.

"In aiding to bring about the settlement which has taken place, I have been assisted by the discipline and high spirit of my Forces by sea and by land, by the alacrity with which my Reserves responded to my call, by the patriotic offers of military aid by my people in the Colonies, and by the proud desire of my Indian Army to be reckoned among the defenders of the British Empire, a desire justified by the soldierly qualities of the force recently quartered at Malta.

"The spontaneous offers of troops made by many of the Native Governments in India were very gratifying to me, and I recognise in them a fresh manifestation of that feeling towards my Crown and Person which has been displayed in many previous instances.

"My relations with all Foreign Powers continue to be friendly.

"Although the condition of affairs in South Africa still affords some ground for anxiety, I have learnt with satisfaction from the reports of my civil and military officers that the more serious disturbances which had arisen among the native population on the frontiers of the Cape Colony are now terminated.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have voted for the public service.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"The Act which has been passed for amending and greatly simplifying the law relating to Factories and Workshops will, I trust, still further secure the health and education of those who are employed in them.

"I have had much pleasure in giving my assent to a measure relating to the Contagious Diseases of Cattle, which, by affording additional securities against the introduction and spread of those diseases, will tend to encourage the breeding of live stock in the country and to increase the supply of food to my people.

"You have amended the Law as to Highways in a manner which cannot but improve their classification and management, and at the same time relieve inequalities in the burden of their maintenance.

"I trust that advantage will be taken of the means which you have provided for dividing Bishoprics in the more populous districts of the country, and thus increasing the efficiency of the Church.

"I anticipate the best results from the wise arrangements which you have made for the encouragement of intermediate education in Ireland.

"The measure for amending and consolidating the Public Health Laws in that country is well calculated to promote the important object at which it aims.

"The measure passed in regard to Roads and Bridges in Scotland and for the abolition of Tolls will greatly improve the management of highways in that part of the United Kingdom; while the Acts relating to Education and to Endowed Schools and Hospitals cannot fail to extend the benefits of education and improve the administration of charitable endowments in that country.

"In bidding you farewell, I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest on your recent labours and accompany you in the discharge of all your duties."

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Saturday the second day of November next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Saturday the second day of November next.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*Friday*, 16*th August*, 1878.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Withdrawn*— Coroners [303]; Magistrates (Summary Jurisdiction) [304].

The House met at a quarter before One of the clock.

## *QUESTIONS.*

### ARMY—THE ROSTER FOR MEDICAL OFFICERS.—QUESTIONS.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA asked the Secretary of State for War, If it be the fact, and if so why is it, that the roster for Medical Officers has, since 1873, been kept as a private document, which officers are not allowed to see in the same manner as customary between 1858 and 1873; and, whether he is prepared to place Medical Officers on a footing, as regards exchanges, similar to that on which the other branches of the service now stand?

COLONEL ARBUTHNOT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Committee appointed to inquire into matters affecting the Medical Department has reported, and when such Report will be circulated; if he will state if there is any objection to a system of open and unconditional exchange, such as exists in the combatant branches of the Army, being allowed to prevail in the Medical Department, and why the old system of keeping a public roster for Foreign Service has been abandoned; and, whether he will order a roster to be kept, either at the Adjutant General's Office or at the Office of the Director General of the Medical Department, which shall be open to inspection by all members of the Department?

COLONEL STANLEY: Sir, the roster for medical officers was, up to the time of the late Director General of the Army Medical Department—that is to say, 1873—hung up in the waiting-room of the Department, in accordance with the regulations of 1859; but it was found that this practice led to various abuses, consequent upon Army exchange agents and other persons coming and inspecting the roster, and then writing letters to the officers who were likely to be concerned. That led to abuses, and it was, therefore, removed from the waiting-room, and was kept in the office of the Surgeon General of the Medical Department; but it is open to the inspection of any officer, and any officer can ascertain his place upon it by application by letter to the Surgeon General. The Committee appointed to inquire into the Medical Department have reported, and I trust to lay their Report upon the Table as soon as the House meets next Session. I believe it will be in a completed state, and fit for Parliamentary publication, by that time. I have further to say, that my own personal wish is to see exchange among medical officers made as free as it can be, compatible with the interests of the Service; but I am bound to point out that, in the other Departments, it can never be so entirely unrestricted as in the combatant branches, and I am not prepared offhand to say it could be entirely assimilated to the system which exists in the combatant branches. That, I think, answers the Questions of both my hon. Friends, and that is all that I am in a position to say at the moment.

## TURKEY—THE PAPERS.

### QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the document named at page 98 of "Turkey, 1878, No. 42," will be published?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that the document referred to had not been published with the last batch of Papers, because it was not dated. It would, however, be in the hands of hon. Members in a very few days.

## CENTRAL ASIA AND AFGHANISTAN.

### QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any objection to the publication of Papers relating to negotiations on the affairs of Central Asia and Afghanistan which may have taken place between England and Russia since the publication of the Papers of 1874?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that there was no objection, and that they would be in the hands of hon. Members in a few days.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—REFORMS IN ASIA MINOR.

### QUESTION.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, he wished to put a Question, either to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or to the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whichever might be most convenient, and in order to have an opportunity of explaining his Question, he would conclude with a Motion. There was a telegram in one of that morning's papers to this effect—

> "That the difficulties which have arisen between Turkey and England in reference to the introduction of reforms in Asia Minor have been almost entirely removed. Sir Austen Layard has abandoned some of his demands which had been objected to by the Porte. The latter declared that the Treaty respecting Cyprus did not imply the renunciation by Turkey of her independence. Turkey would listen to the counsels of England, but would undertake the reforms herself, without there being any necessity for the installation in Asia Minor of British residents, who would seek to introduce reforms, instead of merely watching for their execution."

Now, with reference to certain declarations which had been made from the front Bench regarding the meaning of the Convention, and the assertion that it was not intended on the part of Her Majesty's Government to be a sham, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman Whether this was true—that the Porte had practically refused to give any material guarantees with reference to good government and the reforms to be introduced in Asiatic Turkey; and whether, therefore, the objections that were taken on that—the Opposition—side of the House, that the Paper Convention of June 4 was not a real guarantee, were not sustained by the fact that it had no effective guarantee in it to enable the British Government to say that the reforms which it was to insist upon would be carried out? He wished also to ask, Whether any information had been received from Sir Austen Layard which confirmed the telegram which he had read; and whether, supposing that the matter was arranged in the interval of the Recess, Her Majesty's Government would make public the arrangement which had been entered into between the Government and Turkey. He begged to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, he had not seen the telegram referred to; but, as he understood it, it gave a totally different opinion of the state of affairs from that implied in the interpretation which had been given of it by the hon. Member. All he could state on the subject was that negotiations were going on between Sir Austen Layard and the Porte, and that when those negotiations had reached the point at which it would be desirable to publish the communications, Her Majesty's Government would have no objection to that being done.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

## ISLAND OF CYPRUS—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD: I take this opportunity of asking, Whether the statement in the "Daily News" this morning with regard to the health of the troops at Cyprus is correct or not, because, according to that account, the state of the troops is very alarming? The fever seems to be very extensive indeed, and it would seem that the troops are cantoned in places which must necessarily be unhealthy. It would appear to those who, like myself, perhaps, know very little about the matter, that instead of making an old place like Nicosia the military centre and capital of the Island, it would be better to commence in a new place altogether, where there was no fever such as seems to be so very prevalent there. I wish to know, whether there is any foundation for the very alarming statement of the "Daily News?"

Colonel STANLEY: Sir, in reply to Questions which were put to me two days ago, it was then my duty to state that a telegram received from Sir Garnet Wolseley contained the announcement that the sickness was about 6 per cent of the men in hospital, mostly for fever of a mild type. I have since then had telegrams about various other matters of business, and there has been no reference, except in one of them, to any further increase of sickness. I may also say that letters, both public and private, which I have had, although they refer to cases of fever being undoubtedly very numerous, speak of them as of a comparatively mild type, although some of them, no doubt, been complicated by sunstroke, owing to the intense heat. There has been, so far as we are aware, only three deaths since our troops first landed in Cyprus, and in a telegram which came to hand this morning, about other matters, there are words which certainly do not appear very clear, but which undoubtedly imply that such sickness as there has been is on the decrease. I can only say that it is as much a puzzle to me as it is to some hon. Members, the discrepancy between the official and the private accounts which I receive and the accounts which appear in some organs of the daily Press. I am not saying we can have absolute knowledge on the subject. I can only give the House that knowledge which I possess, and watch the question as carefully as possible. I may add that upon the earliest indications of there being an increase of sickness, we took the precaution of placing six doctors under orders to go out, and those officers either have sailed or are on the point of sailing.

## SPAIN—CASE OF GEORGE WHITE.
### QUESTION.

Captain PIM: Sir, I wish to ask my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question, of which I have given him private Notice. It is to ask him, If he will be kind enough to telegraph at once to the Consul General at Havannah in reference to the case of George White, the British sailor, about whose imprisonment there I put a Question to him yesterday? I can only say that it would be an act of great kindness to allay the anxiety of his friends and relations at Gravesend.

Mr. BOURKE: In answer to my hon. and gallant Friend, I can only say that I will consult my noble Friend the Foreign Secretary, and if he has no objection, I will telegraph as my hon. and gallant Friend desires.

## *ORDERS OF THE DAY.*

### CORONERS BILL.—[Bill 303.]

(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)

SECOND READING. ORDER DISCHARGED. BILL WITHDRAWN.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in moving that the Order for the Second Reading of the Bill be discharged, said, he would take that opportunity of stating that if he succeeded in getting the measure sent before a Select Committee next year, he would bring before that Committee the question of the election of Coroners.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order for Second Reading read, and *discharged;* Bill *withdrawn.*

### MAGISTRATES (SUMMARY JURISDICTION) BILL.—[Bill 304.]

(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General.*)

SECOND READING. ORDER DISCHARGED. BILL WITHDRAWN.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in moving that the Order for the Second Reading of the Bill be discharged, said, he wished to call attention to a matter which appeared to involve considerable hardship. The magistrates throughout the country seemed to be under the impression that the Small Penalties Act was to be put in force in every case—that, in short, they looked upon it as a matter of course that the Act should be put in force—whereas it was optional whether they should put it in force or not. There was no doubt that under this erroneous impression a great many persons had been brought under the operation of the Act who would not have been so brought under its operation, if the magistrates had exercised their discretion in the matter.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, the matter referred to by the right hon. Gentleman was a great grievance and mischief, and it was a great disappointment that there had not been time to pass the Bill. He hoped it would be re-introduced sufficiently early next Session.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order for Second Reading read, and *discharged;* Bill *withdrawn.*

### NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD."

QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. D. Jenkins,

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he was sorry to say that he had no very satisfactory information to give the House with regard to the raising of the *Vanguard.* As far as he could see, the contractor had not made progress with the necessary arrangements for raising that ship. They had been told from time to time that the contractor was building lighters for that purpose; but he (Mr. W. H. Smith) had no evidence that he was really doing so, and it was to be feared that when the 31st of October came the *Vanguard* would be found remaining where she was at the present moment.

### PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend The Lords Commissioners:—

The House went;—and a Royal Commission to that purpose having been read, the *Royal Assent* was given to several Bills.

And afterwards Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by the Lord High Chancellor (in pursuance of Her Majesty's Command).

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Saturday the 2nd day of November next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Saturday the 2nd day of November next.

A

# TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

PASSED IN THE FIFTH SESSION OF

THE TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

41 & 42 VICTORIA.—A.D. 1878.

---

## PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

1. AN Act to apply the sum of Six million pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight.
2. An Act to raise the sum of Six million pounds by Exchequer Bonds, Exchequer Bills, or Treasury Bills.
3. An Act to relieve certain Occupiers of Dwelling-houses from being disqualified from the right of voting in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament by reason of their under-letting such Dwelling-houses for short terms.
4. An Act to extend the hours of Polling at Parliamentary Elections in the Metropolis.
5. An Act to relieve certain Occupiers of Dwelling-houses in Scotland from being disqualified from the right of voting in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament by reason of their under-letting such Dwelling-houses for short terms.
6. An Act to amend the Glebe Loan (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1875.
7. An Act to raise the sum of One million Pounds by Exchequer Bonds, for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight.
8. An Act to enable Local Authorities to acquire and lay out land for Public Parks and Pleasure Grounds in Scotland.
9. An Act to apply certain Sums out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the years ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, and one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine.
10. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better payment for the Army and their Quarters.
11. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.
12. An Act for the prevention of Accidents by Threshing Machines.
13. An Act to declare the law relating to the Acceptance of Bills of Exchange.
14. An Act to amend the Law relating to Public Baths and Washhouses.
15. An Act to grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, to alter other Duties, and to amend the Laws relating to Customs and Inland Revenue.
16. An Act to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Factories and Workshops.
17. An Act to amend the Adulteration of Seeds Act, 1869.
18. An Act to grant Money for the purpose of Loans by the Public Works Loan Commissioners and by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and to authorise the former Commissioners to compound and cancel certain loans and interest, and to amend the Public Works Loans Act, 1875.
19. An Act to amend the Matrimonial Causes Acts.
20. An Act to provide for returns respecting Continuous Brakes in use on Passenger Trains on Railways.
21. An Act to apply the sum of Seven million five hundred thousand pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine.
22. An Act to raise the sum of One million five hundred thousand pounds by Exchequer

Bonds, for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine.

23. An Act to remove doubts concerning the due Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women in Ireland in certain cases.

24. An Act to amend the Public Works Loans (Ireland) Act, 1877, so far as relates to Lunatic Asylums.

25. An Act to amend the Public Health Act, 1875, so far as relates to the supply of Water.

26. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Registration of Voters in Parliamentary Boroughs and the Enrolment of Burgesses in Municipal Boroughs, and relating to certain rights of voting and proceedings before and appeals from Revising Barristers.

27. An Act to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877.

28. An Act to further amend the Law of Entail in Scotland.

29. An Act for conferring powers upon the Metropolitan Board of Works with respect to the Obelisk known as Cleopatra's Needle, and other Monuments.

30. An Act to alter the time of electing Commissioners under the General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862.

31. An Act to consolidate and amend the Law for preventing Frauds upon Creditors by secret Bills of Sale of Personal Chattels.

32. An Act to amend the Metropolis Management Act, 1855, the Metropolitan Building Act, 1855, and the Acts amending the same respectively.

33. An Act to amend the Law relating to Dental Practitioners.

34. An Act to amend the Law relating to Highways in South Wales.

35. An Act to extend for a further limited period section thirty-four of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875.

36. An Act to continue for one year the Police (Expenses) Act, 1875.

37. An Act to further amend the Acts relating to the raising of Money by the Metropolitan Board of Works; and for other purposes relating thereto.

38. An Act for the further relief of Innkeepers.

39. An Act for the Protection of Freshwater Fish.

40. An Act to remove doubts with respect to the application to Scotland of the Prisons Authorities Act, 1874.

41. An Act to enable Returning Officers at Parliamentary Elections in Scotland to require Security for their Expenses; and otherwise to amend the Law of Scotland relating to such Expenses.

42. An Act to amend and further extend the Acts for the Commutation of Tithes in England and Wales.

43. An Act to encourage Regular Marriages in Scotland.

44. An Act to make provision for the foundation of a Dean and Chapter for the Bishopric of Truro, and for the transfer to the Cathedral Church of Truro of one of the Canonries in the Cathedral Church of Exeter; and for other purposes connected therewith.

45. An Act to apply the sum of fourteen millions five hundred thousand pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine.

46. An Act to enable Her Majesty to provide for the Establishment of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearn and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, and to settle an Annuity on Her Royal Highness.

47. An Act to enable the Trustees of the Elders Widows' Fund to apply the Capital of the said Fund in aid of Income; and for other purposes in relation thereto.

48. An Act to amend the Law relating to Endowed Schools and Hospitals and other Endowed Institutions in Scotland; and for other purposes.

49. An Act to consolidate the Law relating to Weights and Measures.

50. An Act to amend the County of Hertford and Liberty of Saint Alban Act, 1874.

51. An Act to alter and amend the Law in regard to the Maintenance and Management of Roads and Bridges in Scotland.

52. An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to Public Health in Ireland.

53. An Act to facilitate improvements in the Organisation of the Admiralty and War Office by the retirement of Clerks from certain of the Civil Departments thereof.

54. An Act to amend the Debtors Act, 1869, and the Debtors Act (Ireland), 1872.

55. An Act to enable the Trustees of the British Museum to remove portions of their Collections.

56. An Act to amend the Law respecting the expense of regulating Commons.

57. An Act for the Revision of the Statute Law of Ireland.

58. An Act for further regulating the use of Locomotives on Highways in Scotland.

59. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Drainage and Improvement of Land in Ireland.

60. An Act to make better provision for Idiots, Imbeciles, and other afflicted persons in Ireland.

61. An Act to remove doubts as to the validity of certain Marriages solemnized in the Islands of Fiji prior to their erection into a British Colony.

62. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts, and to repeal certain other Turnpike Acts; and for other purposes connected therewith.

63. An Act to amend the Prison Acts of 1877, so far as regards the Apportionment of certain Superannuation Allowances between the Treasury and the Local Authorities.

64. An Act to raise the sum of two million pounds by Exchequer Bonds, Exchequer Bills, or Treasury Bills for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879.

65. An Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.

66. An Act to promote Intermediate Education in Ireland.

67. An Act for extending and amending the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts.

68. An Act to provide for the foundation of four new Bishoprics in England.

69. An Act to amend the Law regulating the Office of Clerk of Petty Sessions, and the Law relating to Fines, in Ireland; and for other purposes.

70. An Act to continue various expiring Laws.

71. An Act to extend to Metropolitan Commons certain provisions of the Commons Act, 1876.

72. An Act to prohibit the sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday in Ireland.

73. An Act to regulate the Law relating to the Trial of Offences committed on the Sea within a certain distance of the Coasts of Her Majesty's Dominions.

74. An Act for making better provision respecting Contagious and Infectious Diseases of Cattle and other Animals; and for other purposes.

75. An Act to amend the Law in respect to the Polling District of Arranmore (Ireland).

76. An Act to make further provision respecting the Post Office Telegraphs.

77. An Act to amend the Law relating to Highways in England and the Acts relating to Locomotives on Roads; and for other purposes.

78. An Act to further amend the provisions of the Law of Scotland on the subject of Education, and for other purposes connected therewith.

79. An Act for further promoting the Revision of the Statute Law by repealing certain Enactments which have ceased to be in force or have become unnecessary.

---

## The Acts contained in the following List, being Public Acts of a Local Character, are placed amongst the Local and Personal Acts.

i. An Act to amend an Act passed in the ninth year of the reign of His late Majesty King George the Fourth, chapter sixty-two, so far as the same relates to the Linen and Yarn Halls in the City of Dublin.

viii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the City of Bristol, the Rural Sanitary District of Chester-le-Street Union, the Local Government District of Finchley, the Rural Sanitary District of the Newbury Union, and the Local Government Districts of Wallasey and West Derby.

xxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Abingdon, the Rural Sanitary District of the Abingdon Union, the Local Government Districts of Brampton and Walton, Buxton, and Dalton-in-Furness, the Rural Sanitary District of the Headington Union, the City of Lincoln, the Rural Sanitary District of the Loughborough Union, the Local Government District of Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn, the Boroughs of Saint Helens and Southport, and the City of Worcester.

xxxviii. An Act to confirm two Provisional Orders under the Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to "Ward River and River Suck Drainage Districts."

lvi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bognor Gas, Dysynni Gas, Elland Gas, Formby Gas, Godalming Gas, Greenhithe Gas, Sandown Gas, Shanklin Gas, Western-super-Mare Gas, Alcester Water, Cuckfield, Haywards-Heath, and Lindfield Water, Fowey Water, Frith Hill, Godalming, and Farncombe Water, Holywell and District Water, Newquay Water, Norwood (Middlesex) Water, Wokingham Water, Hoylake and West Kirby Gas and Water, New Tredegar Gas and Water, and Walton-on-the-Naze Gas and Water.

lvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board under the Provisions of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, and the Public Health Act, 1875, relating to the Borough of Droitwich, the Local Government District of Ilkeston, the Borough of Saffron Walden, and the Local Government District of Tow Law.

lviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Mickleover, in the county of Derby, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

ciii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under the General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862, relating to the Burgh of Paisley.

civ. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board under the provisions of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, relating to the parishes of Birmingham and Boldre, and to the Townships of Old Accrington and New Accrington, and certain Orders of the Local Government Board under the provisions of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, relating to the Parishes of Bolnhurst, Keysoe, Little Staughton, Minster, Pertenhall, and Saint Lawrence.

cv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board under the provisions of the Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875, relating to the Boroughs of Devonport and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

cvi. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1867, relating to the Burgh of Lochgelly, in the county of Fife.

cvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under the Elementary Education Act, 1870, to enable the School Board for Portsmouth to put in force the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, and the Acts amending the same.

cviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland under the provisions of the Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875, relating to the Borough of Cork.

cix. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Belper Union, the Borough of Burnley, the Rural Sanitary District of the Chesterfield Union (two), the Local Government District of Ilkeston, the Improvement Act District of Lytham, the Port of Milford, the Local Government District of Rhymney, the Rural Sanitary District of the Rugby Union, the Local Government District of Ryton, the Rural Sanitary District of the Saint Asaph Union, the Port of Sunderland, the Borough of Swansea, and the Local Government District of Tunbridge Wells.

cx. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Education Department under the Elementary Education Act, 1870, to enable the School Boards for Birmingham, Lewannick (Cornwall), and Mold (Flint) to put in force the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, and the Acts amending the same.

cxi. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under the Elementary Education Act, 1870, to enable the School Board for London to put in force the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, and the Acts amending the same.

cxii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of certain Unhealthy Areas within the Metropolis.

cxiii. An Act to confirm the Provisional Order for the inclosure of certain Lands situated in the parish of Orford, in the county of Suffolk, in pursuance of a report of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales.

cxiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Auchenlochan (Kyles of Bute), Carrick Castle (Loch Goil), Conway, Falmouth, Filey, Folkestone, Hythe (Southampton), Margate, Plymouth, Port Seton, Sea View (Isle of Wight), Shanklin, Southend, South Uist, and Walton-on-the-Naze.

cxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Ardglass, Boddam, Lochmaddy, Montrose, Southsea, and Youghal.

cxvi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Town of Dungarvan, and to the Burial Grounds of Barnahely and Templerobin in the County of Cork, and to the Town of Tralee, and to Waterworks in the Town of Tralee.

clxii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Improvement Act District of Bournemouth, the Local Government District of Brotton, the Boroughs of Haverfordwest (two) and Liverpool, the Improvement Act District of Llandudno, the Local Government District of Lofthouse, the Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage District, the Improvement Act District of Middleton and Tonge, the Local Government Districts of Pemberton, Romford, and Tyldesley-with-Shakerley (two), the Borough of Wakefield, the Improvement Act District of West Hartlepool, the Borough of Wigan, and the Local Government Districts of Wilmslow and Workington.

clxiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Cardiff Tramways (Extensions), Manchester Corporation Tramways, Manchester Suburban Tramways, and Oldham Borough Tramways.

clxiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Abergavenny Union, the Improvement Act District of Bradford (Wilts), the Local Government District of Brigg, the Boroughs of Brighton and Cheltenham, the Local Government District of Ebbw Vale, the Improvement Act District of Leek, the Boroughs of Liverpool and Preston, the Local Government District of St. Columb, the Borough of Tiverton (two), the Local Government District of Tredegar, and the Special Drainage District of Washington.

clxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government District of Dawlish, the Rural Sanitary District of the Shardlow Union, and the Borough of Wigan.

clxvi. An Act for authorising the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to compound the Debt due to the Consolidated Fund in respect of Conway Bridge, and for other purposes relating thereto.

ccxi. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to the Darenth Valley Main Sewerage District.

ccxii. An Act for the appointment of Trustees to maintain certain works executed near the River Corrib, in the county of Galway; and for other purposes.

ccxiii. An Act for the Disafforestation of Epping Forest and the preservation and management of the uninclosed parts thereof as an Open Space for the recreation and enjoyment of the public; and for other purposes.

ccxxxi. An Act to confirm, with amendments, certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Aldershot and Farnborough Tramways, Bolton and Suburban Tramways, Gloucester Tramways, Moss Side Local Board Tramways, Newton Heath Local Board Tramways, Reading Tramways, Sunderland Tramways, Wavertree Local Board Tramways, West Derby Local Board Tramways, and Wolverhampton Tramways (Extension).

ccxxxii. An Act to confirm, with amendments, a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Glasgow and Ibrox Tramway.

ccxxxiii. An Act to confirm the Provisional Orders for the Inclosure of certain lands in pursuance of Reports of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales.

# LOCAL ACTS.

---

*The Titles to which the Letter* **P.** *is prefixed are Public Acts of a Local Character.*

---

**P.** i. AN Act to amend an Act passed in the ninth year of the reign of His late Majesty King George the Fourth, chapter sixty-two, so far as the same relates to the Linen and Yarn Halls in the City of Dublin.

ii. An Act to enable the Brighton Aquarium Company to raise additional Capital.

iii. An Act for amending the Royal Bank of Scotland Officers Widows Fund Act, 1870.

iv. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Lewis Augustus Aspinwall for "a new or improved implement for planting Potatoes."

v. An Act for the abandonment of the Railway authorised by the Birkenhead, Chester, and North Wales Railway Act, 1873.

vi. An Act for the abandonment of the Undertaking of the Bodmin and Wadebridge and Delabole Railway Company; and for other purposes.

vii. An Act for the abandonment of the Cornwall Mineral and Bodmin and Wadebridge Junction Railway; and for other purposes.

**P.** viii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the City of Bristol, the Rural Sanitary District of Chester-le-Street Union, the Local Government District of Finchley, the Rural Sanitary District of the Newbury Union, and the Local Government Districts of Wallasey and West Derby.

ix. An Act to confer additional powers upon the Hartlepool Gas and Water Company.

x. An Act for incorporating "The Brading Harbour District Gas Company," and enabling them to construct Gasworks and light with Gas parts of the parishes of Brading and Saint Helen's, in the Isle of Wight, in the county of Southampton.

xi. An Act to confer further powers upon the Company of Proprietors of the Deal Waterworks; to authorise the Company to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

xii. An Act to confirm an agreement between the Serle Street and Cook's Court Improvement Company and the Royal Insurance Company; and for other purposes.

xiii. An Act to extend the time granted to the Swindon, Marlborough, and Andover Railway Company for the completion of certain railways and works; and for other purposes.

xiv. An Act to dissolve and re-incorporate the Sevenoaks Waterworks Company, Limited, and to extend their Limits of Supply; and for other purposes.

xv. An Act to authorise an extension of time for the completion of the Bala and Festiniog Railway.

xvi. An Act to enable the Corporation of Dublin to construct additional Waterworks; and for other purposes.

xvii. An Act for granting further powers to the Imperial Continental Gas Association.

xviii. An Act for conferring further powers on the Farnworth and Kearsley Gas Company for the purchase of land, the construction of works, the raising of money, and otherwise in relation to their undertaking.

xix. An Act to provide for the sale and removal of the Chapel of Saint John's Hospital, in the parish of Saint Lawrence in the city of Exeter, and the application of the purchase money to arise from such sale; and for other purposes.

xx. An Act for extending the time for the completion of the Newsni Railway; and for other purposes.

xxi. An Act for extending the time for the completion of the Railway No. 3 authorised by the Ross and Ledbury Railway Act, 1873; and for other purposes.

xxii. An Act to enable the London and Saint Katharine Docks Company to raise further money.

xxiii. An Act to enable the Legal and General Life Assurance Society to sue and be sued in the name of a public officer, and to make provision as to the vesting of the funds and property of the Society in the trustees from time to time of the Society; and for other purposes.

xxiv. An Act to authorise the Charnwood Forest Railway Company to divert portions of their authorised lines; and for other purposes.

xxv. An Act for the abandonment of the Nettlebridge Branch Railway authorised by the Somerset and Dorset Railway Act, 1873; and for other purposes.

xxvi. An Act for conferring further powers on the Torquay Gas Company.

xxvii. An Act to amend the Batley Corporation Waterworks Act, 1871, and other Acts affecting the Corporation of Batley; and for other purposes.

xxviii. An Act for reviving the powers and extending the time for the completion of a portion of the Railway and Works authorised by the Isle of Wight (Newport Junction) Railway Act, 1872; and for other purposes.

xxix. An Act to authorise Edward Cecil Guinness to construct certain Tramways in the City of Dublin; and for other purposes.

xxx. An Act for authorising the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company to make a new Branch Railway and other works; for conferring upon them additional powers; and for other purposes.

xxxi. An Act for empowering the West Lancashire Railway Company to provide and use Steam and other Vessels; and for other purposes.

xxxii. An Act to confer further powers on the Commissioners acting in the execution of "An Act for draining and preserving certain "fen lands and low grounds in the parish of "Wiggenhall Saint Mary Magdalen, in the "county of Norfolk; and other purposes."

xxxiii. An Act to provide for the cancelling of bond entered into under the Cannock Chase Railway (Extension) Act, 1862.

xxxiv. An Act to extend the powers of the Shrewsbury Gaslight Company.

xxxv. An Act to revive and extend the powers of the Cleveland Extension Mineral Railway Company.

xxxvi. An Act for authorising the East Norfolk Railway Company to raise further money for their main line, for constituting their Aylsham Extension capital a separate capital, for the abandonment of their Wroxham Quay Branch; and for other purposes.

**P**. xxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Abingdon, the Rural Sanitary District of the Abingdon Union, the Local Government Districts of Brampton and Walton, Buxton, and Dalton-in-Furness, the Rural Sanitary District of the Headington Union, the City of Lincoln, the Rural Sanitary District of the Loughborough Union, the Local Government District of Newtown and Llanllwchaiarn, the Boroughs of Saint Helens and Southport, and the City of Worcester.

**P**. xxxviii. An Act to confirm two Provisional Orders under the Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to "Ward River and River Suck Drainage Districts."

xxxix. An Act to amend the Borrowstounness Town and Harbour Act, 1875; to constitute a new Harbour Commission; and for other purposes.

xl. An Act to enable the Great Yarmouth and Stalham (Light) Railway Company to construct a new Railway and other works; and for other purposes.

xli. An Act for incorporating the Marske and Saltburn Gas Company, and authorising them to supply with Gas certain parts of the Parish of Marske in the North Riding of the County of York, and to amalgamate with the Redcar and Coatham Gas Company; and for other purposes.

xlii. An Act to provide for the better care and management of Closed Burial Grounds in the borough of Birmingham; and for other purposes.

xliii. An Act for extending the district within which the York United Gaslight Company may supply gas, for empowering them to construct additional works and to raise additional capital; and for other purposes.

xliv. An Act to extend the time for the completion of the works authorised by the Truro Water Act, 1875.

xlv. An Act for granting further powers to the Nottingham Waterworks Company.

xlvi. An Act for extending the time limited by the Pegwell Bay Reclamation and Sandwich Haven Improvement Act, 1873, and the Pegwell Bay Reclamation and Sandwich Haven Improvement (Amendment) Act, 1876, for the purchase of land and the completion of works.

xlvii. An Act to authorise the Trustees of the Clyde Navigation to construct Ferry Works and establish a Ferry at Stobcross, in the Harbour of Glasgow, to levy and alter rates, and to borrow money; and for other purposes.

xlviii. An Act to re-incorporate with further powers the Lewes Gaslight Company.

xlix. An Act to dissolve the Lea Bridge District Gaslight and Coke Company, Limited, and to re-incorporate the same Company with powers to supply Gas in the parish of Walthamstow and part of the parish of Leyton.

l. An Act to enable the Scarborough Waterworks Company to extend their limits of supply, construct new works, and for other purposes.

li. An Act to enable the Pacific Steam Navigation Company to reduce their Capital and to invest Moneys; and for other purposes.

lii. An Act to incorporate the Preston Tramways Company, and to authorise the construction of Tramways in the Borough of Preston and the adjacent Township of Fulwood, both in the County of Lancaster; and for other purposes.

liii. An Act for the amalgamation of the Scottish Union Insurance Company and the Scottish National Insurance Company, and for the incorporation of the amalgamated Companies by the name of "The Scottish Union and National Insurance Company;" and for other purposes.

liv. An Act to authorise the Hull Street Tramways Company to raise additional Capital, to increase the number of Directors of the Company; and for other purposes.

lv. An Act to provide for the appointment and remuneration of separate Stipendiary Justices for the division of Manchester, in the county of Lancaster, and for the borough of Salford, in the same county; and for other purposes.

**P**. lvi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bognor Gas, Dysynni Gas, Elland Gas, Formby Gas, Godalming Gas, Greenhithe Gas, Sandown Gas, Shanklin Gas, Weston-super-Mare Gas, Alcester Water, Cuckfield, Haywards-Heath, and Lindfield Water, Fowey Water, Frith Hill, Godalming, and Farncombe Water, Holywell and District

Water, Newquay Water, Norwood (Middlesex) Water, Wokingham Water, Hoylake and West Kirby Gas and Water, New Tredegar Gas and Water, and Walton-on-the-Naze Gas and Water.

P. lvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board under the Provisions of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, and the Public Health Act, 1875, relating to the Borough of Droitwich, the Local Government District of Ilkeston, the Borough of Saffron Walden, und the Local Government District of Tow Law.

P. lviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for Mickleover, in the county of Derby, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

lix. An Act for authorising the transfer to the Bristol Port and Channel Dock Company of the undertaking of the Bristol Port and Channel Dock Warehouse Company (Limited); for making further provision as to the Capital of the first-mentioned Company; and for other purposes.

lx. An Act to confer powers on the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council of the city of Glasgow with respect to Public Parks, Museums, and Galleries in the said city; and for other purposes.

lxi. An Act for extending the limits of the Town of Burton-upon-Trent Act, 1853; for incorporating the Commissioners under that Act; for enabling them to construct Flood Embankments, Gasworks, Cemetery, and Markets; and for other purposes.

lxii. An Act for empowering the Local Board for the District of Westhoughton, in the county of Lancaster, to provide their district with a supply of Water; and for other purposes.

lxiii. An Act to authorise the Local Board for the District of Dalton-in-Furness to purchase so much of the Gas Undertaking of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Barrow-in-Furness as relates to the supply of Gas within the District of the Board; to purchase the Dalton Gasworks; to erect Gasworks and to manufacture and supply Gas within their District; to make improvements of Streets; to define and extend the powers of the Board in relation to the improvement of the District; and for other purposes.

lxiv. An Act to confer powers on the Forth Bridge Railway Company, and on the North British, the Midland, the North-eastern, and the Great Northern Railway Companies, with reference to the Forth Bridge Railways; and for other purposes.

lxv. An Act for authorising the making of a New Street in continuation of Pall Mall and Ray Street, in the borough of Liverpool; and for other purposes.

lxvi. An Act to extend the limits of supply of the South Hants Waterworks Company, and to enable them to raise additional Capital.

lxvii. An Act for incorporating a Company for supplying with Water and Gas parts of the parishes of Bedwellty, in the county of Monmouth, and Llangunnyder, otherwise Llangynnider, in the county of Brecon; and for other purposes.

lxviii. An Act to vest Conway Bridge in Commissioners, to provide for the Maintenance and Repair thereof, the reduction of the Tolls, and for other purposes.

lxix. An Act to provide for the improvement and disposal of the Common Lands of Govan in the county of Lanark, and the application of the prices thereof; and for other purposes.

lxx. An Act to authorise the Trustees of the Port and Harbour of Alloa to borrow additional Money; and for other purposes.

lxxi. An Act for the Enlargement and Improvement of the Harbour of Newhaven in Sussex, and for the Construction of a Dock and other Works there.

lxxii. An Act to enable the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company to complete and construct Railways between Croydon, Oxted, and East Grinstead, and to acquire the Lewes and East Grinstead Railway; to confer powers on the South-eastern Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxxiii. An Act to empower the Local Boards of Health for the Districts of Cockermouth and Workington, and the Cockermouth Union Rural Sanitary Authority, in the county of Cumberland, to take water from Crummock Lake for supply within their respective Districts; and for other purposes.

lxxiv. An Act to confer further powers upon the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company, and to enable them to purchase the Hayling Bridge and Causeway.

lxxv. An Act for authorising the Corporation of Scarborough to purchase the Undertaking of the Scarborough Waterworks Company, and to supply with Water the borough of Scarborough, and other places; and for other purposes.

lxxvi. An Act for incorporating the East Grinstead Gas and Water Company; and for other purposes.

lxxvii. An Act to authorise the Rhondda Valley and Hirwain Junction Railway Company to abandon certain of their authorised Railways; to lease so much of their Railway as has been constructed to the Taff Vale Railway Company; to reduce the capital of the Company; and to regulate their affairs.

lxxviii. An Act for dissolving the Hemel Hempsted and Boxmoor Gas and Coke Company (Limited) and the Boxmoor, Two Waters, and Crouchfield Gas and Coke Company (Limited), and incorporating the shareholders of those Companies into a company for supplying gas to Hemel Hempsted and certain neighbouring places in the county of Hertford; and for other purposes.

lxxix. An Act to provide for the erection of Municipal Buildings in the city of Glasgow; and for other purposes.

lxxx. An Act to enable the Local Board for the district of Bedlingtonshire in the county of Northumberland to acquire water rights for the purposes of their water undertaking.

lxxxi. An Act to vary and amend the provisions of the South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Act, 1873.

lxxxii. An Act to sanction certain proceedings of the Blackpool Pier Company (Limited) with reference to the construction of works, carrying into effect an Agreement with the Stoke, Fenton, and Longton Gas Company for the purchase of that Company's undertaking; and for other purposes.

cxxxii. An Act to vest in the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Leicester the Undertakings of the Leicester Gas Company and the Leicester Waterworks Company; and for other purposes.

cxxxiii. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Bradford, in the west riding of the county of York, to construct and maintain additional works for the storage and supply of Water; to enlarge the time for completing waterworks already authorised; to construct and maintain additional works for the storage and supply of Gas; to effect public improvements; and for other purposes.

cxxxiv. An Act to enable the Grand Junction Waterworks Company to raise further moneys, and to amend in certain respects the Acts relating to that Company.

cxxxv. An Act for incorporating and conferring Powers on the Lichfield Gas Company.

cxxxvi. An Act for extending the limits of supply of the Trowbridge Water Company, and for authorising the Company to construct further works, and to raise further money; and for other purposes.

cxxxvii. An Act for extending the Municipal and Police Boundaries of the burgh of Hamilton in the county of Lanark; for authorising the making of new streets, the improvement of existing streets, and the construction of additional waterworks; for providing for the improvement and good government of the burgh; for regulating the supply of gas and water thereto; and for other purposes.

cxxxviii. An Act for enabling the Great Southern and Western Railway Company to construct a new or substituted Railway at Cork; to acquire additional Lands for the purposes of their undertaking; to raise and widen certain of their Bridges; to reduce the number of Directors; and for other purposes.

cxxxix. An Act for making a railway between the town of Limavady, in the county of Londonderry, and the town of Dungiven, in the same county; and for other purposes.

cxl. An Act to authorise the North British Railway Company to make several railways in the counties of Forfar and Lanark, to widen parts of their Glasgow and Coatbridge and Peebles Railways, to acquire additional lands for station purposes, to advance money for the purposes of the Borrowstounness Town and Harbour Act, 1875; to make further provision with respect to the Consolidation of Lien Stocks; and for other purposes.

cxli. An Act for incorporating the Manchester Suburban Tramways Company, and for empowering them to construct Tramways in the neighbourhood of Manchester; and for other purposes.

cxlii. An Act for the abandonment of one of the Railways authorised by the Taff Vale Railway Act, 1873, and for the extension of time for the completion of certain other of the railways thereby authorised.

cxliii. An Act to extend the time limited for the compulsory purchase of lands and completion of the Railway and Works authorised by the Ramsey and Somersham Junction Railway Act, 1875; and for other purposes.

cxliv. An Act for empowering the Cardiff Waterworks Company to construct additional Works, and to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

cxlv. An Act for effecting a transfer to the Metropolitan Board of Works of the open spaces known as Plumstead Common and Shoulder-of-Mutton Green, and for enabling them to preserve, improve, and regulate the same, and to erect a lodge upon Blackheath.

cxlvi. An Act to enable the Neath Harbour Commissioners to raise further Capital, to authorise and confirm Agreements between them and the Corporation of Neath, and the Great Western, the South Wales Mineral, and the Neath and Brecon Railway Companies; and for other purposes.

cxlvii. An Act to amend the Swansea Improvements and Tramways Act, 1874, and to confer further powers upon the Swansea Improvements and Tramways Company; and for other purposes.

cxlviii. An Act to revive and extend the powers of the Clare Slob Land Reclamation Company; and for other purposes.

cxlix. An Act to empower the Dublin Tramways Company to construct further new Tramways; and for other purposes.

cl. An Act for making a Railway from the Stobcross Railway to Yoker and Clydebank, with branches therefrom; and for other purposes.

cli. An Act to confer further Powers on the Great Northern Railway Company.

clii. An Act to confer further Powers on the Dudley and Oldbury Junction Railway Company.

cliii. An Act to amend the Maryport Improvement and Harbour Act, 1866, the Maryport District and Harbour Act, 1868, the Maryport District and Harbour (Gas) Act, 1877, to empower the Trustees to establish and maintain Markets; and for other purposes.

cliv. An Act to enable the Metropolitan District Railway Company to extend their Railway to the Thames at Fulham; and for other purposes connected with the said Company.

clv. An Act for authorising the Great Eastern Railway Company to execute additional Works and to enter into various Agreements, and for conferring on them further Powers in relation to their Undertaking and Capital and the Undertakings of other Companies and parties; for amending their Acts in various particulars; and for other purposes.

clvi. An Act to authorise the transfer of the Canal Property of the Bradford Canal Company, Limited, to the Company of Proprietors of the Canal Navigation from Leeds to Liverpool and the undertakers of the Aire and Calder Navigation; and for other purposes.

clvii. An Act for the formation and improvement of Drumcondra, Clonliffe, and Glasnevin township, comprising the districts of Drumcondra, Clonliffe, and Glasnevin, in the barony of Coolock and county of Dublin; and for other purposes.

clviii. An Act to authorise the construction of Tramways in and near the city of Dublin; and for other purposes.

clix. An Act to authorise the construction of Tramways in and near the city of Dublin, and in the county of Dublin; and for other purposes.

clx. An Act to give effect to the purchase by the Corporation of Limerick of the undertaking of the Limerick Gas Company; to enable the Corporation to borrow money and to levy rates; and for other purposes.

clxi. An Act for incorporating and conferring powers on the Normanton Gas Company.

**P.** clxii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Improvement Act District of Bournemouth, the Local Government District of Brotton, the Boroughs of Haverfordwest (two) and Liverpool, the Improvement Act District of Llandudno, the Local Government District of Lofthouse, the Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage District, the Improvement Act District of Middleton and Tonge, the Local Government Districts of Pemberton, Romford, and Tyldesley-with-Shakerley (two), the Borough of Wakefield, the Improvement Act District of West Hartlepool, the Borough of Wigan, and the Local Government Districts of Wilmslow and Workington.

**P.** clxiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Cardiff Tramways (Extensions), Manchester Corporation Tramways, Manchester Suburban Tramways, and Oldham Borough Tramways.

**P.** clxiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Abergavenny Union, the Improvement Act District of Bradford (Wilts), the Local Government District of Brigg, the Boroughs of Brighton and Cheltenham, the Local Government District of Ebbw Vale, the Improvement Act District of Leek, the Boroughs of Liverpool and Preston, the Local Government District of St. Columb, the Borough of Tiverton (two), the Local Government District of Tredegar, and the Special Drainage District of Washington.

**P.** clxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government District of Dawlish, the Rural Sanitary District of the Shardlow Union, and the Borough of Wigan.

**P.** clxvi. An Act for authorising the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to compound the Debt due to the Consolidated Fund in respect of Conway Bridge, and for other purposes relating thereto.

clxvii. An Act for authorising the Callander and Oban Railway Company to construct a Branch Railway to Oban Bay, with a Quay and Sea Wall and a Road there; and to make near Loch Awe a deviation of their authorised Railway; and to abandon the authorised Branch to Oban Bay and the authorised Pier there, and the portion of line for which the said deviation will be substituted; for extending the time for the completion of the main line between Dalmally and Oban; and for other purposes.

clxviii. An Act for incorporating the Cheadle Railway Company, and authorising them to make and maintain the Cheadle Railway; and for other purposes.

clxix. An Act to empower the Radcliffe and Pilkington Gas Company to acquire additional Lands, and to raise further Moneys.

clxx. An Act to empower the Exeter Gaslight and Coke Company to acquire further Lands for the Extension of their Works, and to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

clxxi. An Act to confer further Powers upon the South Staffordshire Waterworks Company; and for other purposes.

clxxii. An Act for effecting the sale and transfer to the Local Board for Sutton-in-Ashfield, in the county of Nottingham, of the undertaking of the Sutton-in-Ashfield Gaslight and Coke Company; and for other purposes.

clxxiii. An Act for enabling the Caledonian Railway Company to make certain Railways and other Works, and to acquire certain lands, in the Counties of Lanark, Renfrew, Stirling, Perth, and Forfar, to abandon certain authorised Railways in Lanarkshire, and to raise additional money; for extending the periods allowed to that Company by former Acts for acquiring certain lands and completing certain works in Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire, and selling superfluous lands; and for other purposes.

clxxiv. An Act for incorporating the Chester Tramways Company, and for empowering them to construct Tramways in the City of Chester; and for other purposes.

clxxv. An Act to authorise a sale of the Bury and Thetford Railway to the Great Eastern Railway Company, and agreements between that Company and certain neighbouring Companies; and for other purposes.

clxxvi. An Act for conferring further powers on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company with relation to their undertaking; and for other purposes.

clxxvii. An Act to amend the Brecon Markets Act, 1862; and for other purposes.

clxxviii. An Act for making certain railways between the town of Magherafelt, in the County of Londonderry, and Draperstown, in the same county; and for other purposes.

clxxix. An Act for extending the boundaries of the borough of East Retford; to enable the Corporation thereof to acquire the undertaking of the Retford Gas and Coke Company; and for other purposes.

clxxx. An Act to authorise the construction of New Streets and other Works in the borough of Belfast, and to make further provision for the improvement and government of the borough; and for other purposes.

clxxxi. An Act for conferring further powers on the London and North-western Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; for conferring on the London and North-western Railway Company and other Companies further powers in relation to their Joint Undertakings; for making provision for the Completion of a certain Work authorised by the Rhyl Improvement Act, 1872; for transferring to the London and North-western Railway Company a portion of the Undertaking of the Great Northern Railway Company (Ireland); for transferring to the Dundalk, Newry, and Greenore Raiiway Company certain of the powers of the Greencastle and Kilkeel Railway and Pier Act, 1876; and for other purposes.

clxxxii. An Act for empowering the London and North-western Railway Company to make new railways and widen portions of existing railways, and execute other works, and to acquire additional lands in the counties of Buckingham, Warwick, Chester, and Lancaster; and for other purposes.

clxxxiii. An Act to confer powers upon the Metropolitan Railway Company with respect to the Hammersmith and Richmond Railway; to constitute the Kingsbury and Harrow Railway a separate undertaking; to make provision for disposing of sewage and water from engines; and for other purposes.

clxxxiv. An Act for extending the boundaries of the borough of Newbury, in the county of Berks; for empowering the Corporation to acquire the undertaking of the Borough of Newbury Gaslight and Coke Company; and for other purposes.

clxxxv. An Act to authorise the Weston-super-Mare Improvement Commissioners to supply Water within the Urban Sanitary District of Weston-super-Mare and within the parishes of Uphill, Kewstoke, and Worle, in the county of Somerset, to purchase the undertaking of the Weston-super-Mare Waterworks Company; and for other purposes.

clxxxvi. An Act to extend the period limited by the Dover and Deal Railway Act, 1874, as extended by the Dover and Deal Railway Act, 1877, for the compulsory purchase of Lands authorised to be taken by the first-mentioned Act.

clxxxvii. An Act for incorporating and conferring powers on the Castleford and Whitwood Gaslight and Coke Company.

clxxxviii. An Act to authorise the construction of a Bridge over certain railways near the western end of Cromwell Road, Kensington, with roads and approaches in connexion therewith.

clxxxix. An Act to enable the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company to construct a railway to the city of Waterford and certain branch railways and other works, and to confer further powers on the Company with reference to their Undertaking; and other purposes.

cxc. An Act for empowering the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City and County of the City of Exeter to acquire the undertakings of the Exeter Water Company, and of the Dartmoor and Exeter Water Supply Company, Limited, and to make better provision for the supply of water to the city and neighbouring parishes; and for other purposes.

cxci. An Act to enable the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company to make an Extension Railway and other Works; and for other purposes.

cxcii. An Act to extend the time for completing the Letterkenny Railway; to revive some of the powers of purchasing Land for that Railway; and for other purposes.

cxciii. An Act to extend the District of the Improvement Commissioners and the Urban Sanitary Authority for the District of Ramsgate; to enable them to make a new Road; to provide for the severance of Ramsgate from the jurisdiction of the town and port of Sandwich; and for other purposes.

cxciv. An Act to authorise the Corporation of Stockton-on-Tees to construct a Quay and other Works; to borrow Moneys; and for other purposes.

cxcv. An Act to authorise the construction of a Railway in the county of Antrim from Ballymoney to Ballycastle; and for other purposes.

cxcvi. An Act for the better supplying with Water the Parliamentary Burgh of Forfar, and places adjacent; and for other purposes.

cxcvii. An Act to authorise the transfer of the Undertaking of the Mansfield Gaslight Company to the Mansfield Improvement Commissioners.

cxcviii. An Act for authorising the construction by the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board of Over-head or High Level Railways in connexion with their Docks on the Liverpool side of the River Mersey.

cxcix. An Act to extend the time for the completion of certain Works at Bermondsey; and for other purposes.

cc. An Act to provide for the cancelling of the Bond entered into under the Enniskillen, Bundoran, and Sligo Railway Act, 1862.

cci. An Act to confer further powers on the Navan and Kingscourt Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccii. An Act to confer additional powers upon the Bournemouth Gas and Water Company.

cciii. An Act for empowering the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Cheltenham to acquire the undertaking of the Cheltenham Waterworks Company, and for supplying with Water the Borough of Cheltenham and other places; and for other purposes.

cciv. An Act for conferring further powers on the Glasgow and South-western Railway Company for the construction of Works, the acquisition of Lands, and the raising of Money; and for making further provision for the construction of Works at the Harbour of Ayr; and for other purposes.

ccv. An Act for enabling the North-eastern Railway Company to construct a Railway from their Hull and Holderness Branch to Salt End in the East Riding of Yorkshire; and for other purposes.

ccvi. An Act to authorise the Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway Company to extend their Railway from their present Terminus at Waterford into the city of Waterford; and for other purposes.

ccvii. An Act to amalgamate the Undertakings of the Great Western and South Devon Railway Companies; and for other purposes.

ccviii. An Act for empowering the Great Western Railway Company to make new railways, roads, and other works; for extending the time for the completion of authorised railways, and for the purchase of Lands for the same; for empowering the Great Western Railway Company to abandon the construction of certain authorised railways; for vesting in the Great Western Railway Company and the Severn Navigation Commissioners the Undertakings of the Gloucester and Worcester Horse Towing Path Company and the River Severn Horse Towing Path Extension Company; for vesting in the Great Western Railway Company and the Stratford-upon-Avon Railway Company the Undertaking of the Alcester Railway Company; for conferring further Powers upon the Great Western Railway Company and other companies in relation to their respective undertakings; for empowering the Great Western Railway Company to subscribe towards the Capital and Debenture Debt of the Worcester, Bromyard, and Leominster, the Mitcheldean Road and Forest of Dean Junction, the Malmesbury, and the Llynvi and Ogmore Railway Companies; and for other purposes.

ccix. An Act to amend and enlarge the provisions of the Warrington Waterworks Act, 1855, and the Warrington Waterworks Act, 1868; to extend the limits of the Warrington Waterworks Company for the supply of Water; to enable the Company to construct additional Works, and to make further and better provision for supplying the Town and Borough of Warrington and the adjoining Districts with Water; and for other purposes.

ccx. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Littleport and Downham District, and to provide for the making and maintaining of roads in the said district; and for other purposes.

**P.** ccxi. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to the Darenth Valley Main Sewerage District.

**P.** ccxii. An Act for the appointment of Trustees to maintain certain works executed near the River Corrib, in the county of Galway; and for other purposes.

**P.** ccxiii. An Act for the Disafforestation of Epping Forest and the preservation and management of the uninclosed parts thereof as an Open Space for the recreation and enjoyment of the public; and for other purposes.

ccxiv. An Act for effecting an arrangement with respect to the mortgage and other debts of the Cork and Kinsale Junction Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxv. An Act for authorising the construction of Railways in the County of Glamorgan, to be called the Pontypridd, Caerphilly, and Newport Railway; and for other purposes.

ccxvi. An Act for conferring on the Conservators of the River Thames further Powers, and for extending and amending the Thames Acts, 1857 to 1870; and for other purposes.

ccxvii. An Act for making a Railway from the Ilen Valley Railway at Drimoleague to the Town of Bantry, all in the County of Cork; and for other purposes.

ccxviii. An Act for authorising the construction of a Railway from the Narberth Road and Maenclochog Railway at Rosebush to Fishguard; and for other purposes.

ccxix. An Act for conferring further powers on the Teign Valley Railway Company for the construction of works, and otherwise in relation to their Undertaking; and for other purposes.

ccxx. An Act to authorise the application to other Educational Purposes, or the sale or letting, of Schoolhouses and other School Properties held on behalf of Congregations of the Free Church of Scotland; and for other purposes.

ccxxi. An Act to further extend the respective periods for the compulsory purchase of lands for and for the completion of the works authorised by the Metropolitan Inner Circle Completion Act, 1874.

ccxxii. An Act for embanking and reclaiming certain waste land on the bank of the River Fergus, in the County of Clare.

ccxxiii. An Act for conferring further powers upon the holders of certain Debenture Stock of the Banbury and Cheltenham Direct Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxiv. An Act to authorise the construction of Tramways in and near the Town of Croydon, in the County of Surrey; and for other purposes.

ccxxv. An Act to authorise the Leominster and Bromyard Railway Company to construct a new railway; to extend the time for the purchase of certain lands and completion of line authorised by former Act; and for other purposes.

ccxxvi. An Act to extend the time for the completion of the Portishead Docks; and for other purposes.

ccxxvii. An Act to authorise the extension of the Ballymena and Larne Railway, in the County of Antrim, and to confer further powers in relation to that undertaking.

ccxxviii. An Act for making a Bridge over the River Severn from Newnham to Arlingham in the county of Gloucester, with approaches thereto; and for other purposes.

ccxxix. An Act for incorporating the Princetown Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxx. An Act for amending the Acts relating to the Waterford and Wexford Railway Company.

**P.** ccxxxi. An Act to confirm, with amendments, certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Aldershot and Farnborough Tramways, Bolton and Suburban Tramways, Gloucester Tramways, Moss Side Local Board Tramways, Newton Heath Local Board Tramways, Reading Tramways, Sunderland Tramways, Wavertree Local Board Tramways, West Derby Local Board Tramways, and Wolverhampton Tramways (Extension).

**P.** ccxxxii. An Act to confirm, with amendments, a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Glasgow and Ibrox Tramway.

**P.** ccxxxiii. An Act to confirm the Provisional Orders for the Inclosure of certain lands in pursuance of Reports of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales.

ccxxxiv. An Act to authorise the Aberdeen District Tramways Company to construct additional Tramways; and for other purposes.

ccxxxv. An Act to empower the Belfast Street Tramways Company to alter the gauge of their existing Tramways and to construct additional Tramways, and to raise further Money; and for other purposes.

ccxxxvi. An Act to incorporate the Boston District Tramways Company, and to authorise the construction of Tramways in and near the Town of Boston, and from Boston to Wrangle, in the County of Lincoln; and for other purposes.

ccxxxvii. An Act to confer further powers on the Glyn Valley Tramway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxxviii. An Act to authorise the construction of Tramways in the Parish of Wallasey, in the County of Chester; and for other purposes.

---

# PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. AN Act for authorising the Trustees of the Settled Estates of the Marquess of Exeter to raise moneys on the security of the Settled Estates, for the improvement thereof; and for other purposes.
2. An Act to confirm a partition made of certain hereditaments held upon the Trusts by the Will of Samuel Brooks, deceased, declared concerning the hereditaments comprised in the ninth schedule to the said Will, and the short title of which is intended to be Brooks Settled Estates Partition Confirmation Act, 1878.
3. An Act for giving effect to a compromise of suits affecting the Estates in the Counties of Westmeath and Dublin, in Ireland, late of Adolphus Cooke, deceased.
4. An Act for confirming certain Building Leases granted by the late Lord Stafford and the present Lord Stafford of lands in the Borough of Stafford and in the Parish of Castle Church in the County of Stafford, and in the Parish of Shifnal in the County of Salop, which are subject to the uses of a Settlement of the Family Estates of the said Lords Stafford, dated the sixth day of February one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three.
5. An Act to enable the Trustees of the Settlement of Lord Tredegar's Family Estates to take further Shares in the Alexandra (Newport) Dock Company, and for other purposes, and of which the short title is Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Act, 1878.
6. An Act to confirm an Agreement of Compromise made with respect to an Estate or Farm called Pwllcarn and other hereditaments in the County of Glamorgan, and to provide for raising a sufficient sum for payment of purchase moneys, costs, and expenses in connexion with the said Agreement.
7. An Act to be intituled the Vane Tempest Settled Estate Act, 1878.

[SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

# SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1878.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 7 August 1878 ;—*for*,

A RETURN "of the Number of DAYS on which THE HOUSE SAT in the Session of 1878, stating, for each Day, the Date of the Month, and Day of the Week, the Hour of the Meeting, and the Hour of Adjournment ; and the Total Number of Hours occupied in the Sittings of The House, and the Average Time ; and showing the Number of Hours on which The House Sat each Day, and the Number of Hours after Midnight ; and the Number of Entries in each Day's Votes and Proceedings " (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.149, of Session 1877).

(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

| Month. | Day. | House met. | | House adjourned. | | Hours of Sitting. | | Hours after Midnight. | | Entries in Votes. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | H. | M. | H. | M. | H. | M. | H. | M. | |
| 1878 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. 17 | Th | 1 | 30 | 12 | 45 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 45 | 44 |
| ,, 18 | F | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 194 |
| ,, 21 | M | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 0 | - | - | 52 |
| ,, 22 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | - | - | 51 |
| ,, 23 | W | 12 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 0 | 45 | - | - | 21 |
| ,, 24 | Th | 4 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 7 | 15 | - | - | 100 |
| ,, 25 | F | 4 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 62 |
| ,, 28 | M | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 0 | - | - | 82 |
| ,, 29 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 15 | - | - | 67 |
| ,, 30 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 44 |
| ,, 31 | Th | 4 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 8 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 78 |
| Total... | 11 | - | - | - | - | 75 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 795 |
| Feb. 1 | F | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 81 |
| ,, 4 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 76 |
| ,, 5 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 12 | 30 | 8 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 56 |
| ,, 6 | W | 12 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | - | - | 59 |
| ,, 7 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 59 |
| ,, 8 | F | 4 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 8 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 43 |
| ,, 11 | M | 4 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 15 | - | - | 67 |
| ,, 12 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 8 | 30 | 4 | 30 | - | - | 49 |
| ,, 13 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 66 |
| ,, 14 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 49 |
| ,, 15 | F | 4 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 8 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 48 |
| ,, 18 | M | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 70 |
| ,, 19 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 2 | 15 | 61 |
| ,, 20 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 40 |
| ,, 21 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 54 |
| ,, 22 | F | 4 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 9 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 51 |
| ,, 25 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 9 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 77 |
| ,, 26 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 3 | 30 | - | - | 30 |
| ,, 27 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 63 |
| ,, 28 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 66 |
| Total... | 20 | - | - | - | - | 159 | 40 | 17 | 45 | 1,165 |
| Mar. 1 | F | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 63 |
| ,, 4 | M | 4 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 8 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 70 |
| ,, 5 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 15 | - | - | 58 |
| ,, 6 | W | 2 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 3 | 55 | - | - | 62 |
| ,, 7 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 9 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 72 |
| ,, 8 | F | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | - | - | 46 |
| ,, 11 | M | 4 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 8 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 75 |
| ,, 12 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 68 |
| ,, 13 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 54 |
| ,, 14 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 75 |
| ,, 15 | F | 4 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 73 |
| ,, 18 | M | 4 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 79 |
| ,, 19 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 11 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 92 |
| 1878 *cont.* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mar. 20 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 64 |
| ,, 21 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 55 |
| ,, 22 | F | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 71 |
| ,, 25 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 9 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 85 |
| ,, 26 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 | - | - | 59 |
| ,, 27 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 72 |
| ,, 28 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 2 | 15 | 79 |
| ,, 29 | F | 2 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 8 | 30 | - | - | 71 |
| Total... | 21 | - | - | - | - | 170 | 25 | 19 | 0 | 1,443 |
| Apr. 1 | M | 4 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 15 | 92 |
| ,, 2 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 12 | 30 | 8 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 70 |
| ,, 3 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 59 |
| ,, 4 | Th | 4 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 69 |
| ,, 5 | F | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 67 |
| ,, 8 | M | 4 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 8 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 100 |
| ,, 9 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 84 |
| ,, 10 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 59 |
| ,, 11 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 78 |
| ,, 12 | F | 2 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 10 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 76 |
| ,, 15 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 106 |
| ,, 16 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 9 | 45 | 7 | 45 | - | - | 83 |
| Total... | 12 | - | - | - | - | 109 | 40 | 16 | 15 | 943 |
| May 6 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 115 |
| ,, 7 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 8 | 30 | 4 | 30 | - | - | 65 |
| ,, 8 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 89 |
| ,, 9 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 69 |
| ,, 10 | F | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | - | 47 |
| ,, 13 | M | 4 | 0 | *9 | 30 | 17 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 117 |
| ,, 14 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 100 |
| ,, 15 | W | 12 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | - | - | 73 |
| ,, 16 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 2 | 15 | 80 |
| ,, 17 | F | 2 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 | - | - | 58 |
| ,, 20 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 111 |
| ,, 21 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 85 |
| ,, 22 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 66 |
| ,, 23 | Th | 4 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 79 |
| ,, 24 | F | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 85 |
| ,, 27 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 106 |
| ,, 28 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 3 | 30 | - | - | 63 |
| ,, 29 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 80 |
| ,, 30 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 2 | 30 | 82 |
| ,, 31 | F | 4 | 0 | 5 | 45 | 1 | 45 | - | - | 53 |
| Total... | 20 | - | - | - | - | 160 | 20 | 28 | 45 | 1,623 |

* The House sat from 4 o'clock p.m. on Monday, 13th May, till 9.30 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, 14th May.

| Month. | Day. | House met. | | House adjourned. | | Hours of Sitting. | | Hours after Midnight. | | Entries in Votes. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1878 | | H. | M. | H. | M. | H. | M. | H. | M. | |
| June 3 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 112 |
| ,, 4 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 55 |
| ,, 6 | Th | 4 | 0 | 11 | 30 | 7 | 30 | - | - | 97 |
| ,, 7 | F | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | - | - | 73 |
| ,, 13 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 59 |
| ,, 14 | F | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 66 |
| ,, 17 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 102 |
| ,, 18 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 11 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 56 |
| ,, 19 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 53 |
| ,, 20 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 63 |
| ,, 21 | F | 2 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 10 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 59 |
| ,, 24 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 73 |
| ,, 25 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 | - | - | 51 |
| ,, 26 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 46 |
| ,, 27 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 9 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 67 |
| ,, 28 | F | 2 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 | - | - | 47 |
| Total... | 16 | - | - | - | - | 139 | 40 | 13 | 15 | 1,079 |
| July 1 | M | 4 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 2 | 30 | 82 |
| ,, 2 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 10 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 68 |
| ,, 3 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 43 |
| ,, 4 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 61 |
| ,, 5 | F | 2 | 0 | 12 | 45 | 10 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 70 |
| ,, 8 | M | 4 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 2 | 30 | 83 |
| ,, 9 | Tu | 2 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 11 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 78 |
| ,, 10 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 51 |
| ,, 11 | Th | 4 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 45 | 3 | 15 | 59 |
| ,, 12 | F | 2 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 68 |
| ,, 15 | M | 4 | 0 | 2 | 45 | 10 | 45 | 2 | 45 | 84 |
| ,, 16 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 2 | 30 | 64 |
| 1878 cont. | | | | | | | | | | |
| July 17 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 41 |
| ,, 18 | Th | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 57 |
| ,, 19 | F | 2 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 | - | - | 51 |
| ,, 22 | M | 4 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 9 | 45 | 1 | 45 | 73 |
| ,, 23 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 57 |
| ,, 24 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 44 |
| ,, 25 | Th | 4 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 55 |
| ,, 26 | F | 2 | 0 | 12 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 54 |
| ,, 29 | M | 4 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 2 | 30 | 74 |
| ,, 30 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 2 | 30 | 46 |
| ,, 31 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 5 | 55 | - | - | 43 |
| Total ... | 23 | - | - | - | - | 216 | 55 | 34 | 0 | 1,406 |
| Aug. 1 | Th | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 59 |
| ,, 2 | F | 4 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 4 | 15 | 65 |
| ,, 5 | M | 4 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 11 | 30 | 3 | 30 | 45 |
| ,, 6 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 35 |
| ,, 7 | W | 12 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | - | - | 53 |
| ,, 8 | Th | 4 | 0 | 3 | 45 | 11 | 45 | 3 | 45 | 47 |
| ,, 9 | F | 4 | 0 | 2 | 45 | 10 | 45 | 2 | 45 | 56 |
| ,, 10 | S | 12 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | - | 16 |
| ,, 12 | M | 4 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 11 | 30 | 3 | 30 | 52 |
| ,, 13 | Tu | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 1 | 30 | 72 |
| ,, 14 | W | 12 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | - | - | 63 |
| ,, 15 | Th | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 0 | - | - | 62 |
| ,, 16 | F | 12 | 45 | Prorogation. | | | | - | - | 22 |
| Total ... | 13 | - | - | - | - | 108 | 20 | 24 | 30 | 647 |

## SUMMARY.

| Month. | Days of Sitting. | Hours of Sitting. | | Hours after Midnight. | | Entries in Votes. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1878 | | H. | M. | H. | M. | |
| January ...... | 11 | 75 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 795 |
| February...... | 20 | 159 | 40 | 17 | 45 | 1,165 |
| March......... | 21 | 170 | 25 | 19 | 0 | 1,443 |
| April ......... | 12 | 109 | 40 | 16 | 15 | 913 |
| May ............ | 20 | 160 | 20 | 28 | 45 | 1,623 |
| June............ | 16 | 139 | 40 | 13 | 15 | 1,079 |
| July ............ | 23 | 216 | 55 | 34 | 0 | 1,406 |
| August......... | 13 | 108 | 20 | 24 | 30 | 647 |
| Total...... | 136 | 1,140 | 40 | 156 | 30 | 9,101 |

Average Time of Sitting, 8 Hours 23 $\frac{4}{17}$ Minutes.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1878—(PARL. PAPER 0.131.)

SUMMARY.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Divisions on Public Business before Midnight | ... | ... | 156 |
| Ditto ,, ,, after Midnight | ... | ... | 115 |
| Ditto—Private Business ,, before Midnight | ... | ... | 7 |
| Ditto ,, ,, after Midnight | ... | ... | — |
| Total Number of Divisions in Session 1878 | ... | ... | 278 |

# GENERAL INDEX TO SESSION 1878.

---

## EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

It being a principal object of this Index, that the proceedings on each Motion shall be completely recorded, some abbreviations of forms were necessary. Those who are accustomed to the proceedings of Parliament will readily fill up the voids. Those who are not so familiar, may find the following explanation useful, but will find the whole *formulæ* set out at length in the "Contents."

The names which immediately follow the title of a Bill are those of the Peers or hon. Members who have charge of the Bill.

The numbers which are added at stages of Bills are the official numbers of the prints and reprints ordered at each stage, and, with the Statute, will enable the reader to follow all the changes the Bill has undergone.

The entries—Moved, "That the Bill be now read $2^a$;" Amendt. "this day six months;" Question put, "That 'now,' &c."—indicate the usual form of raising the issue—namely, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

"*The Ballot,* Amendt. on Committee of Supply" indicates that the Question was raised by means of an Amendment moved on the Motion (after the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee of Supply had been read), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." In this case the issue is formally raised by the Motion "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add" other words. The decision is taken on the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Nos. added to the "Parliamentary Papers" are in most cases those given in the Commons' "List of Papers for Sale."

# INDEX

TO

# HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE

TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

41° & 42° VICTORIA,

1878.

---

### Explanation of the Abbreviations.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or $1^{a}$, $2^{a}$, $3^{a}$, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY — NAVY — INDIA — IRELAND — SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT — POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS — CHURCH OF ENGLAND — EDUCATION — CRIMINAL LAW — LAW AND JUSTICE — TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

---

ABERDARE Lord
Eastern Question—The Congress—Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 514
Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [238] 1028
Metropolitan Police Force, Address for Returns, [242] 632
Noxious Vapours Commission, Report, [240] 125

*Aberdeen District Tramways Bill (by Order)*
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *June* 17, [240] 1574
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir Walter B. Barttelot*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
Question again proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Delahunty*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived; Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 216, N. 119; M. 97 (D. L. 173)
On Question, "That the Bill be now read 3°?" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°

ABERDEEN, Earl of
China—Chefoo Convention, [242] 34
Prison Authorities Act (1874) Amendment, 1R. [241] 209

ABINGER, Lord
Army—Marking Deserters, [239] 108
Army Recruiting—Fraudulent Re-enlistment, [238] 1387

**Absentee Proprietors (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Parnell, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Patrick Martin*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 115]
Moved, "That the Order for 2R. be discharged" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*) *May* 8, [239] 1589; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

**Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 173]
Read 2°, after short debate *May* 14, [239] 1959
Committee*; Report *May* 15
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *May* 16, [240] 122
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. O'Connor Power*); after short debate, Question put; A. 1, N. 79; M. 78 (D. L. 137)
After further short debate, Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°;" Question put; A. 77, N. none (D. L. 139)
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Belmore*) *May* 17 (No. 87)
Read 2ª *May* 24, 618
Committee * *May* 28
Report * *May* 31
Read 3ª * *June* 3
Royal Assent *June* 17 [41 *Vict.* c. 23]

ACLAND, Sir T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [238] 709, 717
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 379
County Government, Leave, [237] 607; 2R. 1877
Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 795
Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 98
Parochial Charities of the City of London, Res. [239] 1702
Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 550
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 5, [241] 35

ADAM, Right Hon. W. P., *Clackmannan, &c.*
Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 215
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 630
Supply—Marlborough House, [240] 1360
  New Courts of Justice and Offices, [240] 1375
  Public Buildings, [240] 1364
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1943

ADDERLEY, Right Hon. Sir C. B. (President of the Board of Trade), *Staffordshire, N.*
Explosives Act, 1875—Conveyance of Explosives, [237] 1207
Harbour and Lighthouse Returns, [239] 285
Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870—Accounts of Insurance Companies, [239] 520
Mercantile Marine—Miscellaneous Questions
  Deck Passengers — English and Irish Steamers, [237] 254
  Eddystone Lighthouse, [238] 298, 1043
  Establishment of a Signalling Station on the Eddystone Rocks, [238] 1398
  Missing Steamers, [237] 370
Merchant Seamen, Leave, [237] 304; Nomination of Committee, [238] 259
Merchant Shipping Acts, 1854 and 1876—Miscellaneous Questions
  American Officers, [237] 253
  "Calenick," The, [237] 1324
  Certificates of Masters and Mates, [237] 252
Railway Brake Power, [237] 248
Railways—Continuous Brakes, [238] 452, 758
Railways (Ireland)—Continuous Brakes, [238] 1294
Supply—Harbours, &c. [238] 1536
  Lighthouses Abroad, [238] 1544
Turkey—Trade in the Black Sea, &c. [237] 1621
[see NORTON, Lord]

**Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Colonel Stanley, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 169]
*Clerks of Royal Engineer Department*, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Sir
240] Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 31, 1037
Read 2°, after debate *June* 6, 1313
241] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 12, 1367
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Parnell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P. 1375
Committee—R.P. *July* 12, 1424
Committee; Report *July* 16, 1679
*The Civil Service*, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 22, 2059
242] Order for 3R. read, and discharged *July* 26, 450; Bill re-committed; Committee; Report; Considered; read 3°
l. Read 1ª* (*Viscount Bury*) *July* 29 (No. 176)
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 1, 854
Committee*; Report *August* 6
Read 3ª* *August* 8
Royal Assent *August* 13 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 53]

*Admiralty and War Office [Retirement of Officers]*
Resolution considered in Committee *June* 13, [240] 1491
Resolution reported and agreed to *June* 14

**Adulteration of Seeds Act (1869) Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Clare Read, Sir William Earle Welby-Gregory, Mr. Butt*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *April* 1 [Bill 139]
Read 2° *April* 15, [239] 1356
Committee *; Report *May* 6
Read 3° * *May* 8
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Marquess of Bristol*) *May* 13
Read 2ª* *May* 17 (No. 79)
Committee *; Report *May* 20
Read 3ª * *May* 21
Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. 17]

ADVOCATE, The Lord (Right Hon. W. WATSON), *Glasgow, &c. Universities*
Coal Mines—Blantyre Colliery Explosion, [240] 29
242] Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1127;
*cl.* 8, *ib.*; *cl.* 18, *ib.*, 1128; *cl.* A, 1129;
*add. cl.* 1130, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1136,
1139; Consid. 1705, 1708; Amendt. 1710,
1711
Education (Scotland) Act—School Sites, [237] 1049
242] Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland),
Comm. *cl.* 4, 621; *cl.* 7, 622; Amendt. 623;
*cl.* 14, 625; *add. cl. ib.*, 626; Consid. *cl.* A.
Amendt. 978
Locomotives on Highways (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 979; *cl.* 6, 980
Mining Accidents—Kilsyth Explosion, [238] 1745
Prisons (Scotland) Act—Prison Board Clerks, [239] 1369
Public Parks (Scotland), 2R. [237] 362
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. 430
238] Comm. *cl.* 1, 1788; *cl.* 3, 1789, 1790; Amendt.
1794, 1795, 1796; *cl.* 4, 1799, 1805; Amendt.
1809; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.*, 1810; *cl.* 6, *ib.*,
1811, 1813, 1815, 1816, 1818; *cl.* 8, 1820,
1821; *cl.* 9, *ib.*, 1822, 1823; *cl.* 12, 1825
240] 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1191,
1195, 1196; *cl.* 15, 1197, 1200; *cl.* 16, 1205;
Amendt. 1206, 1212; *cl.* 18, 1214; *cl.* 19,
1215; *cl.* 24, 1216, 1686, 1689; *cl.* 29, 1690,
1691, 1693; Amendt. 1694; *cl.* 30, 1695;
*cl.* 32, *ib.*; *cl.* 33, Amendt. *ib.*, 1696;
Amendt. 1697, 1698, 1699; *cl.* 34, Amendt.
*ib.*; *cl.* 35, *ib.*, 1700; *cl.* 36, 1701, 1703,
1705, 1706, 1707, 1708; *cl.* 38, 1711;
Amendt. 1712; *cl.* 41, 1714, 1716, 1720;
*cl.* 43, 1721; *cl.* 44, Amendt. *ib.*, 1722;
*cl.* 45, 1723, 1725, 1727, 1729; *cl.* 49, 1732,
1733; *cl.* 50, 1736; *cl.* 55, 1737; *cl.* 62,
1889; *cl.* 63, 1890; *cl.* 67, Amendt. *ib.*;
*cl.* 78, 1891; *cl.* 79, Amendt. 1892; *cl.* 83,
Amendt. *ib.*, 1893; *cl.* 85, Amendt. *ib.*, 1896,
1898, 1899, 1900; *cl.* 96, *ib.*; *cl.* 97, 1901;
*cl.* 98, 1902, 1903, 1904; *cl.* 102, 1905;
*cl.* 103, *ib.*; *cl.* 104, 1907, 1908; *cl.* 105, *ib.*,
1913; Amendt. 1917, 1918; *cl.* 106, 1919;
Postponed *cl.* 54, *ib.*, 1920, 1926, 1928, 1934;

[*cont.*

ADVOCATE, The Lord—cont.
240] *add. cl.* 1939, 1940, 1957, 1964, 1965, 1966,
1967, 1970, 1973, 1981, 1983, 1986, 1987
241] Consid. 595; *add. cl.* 613, 627, 634, 638,
641, 642, 643; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 644; *cl.* 11,
Amendt. 645; *cl.* 33, 648; Amendt. 649;
*cl.* 36, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 38, 650; *cl.* 42,
Amendt. 651; Amendt. 652; *cl.* 46, 827;
*cl.* 47, Amendt. 828; *cl.* 51, *ib.*; *cl.* 56,
830; *cl.* 88, 836; *cl.* 91, 842; *cl.* 94, *ib.*;
*cl.* 114, 843; 3R. 1076
Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
Courts of Session, [238] 1295
Crown Teinds, [237] 723
Law and Justice—The Scotch Judicial Bench—Lord Craighill, [242] 229, 386
Lunacy Commission—The Vacancy, [240] 926
Police Superannuation Fund, [240] 498
Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, [240] 495
Sheriff Clerks—Salaries, [238] 1748
Scotland—Dunkeld Bridge Tolls, Motion for an Address, [237] 631, 632, 635
Scotland—Religious Denominations, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1779
Supply—Courts of Law and Justice, Scotland, [242] 1270, 1271
Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 686
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 669, 671, 672, 673, 675
Under Secretary of State, 2R. [240] 822
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1944

*Africa*
*African Exploration*, Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 25, [237] 458;—*Mr. Stanley*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 29, 623

*Africa, South*
Observations, Mr. O'Donnell; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 18, [238] 1511
*Expenses of the British Troops in the Cape Colony*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 9, [239] 1594
*Griqualand West*, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 1[illegible], [241] 1243

*Outbreak of the Native Tribes*
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr.
237] J. Lowther *Jan* 21, 255; Question, Sir
Henry Holland; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther
*Jan* 29, 625; Question, Mr. A. Mills; An-
swer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 8, 1325;
Question, The Earl of Kimberley; Answer,
The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Feb* 12,
1483; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen;
Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, 1537;
Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Sir
Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 15, 1734; Ques-
tion, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Sir Michael
Hicks-Beach *Feb* 19, 1924; Question, Mr.
J. Cowen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach
*Mar* 8, [238] 972

[*cont.*

*Africa, South*—cont.
*Military Operations*, Questions, Colonel Mure, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Colonel
239] Stanley *April* 12, 1229; Question, The Earl of Kimberley; Answer, Earl Cadogan *April* 15, 1265; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 10, 1692
*The Supplementary Estimate*, Questions, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, [242] 1635
*The Transvaal*, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 30, [242] 643

*Position of Affairs*, Questions, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 16, [239] 1367
*South African Confederation—The Zulu King*, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 12, [237] 1533;—*The Zulus*, Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 21, [241] 19
*The Cape—Telegraphic Communication*, Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 30, [240] 928
*The Native Tribes*, Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 20, [240] 258
*The Transvaal Republic*, Question, Mr. Courtney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 14, [239] 1885
*The Transvaal Territory*, Questions, Mr. Courtney; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 8, [239] 856; *June* 27, [241] 325; *July* 22, 2060;—*The Correspondence*, Observations, Mr. Courtney; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 15, [242] 2061
*P.P.* [2128]
*The War Expenditure*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Colonel Stanley *April* 15, [239] 1286; Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 16, 1373
*Trial of Kaffir Prisoners*, Question, Mr. Leith; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 24, [241] 126

Parl. Papers—
Further Correspondence respecting Affairs of, with Maps . . . . [1961] [2000]
The Confederation — Correspondence . . [1980] [2100]

*Africa, West*
*The West African Settlements—Sierra Leone*, Question, Mr. Isaac; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 11, [241] 1240

**Agnew, Mr. R. Vans**, *Wigton Co.*
Hypothec (Scotland), Res. [241] 250
Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* 8, [241] 847
Navy—Commanders on the Active List, [242] 1176
Navy Estimates—Half-pay, &c. to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines, [238] 1471
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 676
[*cont.*

**Agnew, Mr. R. Vans**—*cont.*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [238] 1797; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1812, 1816; *cl.* 11, 1824; *cl.* 12, 1826; *cl.* 17, [240] 1214; *cl.* 36, 1705; *cl.* 49, 1733; *cl.* 105, 1912; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1920; Amendt. 1924, 1926; *add. cl.* 1981; Consid. *cl.* 91, Amendt. [241] 841
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1528
Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [242] 1263
Local Government Board, [238] 1552

**Agricultural Tenants (Security for Improvements) Bill**
(*Mr. James Barclay, Sir George Balfour, Mr. Earp*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 39]
2R. [Dropped]

**Airlie, Earl of**
Eastern Question, [237] 1026
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 2R. [239] 656

**Alexander, Colonel C.**, *Ayrshire, S.*
Army Estimates—Army Reserve, [240] 1475, 1482
Land Forces, [238] 702
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 214
238] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. Amendt. 1759, 1770; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1798, 1802, 1806; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1810; Amendt. 1813; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1822; *cl.* 12, Motion for Adjournment, 1826
240] *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1199; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1209; *cl.* 24, Amendt. 1689; *cl.* 41, Amendt. 1712, 1713, 1718, 1719; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 1732, 1734; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 1737; *cl.* 62, Amendt. 1888; Postponed *cl.* 54, Amendt. 1919, 1920, 1930
241] Consid. 603; *cl.* 114, Amendt. 843

**Allcroft, Mr. J. D.**, *Worcester City*
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 986, 1511

**Allen, Major R. S.**, *Somersetshire, E.*
Railways—Level Crossing at Radstock, [237] 725

**Ancient Monuments Bill**
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Russell Gurney*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 63]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 19, [237] 1978
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. R. E. Plunkett*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Onslow*); Question put, and negatived
[*cont.*

*Ancient Monuments Bill*—cont.
Question put, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 64, N. 56; M. 8 (D. L. 19)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *June* 6 [Bill 209]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 29

ANDERSON, Mr. G., *Glasgow*
African Exploration—Mr. Stanley, [237] 623
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 645
Austrian Cattle from Spain, Importation of, [241] 492
Betting Acts—Advertisement Clauses, [241] 1472
Captain Hooper's Life-Saving Apparatus, [241] 1851
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 359; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1614, 1618; Motion for reporting Progress, 1678; *cl.* 9, 1747; *cl.* 15, 1873; *cl.* 16, 1886, 1888; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1910, 1912; *cl.* 22, 1926, 1985, 1987; *cl.* 30, 2070, 2074, 2077; *cl.* 32, Amendt. 2083, 2084; *cl.* 55, 2133; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 2136, 2138; *cl.* 64, Amendt. 2140
242] *cl.* 68, 152, 153, 161; Postponed *cl.* 5, Amendt. 185, 192; *add. cl.* 438, 440, 442, 447
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1599, 1603, 1695
Criminal Law—Convict Letter Carriers, [238] 1144
Dunkeld Bridge Tolls, Motion for an Address, [237] 632
Education (Scotland), 2R. [242] 775
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [242] 621
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 10, [238] 96; *cl.* 17, 307; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 312, 313; *cl.* 27, 324, 325; *cl.* 80, 479; *add. cl.* 505, 607; 3R. [239] 266
Govan Burgh, 2R. [238] 144, 152
Letters Patent—The Seal, [238] 1489
Malta—Appointment of Governor, [238] 1047
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1179
Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [238] 1705
Parliament—Business of the House—Saturday Sittings, [242] 392
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 391
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 412, 419
Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
  American Mail Service, [237] 318, 319
  Eastern Mail Service, [240] 1887
  Post Office and Mail Service—Peninsular and Oriental Company, [240] 1255
  Telegraphic Department—Charges, [242] 1529
  West India Mail Contract, [242] 1637
Post Office—American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1633, 1656
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, [242] 248, 259, 260, 261
Racecourses (Licensing), 2R. [237] 638, 649; Comm. [240] 1240; *cl.* 1, 1486, 1487; *cl.* 6, 1488; Preamble, 1489

[*cont.*

ANDERSON, Mr. G.—*cont.*
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. 428
238] Comm. 1771, 1772; *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 1787, 1788; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1789, 1792, 1796; *cl.* 4, 1805, 1808; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1816, 1817; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1826; Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*
240] *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1182, 1184, 1186, 1190; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1199; *cl.* 16, 1208, 1209; *cl.* 36, 1710; *cl.* 105, 1914; Postponed *cl.* 54, Amendt. 1926, 1937; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1942, 1944, 1958, 1960, 1965, 1966, 1968, 1969, 1970
241] Consid. Amendt. 590, 607; *add. cl.* 641; *cl.* 3, 644, 826; *cl.* 56, 830; *cl.* 80, *ib.*, 831, 833, 839; 3R. Amendt. 1071, 1072
Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, [237] 1535
Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. [242] 776, 777
Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [237] 623
Supplementary Estimates, [237] 1223, 1259, 1260, 1262, 1265; Report, 1441; [242] 1180

ANNESLEY, Earl of
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1170

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
Burials, Res. [237] 1801
Grocers' Licences in Scotland, [240] 261
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [238] 1799, 1807; *cl.* 6, 1816

ANSTRUTHER, Sir W. C., *Lanarkshire, S.*
Civil Service Estimates—Clockmill Estate, [238] 1958
238] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. 1774; *cl.* 3, 1788; Amendt. 1789; *cl.* 4, 1801; *cl.* 6, 1818; *cl.* 11, Motion for reporting Progress, 1823; *cl.* 12, 1826
240] Amendt. 1184, 1186; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 1696; *cl.* 41, 1717; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 1720; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 1733; *cl.* 62, Amendt. 1889; *cl.* 93, Amendt. 1900; *cl.* 105, Amendt. 1908, 1917; *add. cl.* 1944, 1954, 1965, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1981
241] Consid. *cl.* 88, 833

ARBUTHNOT, Colonel G., *Hereford*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Artificers of the Royal Artillery, [239] 1595
  Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1431
  India—Retiring Captains, [240] 742
  Medical Officers, the Roster for, [242] 2086
  Officers of Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Pay, [241] 760, 1235
  Physical Examinations of Officers—Report of the Joint Committee, [242] 1399
  Reserve Forces—Pensions and Good Conduct Pay, [240] 1389
Army Estimates—Army Reserve, [240] 1478
  Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1408
  Commissariat, Transport, &c., Charge for, [242] 1406
  Medical Establishments, [240] 1437, 1443
  Militia, &c. [240] 1445
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 29
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1365

ARGYLL, Duke of
Crete, Island of, [237] 1035
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Austro-Hungarian Monarchy—Speech of the Earl of Derby, Explanation, [239] 1363
British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 696, 697, 710, 1321
Gallipoli, Occupation of, [237] 1920
Greek Provinces of Turkey, [238] 262
Statement by Her Majesty's Government, [237] 365, 366
Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 830
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Conference, Address for Correspondence, [238] 1728
Education (Scotland), 1R. [238] 1831; Comm. *cl.* 19, [239] 953
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 1R. [239] 199; 2R. 653; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1074; *cl.* 12, 1080
Entail Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [238] 530, 534
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 822
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 40, 49, 54

ARMY
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
*Abolition of Purchase*, Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 11, [241] 1235
*Army Clothing*, Question, Mr. W. M. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 28, [238] 450
*Army Enlistment—The Police*, Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 2, [242] 995
*Army Equipment—The First and Second Army Corps*, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 26, [238] 376

*Army Examinations*
*Competitive Examinations for Commissions*, Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue, Lord Hampton; Reply, Viscount Bury; Observations, The Marquess of Lansdowne *May* 21, [240] 352
*Physical Competition for the Army*, Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 17, [240] 1606
*Physical Examination of Officers—Report of the Joint Committee*, Observations, Mr. Hayter; short debate thereon *August* 6, [242] 1397
*Riding and Athletics*, Question, Observations, Viscount Hardinge *May* 21, [240] 351
[See title *Army Examinations*]

*Army* (*India*)
*Artillery Pensions*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 11, [238] 1044
*Enlistment for India*, Observations, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *Mar* 4, [238] 654
*Retiring Captains—Army Circular, 1st May*, 1878, *cl.* 92, Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 27, [240] 742
[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*
*The Indian Staff Corps*, Question, Observations, Lord Waveney; Reply, Viscount Cranbrook; short debate thereon *July* 15, [241] 1449
*The 31st Native Infantry*, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 27, [240] 744

*Army* (*Ireland*)—*Married Soldiers' Quarters—Longford Barracks*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 18, [237] 1846;—*Cavalry Force*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *June* 18, [240] 1683

*Army Medical Department*
*Army Medical Officers*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 16, [240] 23; —*Supply of Medical Officers—Report of Committee*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Colonel Stanley *April* 12, [239] 1228;—*The Medical Service—The New Warrant*, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 20, [240] 1880;—*The Roster for Medical Officers*, Questions, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answers, Colonel Stanley *August* 16, [242] 2086; —*Vacancies and Candidates*, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 18, [237] 1849
*Army Surgeons—The Kaffir Outbreak*, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [237] 1618
*Auxiliary Hospital, Woolwich, The*, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 7, [237] 1209
*Case of Surgeon-Major Clarke*, Observations, Mr. Meldon; Reply, Colonel Stanley; Observations, General Sir George Balfour *August* 6, [242] 1402
*Examinations*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 2, [242] 992

*Army Rank—Clerks of the Royal Engineer Department*, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 14, [237] 1620
*Army Recruiting—Fraudulent Re-Enlistment*, Questions, Observations, The Duke of Bedford, Lord Ellenborough; Reply, Viscount Bury; short debate thereon *Mar* 15, [237] 1384

*Army Re-organization*
*Army Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line*, Observations, Mr. O'Reilly; short debate thereon *Mar* 4, [238] 646
*Brigade Depôts—Cavalry Officers*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Jan* 21, [237] 251
*Compulsory Retirement of Officers*, Question, General Shute; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 14, [239] 1881
*Military Forces Localization Act—The Comptroller and Auditor General's Report*, Observations, Sir Alexander Gordon *June* 13, [240] 1416
*Promotion of General Officers*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 1, [242] 865
[*cont.*

ARMY—*Re-organization—cont.*

*Retirement — The Order in Council*, 1878, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 20, [240] 258

*Arrears of Pay—Officers of Artillery and Engineers*, Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 4, [241] 760;—*Paymasters*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 11, 1239

Report of Select Committee . *P.P.* 204

*Artillery*

*Heavy Artillery*, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 26, [239] 36

*Rifled Ordnance*, Questions, Major O'Beirne; Answers, Lord Eustace Cecil *May* 24, [240] 626; *June* 3, 1075

*Siege Guns*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *May* 23, [240] 496

*Cavalry Colonels — Royal Warrant*, 1878, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Stanley *April* 11, [239] 1093

*Coast Defence—Submarine Mines*, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 22, [238] 1838

*Courts of Inquiry and Courts Martial*, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 18, [238] 1489

*Defences of the Clyde*, Question, Mr. James Stewart; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 21, [238] 1752

*Defences of the Humber*, Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 4, [238] 636

*Department of Contracts*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *July* 18, [241] 1852

*Good Conduct Medals*, Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 14, [242] 1949

*Half-Pay — The Royal Warrant*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 22, [241] 2061

*Kaffir War, The—Officers on Special Service*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 13, [240] 1389

*Landguard Fort*, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 22, [238] 153

*Marking Deserters*, Questions, Observations, Lord Ellenborough; Reply, Viscount Bury; short debate thereon *Mar* 28, [239] 105

*Married Officers and Soldiers*, Questions, Major O'Beirne; Answers, Colonel Stanley *May* 13, [239] 1717; *May* 14, 1883

*Military and Naval Expenditure*, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 20, [240] 254

*Nationality of Adjutants*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 4, [241] 758

*Numbers*, Question, Sir Henry James; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, [239] 1717

*Officers of the Commissariat Department*, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 29, [239] 201

*Paymasters*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Colonel Stanley *April* 11, [239] 1092

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

*Quartermasters (Brigade Depôt)*, Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 26, [239] 35

*Quartermasters*, Questions, Mr. Stacpoole; Answers, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *April* 8, [239] 854; *April* 15, 1286

*Records of Military Services*, Observations, Lord Strathnairn; Reply, Viscount Bury *August* 15, [242] 2010

*Recruiting Sergeants—The Line and Militia*, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 15, [241] 1470

*Regimental Lieutenant Colonels*, Question, General Shute; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 16, [240] 26

*Straits Settlements—The Perak Expedition—Allowances to Officers, &c.*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Jan* 28, [237] 533;—*Allowances to Troops*, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 1, [238] 54, 541;—*Expenses of the Malay Expedition*, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 28, [238] 448

*The Commander-in-Chief—Leave of Absence*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *July* 12, [241] 1335

Leave of Absence—Returns *P. P.* 278

*The Indian Service — The European Force*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 13, [240] 1396

*The Mutiny Act*, Observations, The Earl of Galloway; Reply, Viscount Bury; short debate thereon *Mar* 22, [238] 1831;—*Military Law—Select Committee*, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 25, 299

*The new Line or Ex-Indian Regiments*, Question, Mr. Cobbold; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 29, [239] 200;—*Report of the Committee*, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 9, 1594

*The Regimental Debts Act*, 1863, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 24, [241] 132

*The Royal Artillery*, Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *April* 4, [239] 520;—*Artificers of*, Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 9, 1595

*The Royal Engineer Department*, Question, Sir Arthur Guinness; Answer, Colonel Stanley *April* 11, [239] 1092

*The Royal Engineers—Re-organization of the Clerical Branch*, Question, Mr. Ion Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 28, [239] 117

*The Royal Warrant*, 1870—*Time for Pension*, Question, General Shute; Answer, Colonel Stanley *April* 11, [239] 1095

*The Royal Warrant of* 1877—*Article* 88—*Promotion and Retirement*, Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Jan* 31, [237] 722; Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 7, 1209

*The Tyrone Fusiliers*, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 7, [240] 1342; short debate thereon *June* 17, 1610

*The Veterinary Department*, Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 15, [238] 1398

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

*War Office Clerks*, Question, Mr. Cobbold; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 1, [239] 284

*Wellesley, Hon. Colonel—Appointment as First Secretary of Embassy at Vienna*, Question, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, [239] 1714; —*Army Pay*, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 3, [240] 1072
[See title *Diplomatic Service, The*]

*Army—The Auxiliary Forces*

Miscellaneous Questions

*Adjutants of Volunteers and Yeomanry*, Question, The Earl of March; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 27, [241] 324; Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Stanley, 326
[See title *Army—The Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers*]

*Artillery Sergeants*, Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 5, [242] 1175

*Officers and Men—Double Returns of Efficiency*, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 28, [238] 448

*Retirement of Officers*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 25, [242] 224

*The Militia*

*Clothing Regulations*, Observations, Lord Balfour of Burleigh; Reply, Viscount Bury *July* 30, [242] 637

*Commissions in the Line*, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 13, [239] 1719

*Fines for Drunkenness*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 17, [240] 1605; Question, Observations, Lord Waveney; Reply, Viscount Bury *August* 6, [242] 1297

*Militia Artillery, The*, Question, Lord Waveney; Answer, Viscount Bury *June* 3, [240] 1061

*Militia Artillery Uniforms*, Observations, Lord Waveney; Reply, Viscount Bury; short debate thereon *April* 12, [239] 1193; Question, Lord Waveney; Answer, Viscount Bury *April* 15, 1266

*Militia Colonels*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 29, [242] 525

*Militia Force, The*, Observations, Mr. Hayter; short debate thereon *June* 13, [240] 1418

*Militia Officers*, Question, The Earl of Sandwich; Answer, Viscount Bury *Mar* 29, [239] 184

*Militia Volunteers for Service*, Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *April* 2, [239] 413

*The Northampton Militia*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 7, [240] 1344

*The Royal Cumberland Militia*, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 22, [241] 2054

*The Volunteers*

Question, Lord St. Leonards; Answer, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Mar* 4, [238] 615

*Retired Volunteer Officers*, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Colonel Stanley *April* 16, [239] 1372

[*cont.*

Army—*Auxiliary Forces—The Volunteers—cont.*

*The Hampshire Rifle Volunteers*, Question, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, Viscount Bury; short debate thereon *August* 1, [242] 858; Personal Explanation, Viscount Bury; Observations, Lord Truro *August* 12, 1748

*Volunteer Artillery Adjutants*, Question, Colonel Makins; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 21, [240] 359

*The Yeomanry*

*Yeomanry Adjutants*, Question, Mr. Starkie; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 29, [242] 522

*Yeomanry Sergeant Majors*, Question, Captain Milne-Home; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 17, [240] 1607

*Army—The Military Forces of the Crown —The Indian Contingent*

*Allowances to Families of Indo-Europeans*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 27, [240] 746

*Employment of Indian Troops*, Notice, Earl Granville *May* 13, [239] 1713; Postponement of Notice; Observations, Lord Selborne; short debate thereon *May* 14, 1855; Observations, Lord Selborne; Reply, The Lord Chancellor; debate thereon *May* 20, [240] 187

*Mutiny Act—The European and Native Indian Army*, Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 22, [241] 2056

*Payment—The Rate of Exchange*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, [242] 640; Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 2, 994

*Pay of Officers*, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 13, [239] 1718

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention—Indian Troops in Cyprus*, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 22, [241] 2054

*The Estimates*, Notice of Resolution, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Questions, Mr. Chamberlain, Captain Pim, Mr. Newdegate; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Colonel Stanley; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 13, [239] 1721
[See title *Army—Cost of Indian Troops*]

239] *The Indian Contingent*, Questions, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. J. Holms, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, 1519; Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross; Notice of Question, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 9, 1597; Notice of Questions, Sir Henry James, Sir Henry Havelock; Notice of Motion, Mr. A. Mills *May* 10, 1688; Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope, 1691; Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 14, 1884; Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope

[*cont.*

*Army—The Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent*—cont.

240] *May* 16, 24; Withdrawal of Notice, Mr. Hussey Vivian *May* 23, 496; Questions, Mr. Waddy, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Childers, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Mundella; Answers, Mr. E. Stanhope, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. E. Jenkins, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 24, 623; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 27, 745; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Fawcett, 747;—*Cost*, Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Childers; An-
241] swers, Colonel Stanley *July* 11, 1244

*The Indian Troops in Malta*, Question, Mr. Ashbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 24, [241] 121

*Poisoning of Soldiers at Malta*, Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 22, [241] 2059

*The Native Army in India*, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 4, [240] 1166

*Indian Native Troops (Transport and Employment Abroad)*, Report of Select Comm. *P.P.* 321

Return . . . . . . . . 275

[See titles *Indian Native Troops—Army—The Military Forces of the Crown*]

## *Army—Army Reserve Forces*

LORDS

### Message from the Queen

239] Questions, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Mar* 29, 185

Message read by the Lord Chancellor; Observations, The Earl of Beaconsfield; short debate thereon *April* 1, 268

Ordered that the said Message be taken into consideration on Monday next

Order of the Day for the consideration of the Queen's Message read *April* 8, 760

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her most gracious Message communicating to this House Her Majesty's intention to cause the Reserve Force and the Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof as Her Majesty should think necessary, to be forthwith called out for permanent service (*The Earl of Beaconsfield*), 777; after long debate, Address agreed to, *nemine dissentiente*

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *April* 15, 1265

COMMONS

239] Message from Her Majesty brought up, and read by Mr. Speaker *April* 1, 289

Moved, "That Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be taken into consideration upon Thursday" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

Amendt. to leave out "Thursday," and insert "Monday" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*; after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

[*cont.*

*Army—Army Reserve Forces*—COMMONS—cont.

Moved, "That Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be taken into consideration upon Monday next" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Motion agreed to

Her Majesty's Message considered; Message
239] again read *April* 8, 858

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her Most Gracious Message communicating to this House Her Majesty's intention to cause the Reserve Force, and the Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof as Her Majesty should think necessary, to be forthwith called out for permanent service" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

Amendt. at end, to add "but that this House regrets that Her Majesty's Ministers have thought it right to advise the calling out of Her Majesty's Reserve Forces, considering that no great emergency has been shown to exist, and that such calling out of the Reserves is neither prudent in the interests of European peace, necessary for the safety of the country, nor warranted by the state of matters abroad" (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*), 893; Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. E. Jenkins*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *April* 9, 964; after long debate, Question put; A. 64, N. 319; M. 255

Div. List, A. and N. 1038

Main Question put, and agreed to

Address to be presented by Privy Councillors

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *April* 15, 1288

*Dismissal of the Reserves*, Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 29, [242] 524

## *Army—Army Reserve Forces*

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

*Army and Militia Reserves*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *July* 18, [241] 1846; Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 22, 2052; Question, Observations, The Earl of Camperdown; short debate thereon *August* 6, [242] 1286

*Army and Militia Reserves—Families of Reserve Men*, Questions, Major Nolan; Answers, Colonel Stanley *May* 7, [239] 1518; *May* 13, 1721; Question, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 16, [240] 29

[See title *Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men*]

*Army Reserve, The—The Police*, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 9, [239] 962; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 16, 1365

*First Class Army Reserve*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 10, [239] 1692

*Militia Reserve Act—Non-Commissioned Officers*, Question, Earl Percy; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 1, [241] 496

[*cont.*

*Army—Army Reserve Forces*—cont.
*Pay of Reserve Soldiers*, Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 10, [239] 1693
*Pensions and Good Conduct Pay*, Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Stanley *June* 13, [240] 1389
*Poor Law Relief*, Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 20, [240] 261
*The Eastern Question—The Reserve Forces*, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *Mar* 28, [239] 170; Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Observations, Mr. Parnell *Mar* 29, 207; Question, Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, Viscount Bury *April* 4, 512
*The Militia Reserve*, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *April* 8, [239] 855
*The Reserve Men*, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 4, [241] 759
Civil Employment . . . . *P.P.* 323
Relief to Families . . . . 326
Expenditure and Numbers . . 403

*Army — Artillery — Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns*
Address for Returns (*The Lord Waveney*) *July* 12, [241] 1325; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Army—Breech-loading Ordnance*
Moved, "That more attention should be paid to experiments on new systems of Breech-loading Ordnance than has been given for the last three years" (*Major Nolan*) *Mar* 12, [238] 1146; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Army—Cost of the Indian Troops*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 27, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the cost, direct and indirect, of Her Majesty's Indian Troops serving beyond the old Indian limits east of the Cape of Good Hope" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*, [240] 748; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

*Army—The Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 4, To leave out from "That," and add "the consideration of the rank and retiring allowances of Adjutants of Volunteers be referred to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Knight*) *v.*, [238] 638; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived

*Army—The Auxiliary Forces—The Militia*
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return of the number of effectives in the Auxiliary Forces at the beginning of the financial year (*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Army—The Auxiliary Forces—Yeomanry Adjutants*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "the present system of seconding Officers in Cavalry Regiments requires amendment, as it is calculated to give undue advantages in promotion and retirement under the Royal Warrant of the 13th day of August 1877 to Officers holding such appointments" (*Major O'Beirne*) *v.*, [242] 1395; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

*Army—The Military Forces of the Crown*
240] Notice of Amendment to Motion, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 17, 156
Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 17, 161
Ordered, That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Military Forces of the Crown (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 20
Moved, "That, by the Constitution of this Realm, no Forces may be raised or kept by the Crown in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament, within any part of the Dominions of the Crown, excepting only such Forces as may be actually serving within Her Majesty's Indian Possessions" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *May* 20, 264
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House, being of opinion that the constitutional control of Parliament over the raising and employment of the Military Forces of the Crown is fully secured by the provisions of the Law, and by the undoubted power of this House to grant or refuse Supplies, considers it to be unnecessary and inexpedient to affirm any Resolution tending to weaken the hands of Her Majesty's Government in the present state of Foreign affairs" (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *May* 21, 362; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
Debate resumed *May* 23, 499; after long debate, Question put; A. 226, N. 347; M. 121
Division List, A and N. 610
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

*Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions*
Moved, That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty for Report of the Joint Committee of the War Office and the Civil Service Commissioners appointed to consider the question whether the present literary examinations for the Army should be supplemented by physical competition (*The Lord Hampton*) *June* 7, [240] 1328; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Report of Committee . . . *P.P.* 254

*Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men*
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for recent Correspondence between the War Office and Boards of Guar-

[*cont.*

*Army Reserve — Allowances to Families of Reserve Men*—cont.
dians or members of Boards of Guardians relative to allowances to wives and children of the Army Reserve men who have been called into active service (*The Earl De La Warr*) *May* 16, [240] 5; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the present allowance of 6*d.* per diem for each wife and 2*d.* for each child of the Reserve men should be increased in those cases in which the calling out of the Reserve men has left their families with inadequate means of support" (*Major Nolan*) *v.*, [242] 1378; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

*Army (Royal Artillery and Engineer Officers' Arrears of Pay)*
Ordered, That the Select Committee of last Session on Royal Artillery and Royal Engineer Officers' Arrears of Pay be re-appointed *Feb* 7; That the Committee do consist of Seventeen Members:—Sir George Balfour, Sir Walter Barttelot, Major O'Beirne, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Grant Duff, Lord Eslington, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Carpenter Garnier, Lord George Hamilton, Sir John Hay, Mr. William Holms, Colonel Jervis, Mr. Mills, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Denzil Onslow, and Sir Henry Wolff

**Arranmore Polling District (Ireland) Bill** (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Marquess of Hamilton, Mr. Charley*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 22 [Bill 270]
Read 2° * *July* 29
Committee *; Report *August* 1
Read 3° * *August* 2
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Denman*) *August* 5 (No. 189)
Read 2ª * *August* 12
Committee *; Report *August* 14
Read 3ª * *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 75]

*Artizans Dwellings Act,* 1875—*Operation in Ireland*
Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 12, [241] 1334

ASHBURY, Mr. J. L., *Brighton*
Friendly Societies Act, 1875—Leeds County Court, [238] 61
Malta, Indian Troops in, [241] 121
Turkey—Bosnia, Herzegovina, &c. Insurrections in, [237] 927

ASHLEY, Hon. A. Evelyn M., *Poole*
Bessarabian Moldavia, Cession of, [239] 412
Crete, [240] 255
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 657, 688
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 573

[*cont.*

ASHLEY, Hon. A. Evelyn M.—*cont.*
Greece — Alleged Agreement with Turkey, [242] 863
Greeks—Correspondence of Mr. Gladstone, [237] 727
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 710
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1156, 1172, 1173, 1182
Natal, Colony of—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 463
Turkey—Greek Refugees, [238] 873
Slavery — Withdrawal of Motion, [242] 1215

*Asia, Central*
*Russia and Afghanistan,* Question, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 14, [242] 1947; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 16, 2087
*Russian Advance,* Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 12, [242] 1764; Observations, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Reply, Mr. Bourke; debate thereon *August* 13, 1927
*Russian Military Expedition,* Question, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 5, [242] 1179

ASSHETON, Mr. R., *Clitheroe*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1583
Congé d'élire, 2R. [239] 1548
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 354
County Government, 2R. [237] 1885
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1306; *cl.* 17, 1326
Parliament—Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, [240] 1076, 1177
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 87
Racecourses (Licensing), 2R. [237] 647
Supply—County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1010
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 24
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1149
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1865

**Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Downing, Mr. Chaine, Mr. Macartney, Mr. King-Harman*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 51]
2R *, Debate adjourned *Mar* 13
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir J. HOLKER), *Preston*
Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. [238] 1135
Bankruptcy Law Amendment, [237] 373; 2R. [238] 1125, 1134
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 128, 132, 139
Bills of Exchange—Acceptance, [239] 962
Bills of Sale, Consid. *add. cl.* [239] 1263, 1264
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1264
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1636
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1578

[*cont.*

**Attorney General, The**—*cont.*
- Criminal Law—Burglars with Housebreaking Implements—Definition of "Night," [241] 1970
- Criminal Law Consolidation, [238] 1491
- Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 684
- Criminal Law (Indictable Offences), [241] 763; Leave, [239] 1936, 1957; 2R. [240] 1672, 1881
- Criminal Law Practice Amendment, 2R. [237] 1840
- Cyprus, Government of, [242] 40, 388
- Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1891
- Divorce Court—"Hume *v.* Hume," [238] 60
- Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1067
- Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1772
- Friendly Societies Act, 1875—Leeds County Court, [238] 61
- Hertford College—University Tests Act, 1871, [239] 1593
- Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1906
- Land Registry, [240] 981
- Law and Justice—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Divorce and Criminal Cases, Reports of, [242] 1638
  - High Court of Justice—Taxing Masters' Offices, [242] 1637
  - Judicature Act—Leeds Civil Assizes, [242] 993, 1766
  - Leicester Assizes, [242] 1528
  - Manchester and Liverpool Civil Assizes, [242] 222
- Letters Patent—The Seal, [238] 1490
- Masters and Servants—Liability of Employers, [241] 1244
- Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [238] 440
- Mercantile Amendment Act, 1856—Bills of Exchange, [238] 1593
- Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 369, 400, 437
- Municipal Corporations Acts, [242] 520
- Mutiny Act—European and Native Indian Army, [241] 2056
- Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, [237] 533; Res. [242] 1185, 1191
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [240] 932; [242] 1635
  - Franchise of the Reserve Men, [240] 623
  - Representation of Clare, [241] 1463
- Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1100
- Parliamentary Election Petitions, [237] 373
- Patent Laws—Legislation, [237] 1850
- Provisional Orders for Irish Water Works, [241] 856
- Railways—Level Crossing at Radstock, [237] 725
- Russia—Purchase and Equipment of Privateers, [240] 357
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 952, 957, 960
  - County Courts, [240] 976
  - Land Registry, [240] 981
- Treaty of Berlin—Articles 2 and 61, [242] 869

**Bagge, Sir W.,** *Norfolk, W.*
- Criminal Law—Assaults on the Police in Merionethshire, [237] 1056

**Bailey, Sir J. R.,** *Herefordshire*
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 872
- Prisons Act, 1877—Governors of Gaols, [239] 1720
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 49

**Balfour, Major-General Sir G.,** *Kincardineshire*
- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. [241] 1374; *cl.* 2, 1384
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1425
  - Department of Contracts, [241] 1852
  - Enlistment for India, [238] 663
  - Indian Service, [240] 1390
  - Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 650
  - Surgeon-Major Clarke, Case of, [242] 1406
- Army Estimates—Administration of Army, [242] 1419, 1420
  - Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1408
  - Home Charges for Regular Forces in India, [242] 1422
  - Medical Establishments and Services, [240] 1438
  - Miscellaneous Effective Services, [242] 1419
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [242] 1419
- Asia, Central—Reported Russian Advance, [242] 1942
- Breech-Loading Ordnance, Res. [238] 1149
- Burials, Res. Amendt. [237] 1798
- Charity Commission—North Sunderland Harbour, [240] 1607
- Civil Service Estimates, [238] 1507; Res. [242] 1450
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 992; *cl.* 16, 1891; *cl.* 33, [242] 402, 409
- Eastern Question—Fleet in the Dardanelles, [238] 1755
- East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 469
- East India (Public Works), Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 331, 354
- Education (Scotland), 2R. [242] 775; Comm. *cl.* A, 1129
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [242] 621; *cl.* 12, 624; *cl.* 14, 625; *add. cl.* 626
- Fisheries—Denmark—Re-appearance of the Herrings, [237] 1534
- Harbour and Lighthouse Returns, [239] 285
- Harbour Loans, [241] 489
- Hypothec (Scotland), 2R. [237] 363
- Hypothec (Scotland) (No. 3), 2R. [239] 508
- India—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Civil and Military Employment—General Richard Strachey, [241] 1463, 1464
  - Indian Finance—Anglo-Indian Balances, [242] 1298, 1299;—Civil Expenditure, [237] 1423;—India Debt, [242] 1525;—Indian Exchanges, [242] 1212
  - Sir John Strachey's Speeches, [237] 1535
  - West Frontier Policy, [237] 246
- India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1904
- India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 487, 1323; [242] 1761

[*cont.*

**Balfour**, Major-General Sir G.—*cont.*
Indian Budget, 1878-9, [238] 1752
Indian Contingent—Payment—Rate of Exchange, [242] 640, 994
Loans for Roads and Bridges, [238] 637
Manchester Corporation Water, Instruction, [237] 1727
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 39, [239] 129; *cl.* 41, 133; *cl.* 48, 136, 137; *cl.* 97, 150, 151
Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, Res. [242] 1200
Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-77—Report, [242] 1694
Navy Estimates—Departmental Statement, [238] 1441; [242] 1572
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [239] 1234
Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1052
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 403
Population Statistics—Registrar General's Returns, [242] 1531
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1256; Comm. 1351; *cl.* 5, 1353, 1354, 1355
Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1003
238] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. 1782; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1821; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1824, 1825
240] *cl.* 24, 1686; *cl.* 29, 1690, 1692; *cl.* 30, 1695; *cl.* 36, 1703, 1709; *cl.* 38, 1711; *cl.* 41, 1714; *cl.* 45, 1730; *cl.* 98, 1903; *cl.* 102, 1905; *cl.* 103, *ib.*, 1906
241] Consid. *cl.* 38, 650; *cl.* 39, *ib.*
Scotch and Irish Fishery Loan Accounts, [242] 1764
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 862
Supply—Civil Contingencies, Re-payments to, [238] 1619, 1623
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1626, 1627
  Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 944
  Harbours, &c. [238] 1534, 1535, 1537
  Lighthouses Abroad, [238] 1543
  London Bankruptcy Court, [240] 972
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [242] 1687
  Provisions, Forage, &c. [238] 1623
  Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [238] 1553, 1555
  Report, [242] 1692
  Royal Palaces, [238] 1517, 1518, 1519
Trade of the United Kingdom, [242] 1172
Tunis and Tripoli, [241] 1580
War and India Offices, [242] 778
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 565, 1150
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1355, 1356, 1358, 1359

**Balfour**, Mr. A. J., *Hertford*
Burial Law Amendment, Leave, [239] 1358, 1359
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 943
East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 450
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 407
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 224
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [238] 1801; *cl.* 5, 1809

**Balfour of Burleigh**, Lord
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia—Clothing Regulations, [242] 637
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 2R. [239] 656
Factories and Workshops, 3R. [240] 4

***Ballymena and Larne Railway Bill*** [H.L.]
*l.* Read 3ª *June* 24, [241] 102
After short debate, Bill passed

**Bankers' Books (Evidence) Bill**
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Herschell, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Rodwell*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *August* 6 [Bill 293]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 12

**Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Ripley*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 25 [Bill 89]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 11, [238] 1135
Committee [Dropped]

**Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
*c.* *Legislation*, Question, Mr. Freshfield; Answer, The Attorney General *Jan* 24, [237] 373
Ordered * *Feb* 25
Read 1°* *Feb* 26 [Bill 119]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 11, [238] 1125
Bill withdrawn* *August* 5

**Barclay**, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 129, 136
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 401; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1615, 1618, 1717; *cl.* 9, 1743, 1748; *cl.* 10, 1856; Amendt. 1862, 1864; *cl.* 15, 1876; Amendt. 1881, 1883; *cl.* 16, 1892, 1904; *cl.* 21, 1908, 1911, 1912; Amendt. 1918, 1919, 1920, 1922; *cl.* 22, 1987, 1991; Amendt. 1992, 1999; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 2011, 2013, 2015, 2016; *cl.* 30, 2071, 2076; *cl.* 31, 2081, 2082; *cl.* 32, Amendt. 2083; *cl.* 39, Amendt. 2088, 2089; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 2090; *cl.* 53, 2091; *cl.* 54, 2093, 2094; *cl.* 55, 2099, 2127; *cl.* 62, Amendt. 2138
242] *cl.* 68, 156; *cl.* 70, Amendt. 170, 171, 173; Postponed *cl.* 5, Amendt. 188; *add. cl.* 765, 767, 769; Schedule 5, 807, 808, 811
Crown Teinds (Scotland), [237] 723
Education (Scotland), 2R, Motion for Adjournment, [242] 774; Comm. *cl.* A, 1128, 1129; *add. cl.* 1131, 1132, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1138
Education (Scotland) Act—School Sites, [237] 1049
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [242] 615, 621; *cl.* 7, 623; *add. cl.* 626, 627
Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1472; Comm. [238] 69
Harbours (Scotland), [240] 167

[*cont.*

**Barclay**, Mr. J. W.—cont.
Locomotives on Highways (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 979; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 980
Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, [238] 260
Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 17, [241] 1940
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 363; Motion for Adjournment, 367
Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877—Cell Accommodation, [238] 448
Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties, Res. [240] 627
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. 419
238] Comm. *cl.* 3, 1789, 1791, 1798; *cl.* 4, 1802,
1803, 1804, 1808, 1809; *cl.* 6, 1817, 1818;
*cl.* 9, Amendt. 1823; *cl.* 11, 1825
240] *cl.* 12, 1183, 1184, 1185; Amendt. 1186, 1188,
1189, 1191, 1192, 1194; *cl.* 15, Amendt.
1197, 1198, 1200, 1202, 1204; *cl.* 16, 1205;
Amendt. 1207; *cl.* 17, 1211; *cl.* 19, 1215;
*cl.* 29, 1691; *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1694, 1695;
*cl.* 32, Amendt. *ib.*, 1698, 1699; *cl.* 35,
Amendt. 1700; *cl.* 36, Amendt. *ib.*, 1701,
1702, 1704, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709;
*cl.* 37, 1710; *cl.* 38, *ib.*, 1712; *cl.* 41,
1717; *cl.* 45, 1727; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 1732,
1734; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 1736, 1737; *cl.* 56,
Amendt. 1738; *cl.* 57, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 63,
Amendt. 1889; *cl.* 64, Amendt. 1890; *cl.* 85,
Amendt. 1893, 1897; *cl.* 96, Amendt. 1900;
*cl.* 97, Amendt. 1901; *cl.* 98, Amendt. 1902,
1903, 1904; *cl.* 104, 1907; *cl.* 105, 1911;
Postponed *cl.* 54, 1920, 1925, 1939; *add. cl.*
1955, 1967, 1973, 1981, 1983, 1988, 1990
241] Consid. 609; *add. cl.* 639; *cl.* 3, 644; *cl.* 10,
Amendt. 645; *cl.* 39, Amendt. 650
Supply—Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1622
  Fishery Board, Scotland, Amendt. [240] 682
  Friendly Societies, [239] 1629
  Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1638, 1641
  Local Taxation in Scotland, &c., Motion for reporting Progress, [240] 816, 817
  Lunacy Commission, Scotland, [240] 812, 813
  Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 997, 1000
  Privy Council for Trade, &c., Committee of, [239] 1608, 1610
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 673, 681
  Secret Services, [240] 663
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Powers), [238] 296
Under Secretaries of State, 2R. [240] 824
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1941; Motion for Adjournment, 1945

**Bar Education and Discipline Bill**
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 24 [Bill 88]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 21, [238] 128; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. James Barclay*); after short debate, Question put; A. 29, N. 101; M. 72 (D. L. 27)

[*cont.*

*Bar Education and Discipline Bill.*—cont.
Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°," 136; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Dr. Cameron*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn * *July* 25
*Legislation*, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, [242] 642

**Baring**, Mr. T. C., *Essex, S.*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1385
Epping Forest, Comm. [241] 575; *cl.* 13, 577
Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1548
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1570
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 1968
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 1023
Supply—Stationery Office, [240] 81

**Barne**, Lt.-Colonel F. St. John N., *Suffolk, E.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 30, [241] 2074
Eastern Question—Armistice, The, [237] 1210
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 916

**Barran**, Mr. Alderman J., *Leeds*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 1015
Endowed Schools (Leeds Poors Estate), Motion for an Address, [238] 1657
Judicature Act—Leeds Civil Assizes, [242] 993, 1766
Locomotive Accident near Leeds, [240] 257
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 206
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 269

**Barttelot**, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. Amendt. [240] 1574, 1581
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1421
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 641
Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1409
  Land Forces, [238] 691
  Volunteer Corps, [240] 1457, 1458
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 1644
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 222, 225; Comm. *cl.* 10, 1856; *cl.* 15, 1872; *cl.* 22, 1930; *cl.* 68, [242] 156; Postponed *cl.* 33, 403; *add. cl.* 445
Cotton Manufactories — Riots in Lancashire, [240] 33, 159
County Government, Leave, [[237] 597; 2R. 1682, 1683, 1684
Highways, Comm. [240] 1345; *cl.* 11, [241] 858; *add. cl.* 1337, 1358
Inclosure Provisional Order (Llanfair Waterdine), 2R. [240] 1319
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1349

[*cont.*

**Barttelot**, Colonel Sir W. B.—*cont.*
Income Tax, Res. [238] 390
Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1899
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 899
"Nineteenth Century"—Article on "Liberty in the East and West" (Mr. Gladstone)—Mr. Hanbury's Motion, [240] 1616
Parliament—Public Business, [239] 1287
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 413
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1045
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 379; *cl.* 1, 1823; *add. cl.* [240] 907; Consid. [241] 1257
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1472, 1473
County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1008
Local Government Board, &c. [238] 1548; [239] 1645
Science and Art Department Buildings, [240] 1380; [242] 1260
Survey of the United Kingdom, [240] 1375
Tramways Orders Confirmation, Comm. [240] 1316
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 492
Valuation, 2R. [237] 1595
Valuation of Property, 2R. [240] 1317; Comm. 1506; *cl.* 9, Amendt. [241] 57; *cl.* 16, 65

**Bates**, Mr. E., *Plymouth*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1589
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," [240] 1251
Naval Forces in the Pacific, [239] 666
Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 963
Supply—Provisions, Forage, &c. [238] 1625

**Bath**, Marquess of
Eastern Question—Treaty of Berlin—Agreement between England and Russia, [242] 371
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [240] 1160; *cl.* 4, *ib.*

**Baxter**, Right Hon. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 412
Customs Department — Appointment of Sir Charles Du Cane, [240] 1887
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 566
Greece and Crete, [238] 1956
India — Ecclesiastical Salaries, [237] 248; [240] 27
Parliament—Public Business, [241] 1336
Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1050
Post Office—American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1644
Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties, Res. [240] 634
Railway Brake Power, [237] 248
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1173
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1774, 1793
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [238] 1770; *cl.* 4, 1800, 1805
Turkey—Circassians in Syria, [239] 1691
Slavery and the Slave Trade, [241] 1247
Under Secretary of State for Scotland, [239] 1691

**Bazley**, Sir T., *Manchester*
Boiler Explosions, [242] 215

**Beach**, Right Hon. Sir M. E. **Hicks-** (Chief Secretary for Ireland, *afterwards* † Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Gloucestershire, E.*
†Africa, South—Miscellaneous Questions
†[238] 1514; [240] 258
†Cape, The—Telegraphic Communication, [240] 928
†Griqualand West, [241] 1243
†Outbreak of the Native Tribes—The Zulus, [241] 19;—Trial of Prisoners, 127
†Transvaal Territory, [239] 856, 1367, 1368, 1885; [241] 325, 2060;—†Correspondence, [242] 2071, 2077;—†Kaffir Outbreak, [237] 1325, 1537, 1734, 1924; [238] 972; [239] 1692; [242] 643;—†Zulu King, [237] 1533
†Africa, West—Sierra Leone, [241] 1240
†Belfast Improvement, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1060
†Borneo and Sulu, [239] 857
†Ceylon—Ecclesiastical Vote, [238] 1046
†China—Outrage at Hong Kong, [239] 525
Civil Bill Ejectments—Returns, [237] 373
†Colonial Marriage Law—Western Australia—Natal, [242] 226
†Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 187
†Coolie Emigration to the Mauritius, [237] 1848
†Criminal Law — Queen *v.* Castro — Arthur Orton, [238] 1947
†Dominion of Canada — Canada Temperance Bill, [239] 665; [240] 833
†Fiji—Status of the Natives, [242] 1532
†Gibraltar—Sanitary Condition, [238] 1839
†Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [242] 279; *cl.* 7, 324; Schedule, 329; Amendt. 331
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Convicts in Spike Island, [237] 619
County Government in Ireland, [237] 1619
Criminal Law—Edmond M'Grath, Case of, [237] 247
Geological Survey of Ireland—The "Freeman's Journal," [237] 372
Irish Constabulary Fund, [237] 1055
Irish Constabulary—Payments for Special Services, [237] 459
Lord Justice Christian, [237] 531
†Local Government and Taxation of Towns, [238] 261
Prisons Act—Rules and Regulations, [237] 1050
†Malay Peninsula—Expenses of the Expedition, [238] 448
†Malta, [240] 263
†Appointment of Governor, [238] 1047
†Taxation and Finances—Mr. Rowsell's Report, [238] 1397
†Malta and Ceylon—Food Taxes, [238] 1041
†Moar Succession, The, [239] 1228
†Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent, [240] 156; Res. Amendt. 280, 284, 291, 328

[*cont.*

**Beach**, Right Hon. Sir M. E. **Hicks**—*cont.*
- †Natal, Colony of—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 468
- †Newfoundland — Magistrate, Appointment of, [238] 451
- †New Zealand—Crown Redress (No. 2) Act, [238] 1395
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Address in Answer to the Speech, [237] 134, 206, 213
  - †County of Clare—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, [241] 2061; [242] 43
  - Public Business—Sunday Closing in Ireland, [237] 156
- †Public Works Loans (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment, Comm. [241] 66
- †St. Kitts, Taxation in, [242] 641
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1712, 1718
- †Sierra Leone, [239] 412
- †Straits Settlements—Perak, [240] 1355; [242] 1218, 1219
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 901, 902, 903
- †Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, [240] 1291, 1299, 1304
  - †Local Government Board, Ireland, [241] 1561, 1562
- †Tanna—Execution of a Native, [238] 1756
- Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 266, 273
- †Victoria, Colony of—Ministerial Crisis, [238] 1400
- †Windward Islands—Barbadoes, [242] 1179

**Beach**, Mr. W. W. B., *Hampshire, N.*
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, [239] 1339; *cl.* 20, 1342
- Highways, Comm. [241] 459; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 466; *cl.* 7, 469; *cl.* 11, 473; *cl.* 18, 887
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 31

**Beaconsfield**, Earl of (First Lord of the Treasury)
- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Volunteers, [238] 615
- Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 10
- Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [238] 46
- Cyprus, Island of—Financial Arrangements, [242] 26, 28
- Dover Harbour, Motion for Papers, [238] 1933
- Earl Russell, the Late, [240] 1034
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions [237] 1198
  - Congress, The—Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 487;—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1753;—Ministerial Statement, [240] 1058
  - Dardanelles, The—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1421;—Resignation of Ministers, [237] 435, 446, 450, 451, 452
  - Greek Provinces of Turkey, [238] 265
  - Message from the Crown, [239] 185, 186
  - Statement by Her Majesty's Government, [237] 366, 367
  - Treaty of Berlin—Port of Batoum, [242] 202;—Personal Explanation, 337

[*cont.*

**Beaconsfield**, Earl of—*cont.*
- Italy—Victor Emmanuel, Funeral of, [237] 455
- Message from the Queen—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 1, 202
- Message from the Queen—Reserve Forces, Calling out of the, [239] 268, 274; Motion for an Address, 760, 839
- Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [239] 1855; [240] 247, 248
- Ministry, The—Ministerial Resignations, [242] 853;—Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [239] 103
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [237] 910
  - Easter Recess, [238] 1382
  - Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 27, 30, 33, 36
  - Whitsuntide Recess, [240] 615
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 627
- Science and Art—Museum of Casts from the Antique, [238] 1943, [242] 516
- Tramways (Use of Mechanical Powers), Res. [242] 341

*"Beagle," H.M.S.—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders—Execution of a Native of Tanna*

237] Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer,
Mr. W. H. Smith *Jan* 24, 371; Question,
Mr. Gorst; Answer, The Attorney General
*Jan* 28, 532; Question, Sir Charles W.
Dilke; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 14,
1617; Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr.
238] W. H. Smith *Mar* 18, 1494; Questions,
Lord Francis Hervey, Mr. Childers; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 21, 1744;
Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir
Michael Hicks-Beach, 1756; Questions, Dr.
239] Kenealy; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith
*April* 4, 527; Questions, Mr. Gorst, Mr.
Childers; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith
240] *May* 16, 35; Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 24, 621;
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *May* 27, 740; Question, Mr.
Gorst; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 6,
1254

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that instructions may be issued to the Officers commanding Her Majesty's ships to define and regulate their authority to put persons to death not subjects of Her Majesty" (*Mr. Gorst*) *v.* [242] 1183; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put, and agreed to

*Parl. P.* . . . . . . 65, 223

**Beauchamp**, Earl (Lord Steward of the Household)
- Bishoprics, 1R. [238] 1481; Comm. [239] 515; Report, 954, 955; 3R. 1864
- Criminal Law—Alleged Cruelty to a Cat, [238] 1034

[*cont.*

**Beauchamp**, Earl—*cont.*
- Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne—Queen's Answer to the Address, [242] 850
- Employers Liability for Injuries to Servants, [239] 1362, 1714
- Factories and Workshops, 2R. [239] 943
- Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), [241] 208
- Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [238] 1026
- Metropolitan Police Force—Address for Returns, [242] 633, 636
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Her Majesty's Answer to Address, [237] 316
- Reserve Forces—Her Majesty's Answer to Address, [239] 1265
- Vivisection, Address for Papers, [241] 753; [242] 214

**Beaumont**, Lt.-Colonel F. E. B., *Durham, S.*
- Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1581
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 21, [241] 1085, 1086, 1089, 1091; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1093, 1095
- Tramways—Mechanical Power, [240] 1606

**Beaumont**, Mr. W. B., *Northumberland, S.*
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 21, [241] 1089; *add. cl.* 1340, 1355, 1356, 1357

**Bedford**, Duke of
- Army Recruiting—Fraudulent Re-enlistment, [238] 1384
- Conservancy Navigation, &c., Boards, [237] 244

*Belfast Improvement Bill* (*by Order*)
- *c.* Order for Consideration of Lords' Amendts. read *July* 9, [241] 1054
- Moved, "That the said Amendts. be now taken into Consideration" (*Mr. J. P. Corry*)
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Biggar*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, main Question put, and agreed to; Lords' Amendts considered
- After further short debate, Lords Amendts. agreed to

*Belfast Street Tramways Bill* (*by Order*)
- *c.* Read 3° * *June* 17

**Bell**, Mr. I. L., *Hartlepool*
- Coal Mines—Haydock Explosion, [242] 1550, 1552, 1555
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1724; Postponed *cl.* 33, [242] 424
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1591
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 23, [241] 1098
- International Exhibition of Paris, 1878, [242] 1268
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [242] 1578
- Supply—Local Government Board, Ireland, [241] 1559, 1562
  - Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1775

**Belmore**, Earl of
- Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 2R [240] 618
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [238] 745
- Dublin University Commission—Report, [241] 955
- New South Wales—Colonial Finance, Address for Papers, [239] 1867, 1880

**Benett-Stanford**, Mr. V. F., *Shaftesbury*
- Colonel Wellesley, [239] 1714, 1715, 1716
- Diplomatic Appointments—Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, [240] 31; Res. 169, 177, 183
- Highways, Comm. [241] 459
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2020
- Parliament—Morning Sittings, [239] 1239
- Post Office — Newspaper Registration, [240] 1339
- Public Health (Metropolis)—Suburban Interments, [239] 1226
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 905
- Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1279

**Bentinck**, Right Hon. G. A. F. Cavendish (Judge Advocate General), *Whitehaven*
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 6, [238] 2002; *cl.* 44, [239] 135; *cl.* 48, 136, 139; *cl.* 66, 149; *cl.* 97, 150
- Mutiny and Marine Mutiny Acts, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1191

**Bentinck**, Mr. G. W. P., *Norfolk, W.*
- Army—Landguard Fort, [238] 153
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1321
- Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1448, 1461
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, [237] 257
- Post Office—India Mail Contract, [237] 1732
- Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [239] 1598
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 868

**Beresford**, Lord C. W. D., *Waterford Co.*
- Endowed Schools (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [240] 1228
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. [242] 1787
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1101, 1114
- Seamen and Marines' Widows' Pension Fund, Res. [238] 1499
- Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 154

**Beresford**, Colonel F. M., *Southwark*
- Army—Retired Volunteer Officers, [239] 1372
- Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, [242] 1522
- Eastern Question—Congress, The—Civil and Religious Liberty in Poland, [237] 1848

**Beresford**, Colonel F. M.—*cont.*
  Metropolitan Board of Works—National Opera House, [237] 1208
  Metropolitan Board of Works and the Water Companies, [237] 530
  Navy—Case of Mr. John Clare, [238] 1336
    H.M.S. "Eurydice," [242] 1565, 2041

*Bermondsey Vestry Bill (Lords) (by Order)*

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 7, [239] 1509
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Stansfeld*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 117, N. 122; M. 5 (D. L. 112)
  Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

**Biggar**, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*
  Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1601
  Absentee Proprietors (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1590
  Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 3R. [240] 122, 123
  Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1377; *cl.* 2, 1385, 1386, 1425
  Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1431
  Army Estimates—Medical Establishments and Services, [240] 1439
    Volunteer Corps, Amendt. [240] 1472
    Yeomanry Cavalry, [240] 1448
  Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 135
  Belfast Improvement, Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. [241] 1054, 1059, 1060, 1067
  Bishoprics, 2R. [241] 1029
  Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1648
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. 995;
. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1610, 1617, 1619, 1724;
. *cl.* 55, 2101; Amendt. 2104, 2107, 2109,
. 2111, 2112, 2113, 2119, 2122, 2123, 2132;
. *cl.* 64, 2145
242] *cl.* 68, 158, 165; *cl.* 70, Amendt. 166, 167,
. 168, 172; Postponed *cl.* 5, Amendt. 185, 186
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1598, 1606, 1696
  County Government, 2R. [237] 1911
  Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), 2R. [240] 1672
  Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1760
  Dental Practitioners, [237] 1993
  Dover and Calais Mail Contract, Res. [240] 1237
  Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 28
  Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 19
  East India (Appointment of Mr. M. Macpherson), Res. [237] 1975
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 16, 127;
. *cl.* 17, 307; *cl.* 22, 317; *cl.* 69, 472; Amendt.
. 474, 475; *cl.* 80, 478, 479; *cl.* 99, 487, 488;
. *add. cl.* 504, 506, 597, 599, 602, 613
  India Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 131

[*cont.*

**Biggar**, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Criminal Law—Edward O'Kelly, Case of, [241] 958
    Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1875—Searches for Arms, [241] 123, 958
    Taxation—Volunteer Force, [241] 131
  Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1956
  Irish Estimates, [240] 1664, 1665
  Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1933
  Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 504
  Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1532
  Mutiny, Comm. [238] 1983; *cl.* 1, 1988, 1991, 2001; *cl.* 22, [239] 42, 52; *cl.* 23, 61; *cl.* 26, 126; *cl.* 39, 131; *cl.* 56, 143; *cl.* 97, 151; *add. cl.* 163
  Navy—Case of Mr. John Clare, [238] 1335
  Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    Business of the House, [240] 841
    Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, [240] 1182
    Privileges of Members, [240] 655
  Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 402
  Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 366, 368
  Political Prisoners, 2R. [241] 735
  Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [239] 1601
  Public Parks (Scotland), 2R. [237] 360
  Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 470
  Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 1961
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 388; *cl.* 1, 1852, 1853
  Street Traffic—Military Bandsmen, [240] 21
  Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1451
  Supply—Admiralty Registry of the High Court, of Justice, [240] 972
    Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 962, 964, 966
    Charity Commission, [239] 1612, 1613
    Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1549
    Civil Service Commission, [239] 1618
    Civil Services and Revenue Departments, Motion for reporting Progress, [239] 180, 183
    Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1533
    Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, Amendt. [239] 1620, 1625, 1626
    Friendly Societies, [239] 1630
    House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1457, 1460, 1463, 1469, 1470; Amendt. 1471, 1476
    Land Registry, [240] 989
    Law Charges, [240] 941
    Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1640
    Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1557, 1562
    Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1504
    Mint, Coinage, &c. [239] 1762, 1763, 1764
    Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1769, 1770, 1771, 1773
    Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1778; Amendt. 1779
    Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 994
    Privy Council Office, [239] 1495, 1496

[*cont.*

Biggar, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Privy Council for Trade, &c., Committee of, Amendt. [239] 1610, 1611
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 668, 673; Amendt. 674, 675, 676
Queen's Bench, &c. [240] 969
Report, [240] 1153, 1154
Royal Palaces, [238] 1520
Secret Services, [240] 666
Stationery Office, [239] 1786; Amendt. 1795, 1805, 1811; [240] 47, 62, 65, 73, 80
Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 90
Works and Public Buildings, [240] 93
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1588
Tramways (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [239] 99
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 267, 272
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1527; *cl.* 3, Amendt. [241] 22, 32
Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1568
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 150
Ways and Means, Comm. [237] 1453
Weights and Measures, Comm. [240] 1674; *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, [241] 409

## Bills of Exchange (Acceptance) Bill

(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Herschell, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Watkin Williams*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 28 [Bill 135]
Read 2°* *April* 1
Committee*; Report *April* 8
*Legislation*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 9, [239] 962
Considered*; read 3° *April* 9
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Chancellor*) *April* 11 (No. 71)
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *April* 12
Read 3ª* *April* 15
Royal Assent *April* 16 [41 *Vict.* c. 13]

## Bills of Sale Bill

(*Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Monk, Mr. Ripley*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 25 [Bill 90]
Read 2°* *Feb* 27
Committee*; Report *Mar* 15 [Bill 129]
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *April* 5, [239] 753
Considered *April* 12, 1263
Read 3°* *May* 8
Lords Amendts. [Bill 247]
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Selborne*) *May* 13 (No. 80)
Read 2ª *May* 28, [240] 827
Committee* *June* 27 (No. 135)
Report* *July* 2 (No. 143)
Read 3ª* *July* 4
Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 31]

Birley, **Mr. H.**, *Manchester*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 732
East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 447

[*cont.*

Birley, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 48, Amendt. [238] 338; *cl.* 50, Amendt. 339
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1514, 1527
Supplementary Estimates, [237] 1099
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1698

## Bishoprics Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)

*l.* Presented; read 1ª *Mar* 18, [238] 1481 (No. 43)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª"
239] *Mar* 26, 4
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and add ("this day six months") (*The Lord Houghton*); after debate, on Question, that ("now,") &c.; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª
. Committee, after short debate *April* 4, 514
. Report *April* 9, 954 (No. 63)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª"
. *May* 14, 1855
Amendt. to leave out all after ("that,") and insert ("in the opinion of this House any necessity that may exist for additional bishops should be met by an addition to the number of suffragan bishops") (*The Earl of Rosebery*); after short debate, on Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the Motion? Cont. 107, Not-Cont. 33; M. 74
. List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1866
Resolved in the Affirmative; Motion agreed to; Bill read 3ª (No. 70)
*c.* Read 1°* (*Mr. Secretary Cross*) *May* 29 [Bill 197]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
241] *July* 8, 1026
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Andrew Lusk*); Question put, and negatived
Original Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" put; A. 188, N. 60; M. 128 (D. L. 199)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
242] Committee deferred *July* 26, 450
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"
. *July* 31, 829
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable, so long as the Episcopal Church continues to be established by law, to increase the number of Bishops" (*Mr. Joseph Cowen*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *August* 9, 1642; after short debate, Question put; A. 75, N. 38; M. 37 (D. L. 255)
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to; Committee; Report
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°"
. (Queen's *Consent* signified) *August* 14, 2008; after short debate, Question put; A. 62, N. 20; M. 42 (D. L. 278)
Bill read 3°
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 15 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 68]

*Blackburn and Over Darwen Tramways Bill (by Order)*
c. Read 3° * *June* 17

Blackburn, Lord
Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 190

Blackburne, Colonel J. I., *Lancashire, S. W.*
Noxious Vapours, Commission on—The Report, [238] 756 ; [239] 1720

Blake, Mr. T., *Leominster*
Criminal Law — Queen *v.* Castro — Arthur Orton, [238] 1947
Customs' Clerks, [239] 1090
Parliament—Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, [240] 1181
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 211, 214
Roads—South Wales District, [237] 1730
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 29, 31 ; *cl.* 8, 50

Blantyre, Lord
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1965

Blennerhassett, Mr. R. P., *Kerry*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [237] 1949
Inland Revenue—Distributor of Stamps in Kerry, [239] 115
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1172
Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 979
Resident Magistrates (Ireland) — Waterford Magistracy, [238] 1750
University Education (Ireland), Res. [240] 1048, 1085
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1838

**Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) Bill**
(*Mr. Wheelhouse, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Isaac*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 72]
Read 2° * *Feb* 1
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 15 [Bill 130]
Committee (*on re-comm.*) deferred *Mar* 18, [238] 1579
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read *April* 15, [239] 1357
Moved, "That this House will To-morrow, at Two of the clock, resolve itself into the said Committee"
Amendt. to leave out "this day, at Two of the clock," and insert "upon Monday 6th May" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That this day, at Two of the clock, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put ; A. 44, N. 15 ; M. 29 (D. L. 107)
Main Question put, and agreed to
Moved, "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee" *August* 9, [242] 1712
Amendt. to leave out "this day," and insert "upon Tuesday next" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That 'this day, &c. ;" after short debate, Question [*cont.*

*Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) Bill*—cont.
put ; A. 40, N. 40 ; and the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker declared his vote with the Noes (D. L. 266)
Words inserted ; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Bill withdrawn * *August* 13

*Board of Works—Report of the Commission*
Question, Mr. Gray ; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 20, [240] 1882

*Boiler Explosions—Legislation*
Question, Sir Thomas Bazley ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 25, [242] 215

Boord, Mr. T. W., *Greenwich*
Supply—Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1236
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 567

*Borneo*
*Borneo and Sulu*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 8, [239] 857
*The British Borneo Company*, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 21, [240] 358
*The Consular Agent at Sindak*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 20, [240] 1881

**Borough Franchise (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Butt, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Gray*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 12
Order for Leave read, and discharged *Mar* 13

**Borough Franchise (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Butt, Mr. Gray, Mr. Maurice Brooks*)
c. Ordered * *April* 2
Read 1° * *April* 3 [Bill 141]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 15, [239] 1960
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. James Corry*) ; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c. ;" after debate, Question put ; A. 197, N. 228 ; M. 31
Div. List, A. and N. 1987
Words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to ; 2R. put off for six months

**Borough Voters Bill**
(*Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Boord*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 68]
Read 2° * *Feb* 11
[Consolidated with *Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill*]

*Boston District Tramways Bill* (*by Order*)
c. Read 3° * *June* 17

Bourke, Hon. R. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lynn Regis*
  African Exploration — Mr. Stanley, [237] 623
  Asia, Central—Miscellaneous Questions
    Reported Russian Advance, [232] 1930
    Russia and Afghanistan, [242] 1947, 2088
    Russian Military Expedition, [242] 1179, 1764
  Bessarabian Moldavia, Cession of, [239] 413
  British Borneo Company—Consul at Sindak, [240] 1882
  China—Chefoo Convention, [237] 248, 1424; [242] 1438
    Famine, [241] 328
  Consuls—Convention with the United States, [242] 1765
  Cyprus, Island of—Tithes and Taxes, [242] 2015
  Danube Commission, [238] 636
  Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions [237] 822
    Blockade of the Black Sea, [237] 1057, 1206, 1322
    Circular Remonstrance of Prince Gortchakoff (1856), [238] 1754
    Congress, [238] 1593;—Armenians, [240] 1168;—Greece, [242] 1767;—Instructions to the British Plenipotentiary, [242] 219, 220; —Ministerial Statement, [240] 1078;— Russia and Bessarabia, [239] 476, 477, 527;—Thessaly, [242] 518
    Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 1069; [242] 39, 2089
    Dalmatian Frontier, [238] 1958
    Despatch of May 30, [241] 2063
    Despatches of January 4, 8, and 10, [237] 374
    Navigation of the Danube, [238] 540
    Neutrality, Laws of, [237] 1051
    Peace, Terms of—Despatch of Earl Derby, Dec. 25, 1877, [237] 322, 1536, 1537
    Russia and Roumania, [239] 672
    Telegraphic Communication in Turkey, [237] 727
    Treaty of Berlin, [241] 1582;—Bulgaria, [242] 526;—Reforms in Turkey, [242] 2025;—Transit Dues in Austria and Turkey, [242] 220
    Turkey—Greeks in Bulgaria, [238] 1289
    Turkey and Greece, [237] 254
    War—Treatment of English Doctors by the Russians, [238] 1293
  Egypt—France and England, Correspondence between, [237] 1052
    Suez Canal—Return of Rates, &c. [239] 287
  Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 539, 564, 593
  Egyptian Finances, [239] 116, 206, 857
  Foreign Office—Abstraction of a State Paper — Anglo-Turkish Memorandum, [241] 2059
    Temporary Writers, [241] 495, 758
  Foreign Office Reports, [240] 1340
  German Emperor, [240] 1169
  Greece and Crete, [238] 1955, 1956

[*cont.*

Bourke, Hon. R. —*cont.*
  Italy—Pope Pius IX., Death of—Sittings of the Conclave, [237] 1235
  Japan—Treaty of 1858—Admission of Opium, [241] 127
  Mexico — Diplomatic Relations, Revival of, [238] 1298
  Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1169, 1173
  Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, [240] 740
  Persia—Visit of the Shah, [240] 928
  Persian Legation, the Late, [239] 663
  Russia—Poles in Turkey, [237] 1731
  Russia and Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Batoum, [242] 2019
    British Embassy, [238] 758
    Polish Doctors, Alleged Execution of, [238] 759
  Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [237] 623
  South America—British Cemetery at Monte Video, [240] 1886
  Spain—Miscellaneous Questions
    Cuba, Insurrection in, [238] 299; [239] 1284;—George White, Case of, [242] 2019, 2090;—Slavery in, [238] 1959
    Fiscal Legislation—Duties on British Goods, [241] 1581
    "Octavia" and the "Lark," [240] 1884
    "Octavia," Seizure of, [238] 452
  Spain and China—Emigration Treaty, [241] 1468
  Sugar Convention, 1877, [238] 154; [239] 528; —Refining Sugar in Bond, [242] 227
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 880
  Supply—Consular Services, [240] 1288, 1289
    Diplomatic Services, [238] 1607, 1611
    Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1274, 1279, 1280, 1281
    Foreign Office, [239] 1486
    House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1480
    Suez Canal (British Directors), [238] 1611
  Tunis and Tripoli, [241] 1580
  Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Asia Minor—The Lazes, [242] 2022, 2023
    British Subjects in Constantinople, [237] 723, 1847; [238] 452
    Bulgaria, Alleged Outrages in, [237] 926
    Circassians in Syria, [239] 1691
    Consular Officers, Reports of, [237] 463
    Creditors, Unsecured, [242] 993
    Crete, [237] 620, 927, 1050; [238] 60; [241] 817; [242] 2020;—The Correspondence, [239] 219;—The Insurrection, [239] 667, 668, 1372, 1373
    Crete and Mitylene, [241] 958
    Ill-treatment of English Doctors, [237] 1922
    Murder of Mr. Ogle, [239] 666, 1596; [240] 1083, 1613
    Papers, [242] 2087
    Roumania—Commercial Treaty, [241] 2053
    Roumelia, Atrocities in, [241] 1246
    Slavery and the Slave Trade, [241] 1247, 1248
    Thessaly, Alleged Outrages in, [242] 1950, 1951
    Turkey and Russia—Bulgaria, [242] 1531
    War—Black Sea Ports, [237] 925
  Turkey—Murder of Mr. Ogle, Res. [242] 1965, 1994, 1996

**BOWEN, Mr. J. B.,** ***Pembroke***
- County Government, [238] 1749
- Divorce Court—"Hume *v.* Hume," [238] 59
- Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 717

**BOWYER, Sir G.,** ***Wexford Co.***
- Army—Heavy Artillery, [239] 36
- Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 130
- Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1256, 1260
- Church Livings, Res. [237] 1567
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 436
- County Government, Leave, [237] 601; 2R. 1668, 1679, 1914
- Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Comm. Bill withdrawn, [242] 2039
- Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 666, 669
- Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1883
- Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 15
- Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 776
- East India Revenue Accounts — Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1917
- Endowed Schools (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1230
- Germany—Religious Refugees, [237] 1206
- Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1915, 1932
- Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1903
- Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 731
- Malta, [240] 263
  - Revenue and Taxation—Maltese Nobility, [237] 255
  - Taxation and Finances—Mr. Rowsell's Report, [238] 1397
- Martin, Mr. Wykeham, Death of, Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1051, 1052
- Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, [238] 260
- Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 994
- Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1466
- Parliament—Privileges of Members, [240] 655
- Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1053
- Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 396
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, [237] 260
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1189, 1192
- Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1016
- Sergeant M'Carthy, Case of, Motion for an Address, [241] 1410
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1233
- Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1524
  - House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1454, 1465
  - Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1498
  - Mint, including Coinage, [238] 1552
  - Public Offices Site, [238] 1539
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 670
  - Science and Art Department Buildings, [240] 1380
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1690

[*cont.*

**BOWYER, Sir G.**—*cont.*
- Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, Comm. [242] 1856; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1859, 1860, 2016; 3R. Amendt. 2026, 2034
- Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1371, 1372; Report, [239] 1250

**BRADY, Dr. J.,** ***Leitrim Co.***
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2124, 2128, 2138
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 69, [238] 470
- Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 518
- Registration of Land, &c. [237] 369
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 902
- Supply—Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 680

**BRAND, Right Hon. H. B. W.,** (*see* SPEAKER, The)

**BRASSEY, Mr. T.,** ***Hastings***
- Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1050
- Navy—Boiler Committee, Report of the, [238] 446
  - Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, [238] 446
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1087
- Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [238] 1470,
  - Departmental Statement, [238] 1432, 1438, 1455
  - Military Pensions and Allowances, [238] 1472
- Post Office—Letter Carriers, [240] 1165
- Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1450

**Breach of Promise of Marriage Bill**

(*Mr. Herschell, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Ryder*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 21 [Bill 80]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 16

**BRIGGS, Mr. W. E.,** ***Blackburn***
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 1008
- Factories and Workshops, [238] 62; Comm. *cl.* 27, 319
- Idiots, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [241] 582
- India—Indian Budget, [242] 868
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 391; *cl.* 1, 1837, 1846

**BRIGHT, Right Hon. J.,** ***Birmingham***
- Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [237] 1965
- Burials, Res. [237] 1814
- Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1267
- Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1640
- Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 575, 576
- Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1906
- Eastern Question—Armistice, The—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1330, 1331
  - Conference—Russia and Bessarabia, [239] 476

[*cont.*

Bright, Right Hon. J.—*cont.*
East India (Public Works), Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 341, 351
Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 777
India—Bombay Town Hall, [239] 415
Isle of Man—Vaccination, [238] 1841
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1101, 1386, 1387
Russia—Poles in Turkey, [237] 1731
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 789, 804, 1223, 1226
Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 563
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 479

Bright, Mr. J., *Manchester*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 545; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1613, 1676; *cl.* 55, 2131; Postponed *cl.* 33, [242] 425
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1584, 1697
Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 786
Treaty of Berlin—Transit Dues in Austria and Turkey, [242] 220
East India Revenue Accounts — Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1914
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1519; Instruction, 1723
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 986
Prisoners, Treatment of, [240] 1682

Brise, Colonel S. B. Ruggles-, *Essex, E.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 16, [241] 1905; *cl.* 55, 2098
Coroners—Inquests on Lunatics, [239] 1090
County Government, Comm. [238] 918
Highways, Comm. [241] 463; *add. cl.* 1353
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1623; *cl.* 3, [241] 40; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 34; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 37; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 57; *cl.* 16, 65

Bristowe, Mr. S. B., *Newark*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 30, [241] 2071
County Government, Comm. [238] 917
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 37, [238] 331; *cl.* 77, 477
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 888; *cl.* 21, 1086; *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1103; *add. cl.* 1340, 1354
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 414
Supply—Civil Service Commission, [238] 1546
Foreign Office, [239] 1486
Friendly Societies, [239] 1630
House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1480
Local Government Board, [238] 1548; [239] 1639, 1643
Marlborough House, [238] 1520
Pauper Lunatics, England, [240] 1311
Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [242] 1854

**British Museum (Transfer of Collection) Bill** (*Mr. Walpole, Mr. Lowe, Sir John Lubbock*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 2 [Bill 236]
Read 2° * *July* 9

[*cont.*

*British Museum (Transfer of Collection) Bill*—cont.
Committee *; Report *July* 15
Considered * *July* 31
Read 3° * *August* 1
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) *August* 2 (No. 183)
Read 2ª *August* 6, [242] 1285
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 13 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 55]

Brogden, Mr. A., *Wednesbury*
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1152

Brooks, Mr. M., *Dublin*
Collection of Rates (Dublin), [240] 1167; Leave, 1676
Dublin Tramways, 2R. Amendt. [239] 21, 26, 32, 34, 662
Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. Amendt. [240] 12, 21; [241] 1234
Ireland—Collector of Rates Office, Dublin—The Report, [240] 627
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 802, 816
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," [242] 523
Parliament — Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1969; Amendt. 1972, 1976; [239] 1223, 1224
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 126
Railways—Brake Power, [239] 1366;—Continuous Brakes, [238] 758
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 289; Comm. 1695, 1709, 1717; [239] 381; Motion for reporting Progress, 390; *cl.* 1, 1840; 3R. [242] 1619
Science and Art Museum (Dublin), [242] 864
Supply — International Exhibition at Paris, 1878, [242] 1269
Prisons, Superintendence of, &c., in Ireland, [242] 1609
Registration of Deeds in Ireland, [242] 1275, 1276, 1612
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1698
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills, Res. [239] 1282

Brown, Mr. A. H., *Wenlock*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 642
Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1876
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 885
Inhabited House Duty, [237] 1924
Poor Law—Eliza Littlehales, Case of, [240] 1885
Post Office—Porterage on Telegrams, [241] 1467
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 580
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1256
Weights and Measures, 2R. [238] 720

Browne, Mr. G. E., *Mayo Co.*
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Belmullet, [237] 319

**Bruce, Hon. T. C.,** *Portsmouth*
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [242] 1579
  - Scientific Departments, [238] 1470
- Turkey and Russia—Bulgaria, [242] 1530

**Bruen, Mr. H.,** *Carlow Co.*
- Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1967
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 70, [242] 173
- Ireland—Railways—Continuous Brakes, [238] 1294
- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1973
- Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1139
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1180
- Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 84
- Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 456, 459
- Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 673
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 900
- Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 686
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [238] 1677
- Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 267
- Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1578

**Buccleuch, Duke of**
- Army and Militia Reserves, [242] 1295
- Eastern Question—British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 709, 710
- Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 19, [239] 951, 953
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 37, Amendt. [241] 2046

**Bulwer, Mr. J. R.,** *Ipswich*
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 762
- Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1071
- Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1341, 1358, 1365
- Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1383
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1246
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 959
  - House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1458
  - Law Charges, [238] 1559
- Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1161

***Burials***
- Question, Sir Charles Forster; Answer, Mr. Osborne Morgan *Feb* 5, [237] 1056
- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the long pending controversy as to interments in parish churchyards ought to be closed, by permitting such interments either without any burial service or with the burial services preferred by the relatives or friends of the deceased, and conducted by persons chosen by them" (*Mr. Osborne Morgan*) *v.*, 1736; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 242, N. 227; M. 15
  - Div. List, A. and N., 1836

**Burial Law Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Balfour, Lord Francis Hervey, Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Wait*)
- *c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *April* 15 [Bill 154]
- 2R. [Dropped]

**Burt, Mr. T.,** *Morpeth*
- Coal Mines—Haydock Explosion, [242] 1552
- Criminal Law—The Rev. H. J. Dodwell, [242] 643
- Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 2R. [242] 527; 3R. 780
- Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1061
- Frauds by Fiduciary Agents, [238] 1146
- Mines Regulation Act, 1872—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Blantyre Colliery Explosion, [238] 1487
  - Blasting—Apedale Explosion, [239] 202
  - Dinas Collieries, [242] 1868
  - Explosions in Coal Mines, [242] 640
- Ways and Means, Report, [239] 750

**Bury, Viscount** (†Under Secretary of State for War)
- †Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [242] 854
- †Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - †Army and Militia Reserves, [242] 1290
  - †Army Records of Military Service, [242] 2013
  - †Competitive Examinations for Commissions, [240] 355
  - †Marking Deserters, [239] 108, 111
  - †Mutiny Act, [238] 1834
  - †Reserves, The, [239] 513
- †Army—Auxiliary Forces—Miscellaneous Questions
  - †Hampshire Rifle Volunteers, [242] 858, 859, 860; Personal Explanation, 1748
  - †Militia Artillery, [240] 1061
  - †Militia Artillery Uniforms, [239] 1194, 1266
  - †Militia—Clothing Regulations, [242] 639
  - †Militia—Fines for Drunkenness, [242] 1297
- †Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, Motion for a Return, [240] 830
- †Army—Artillery—Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns, Motion for Returns, [241] 1328
- †Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions, Address for a Paper, [240] 1329
- †Army Recruiting—Fraudulent Re-enlistment, [238] 1386
- †Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 7
- Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [238] 56
- Eastern Question — Russia and the Porte—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [238] 293
- †Forces of the Crown in Ireland, Motion for a Return, [240] 1338
- †Mutiny, Comm. [239] 396
- †Parliament—Militia Officers, [239] 184
- †Projectiles—Shells and Armour-plates, Motion for Returns, [239] 1273

**Butt**, Mr. I., *Limerick City*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 59, [241] 2137 ; *cl.* 64, 2142 ; *cl.* 70, [242] 170 ; *cl.* 71, 178, 180
Eastern Affairs, Res [242] 1084
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1774
241] Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. 1520
242] Comm. *cl.* 2, 279, 280 ; *cl.* 5, 291 ; *cl.* 6, 313,
315, 316, 317 ; *cl.* 7, 322 ; *cl.* 8, 326 ;
Schedule 328, 329, 331 ; Consid. 1793, 1794,
1795 ; *cl.* 6, 1817, 1818
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1148
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)—The Governor of Limerick Asylum, [240] 640
Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 930
Order of Business, [241] 2063
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1046
Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1546, 1548
Commissioners of Charitable Donations, &c. for Ireland, [241] 1550
Irish Academy, [241] 1543, 1544
Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1563
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, [241] 1538
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, Motion for Adjournment, [241] 945, 947, 949, 1048, 1049

**Cadogan**, Earl (†Under Secretary of State for the Colonies)
†Malta—Protest of the Maltese Nobles, [241] 850, 851
†Mauritius—Coolie Immigration, [239] 651
†New South Wales—Colonial Finance, Address for Papers, [239] 1879
Parliamentary Elections (Metropolis), 2R. [237] 1844, 1846
†South Africa—Outbreak of the Native Tribes, [239] 1265
†Victoria, Colony of—Ministerial Crisis, [238] 1392, 1394, 1706 ; [239] 268

**Cairns**, Lord (*see* **Chancellor**, The Lord)

**Callan**, Mr. P., *Dundalk*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 363, 387 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 392 ; *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, 641, 643

**Cambridge**, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Army and Militia Reserves, [242] 1292, 1296
Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions, Address for a Paper, [240] 1332
Army—Marking Deserters, [239] 110
Army (India)—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1455
Army Recruiting—Fraudulent Re-enlistment, [238] 1387
Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 9
Dover Harbour, Motion for Papers, [238] 1932

**Cameron**, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 136, 140
Church of England—Queen Anne's Bounty Board, [241] 2050
Customs—Outport Clerks, [242] 1763
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 20, Amendt. [239] 1340, 1347
Dental Practitioners, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1991, 1993
Education (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 1131, 1133 ; Consid. *cl.* A. 1709
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1054
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [242] 623
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 64, Amendt. [238] 342 ; *cl.* 68, 459 ; *cl.* 69, Amendt. 465, 472, 474, 476 ; *add. cl.* 604
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 688, 724
Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* 8, [241] 847
Navy—Engine-room Artificers, [242] 1523
Parliament—Order of Business, [241] 766
Scotch Business of the House, [240] 25
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [238] 365
Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 211, 214
Public Health—Small-pox, [242] 223
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. 421
238] Comm. 1785 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1799, 1806,
1808, 1809 ; *cl.* 8, 1820
240] *cl.* 24, 1215 ; Amendt. 1685 ; *cl.* 36, 1701 ;
Amendt. 1702, 1706, 1707 ; *cl.* 41, 1719 ;
*cl.* 104, 1908 ; *add. cl.* 1953, 1960, 1964 ;
Amendt. 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1977,
1978, 1981, 1989
241] Consid. 595, 600, 601 ; *cl.* 88, 830 ; Amendt.
831, 837, 839 ; 3R. 1076
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1705
Supply—Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 670, 672, 680
Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1015
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1698
University Commission—The Medical Professorships, [241] 1843
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1943
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1158

**Cameron**, Mr. D., *Inverness-shire*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 85, [240] 1894, 1896

**Campbell**, Lord
Army—Auxiliary Forces—The Militia, Motion for a Return, [240] 828, 831
Army—The Reserves, [239] 512
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions [237] 1201
Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 479, 514
Armistice, Terms of the, [237] 1721, 1841
Conference, The, [237] 1598
Correspondence, [237] 920
Movements of the Fleet, [237] 689, 690, 1420 ; [238] 43
Postponement of Motion, [238] 1275
Russian Armies, Advance of, [237] 817
Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 870

[*cont.*

**Campbell**, Lord—*cont.*
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte, Res. [237] 508, 511, 524, 526
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Conference, Address for Correspondence, [238] 1707, 1722, 1735
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [238] 265, 294

**Campbell**, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1381
Army—Enlistment for India, [238] 654
Army Supplementary Estimate for Native Indian Troops, [240] 804
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 844 ; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1648, 1651 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1654, 1658, 1666 ; *cl.* 7, 1682
Central Asia—Reported Russian Advance, [242] 1940
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1642, 1644
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [239] 1291 ; *cl.* 17, 1324, 1339 ; *cl.* 20, 1344, 1346 ; 3R. 1667
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Conference, [238] 1403
  Indian Contingent—Cost, [241] 1244
  Laws of Neutrality, [237] 1051
  Negotiations, [239] 1425
  Presidency, The, [238] 1038
  Treaty between Russia and Turkey, [238] 1403
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 612, 1125
Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 1126 ; *cl.* 7, 1127 ; *cl.* 18, 1128 ; *cl.* A, 1129 ; Consid. 1703 ; *cl.* A, 1707, 1708, 1709
Egyptian Finances, [239] 116, 226, 857
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 614, 620 ; *cl.* 7, 622 ; *cl.* 14, 625, 626
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 65, [238] 348
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [237] 303
Income Tax, Res. [238] 397
India—Miscellaneous Questions
  Finances—Indian Exchanges, [242] 1205
  Indian Taxation, [238] 450
  Military Service, [238] 300
  Vernacular Press Act, [241] 494 ;—The Press Commissioner, [240] 1071
India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 431, 464
India—East India (Public Works), Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 348, 351
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1918
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 473, 485, 490
Indian Press Law, Res. [238] 1604 ; [242] 71
Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 748, 762
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 6, [242] 1825
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1134
Law and Justice—Scotch Judicial Bench—Lord Craighill, [241] 1850, 1851 ; [242] 229
Local Government Board, [238] 1550
Local Taxation, [239] 1719

**Campbell**, Sir G.—*cont.*
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 913, 1040
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 410
Natal, Colony of—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 466
Navy—War Material at Tenedos, [239] 1095
Navy Estimates—Military Pensions and Allowances, [238] 1476
Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 809
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [241] 331, 1246
  Derby Day—Adjournment, [240] 1171
  Order of Business, [238] 455
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 277
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1251
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. 423
238] Comm. 1775 ; *cl.* 3, 1796 ; *cl.* 4, 1805, 1808,
. 1809 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1821
240] 1083 ; *cl.* 12, 1187, 1191, 1194 ; *cl.* 15, 1201 ;
. *cl.* 16, 1205 ; *cl.* 29, 1694 ; *cl.* 33, 1697, 1698 ;
. *cl.* 35, 1705, 1706 ; *cl.* 41, 1714, 1715, 1718,
. 1719 ; *cl.* 45, 1726, 1731 ; *cl.* 85, 1899 ;
. *cl.* 98, 1903 ; *cl.* 102, 1905 ; *cl.* 104, 1908 ;
. *cl.* 105, 1915, 1917, 1918 ; *add. cl.* 1969,
. 1973, 1976, 1981
241] Consid. 612 ; *cl.* 33, 647, 649 ; *cl.* 38,
. Amendt. 650 ; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 652 ; *cl.* 46,
. Amendt. 826 ; *cl.* 94, Amendt. 842
Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Church of Scotland—Opening of General Assembly, [240] 927
  Harbours, [240] 168
  Office of Lord Clerk Register, [240] 1883
Scotland—Religious Denominations, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1796, 1797
South Africa—Miscellaneous Questions
  Outbreak of Native Tribes—Military Operations, [239] 1229
  Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1635
  War Expenditure, [239] 1286, 1594
Straits Settlements—Perak, [240] 1354 ;—Expedition—Pay of the Indian Troops, 1390
Supplementary Estimate, Comm. [237] 1384
Supply—Epping Forest Commission, [238] 1616
  Fishery Board, Scotland, [240] 684, 689
  Local Government Board, [238] 1550
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [242] 1688
  Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1778
  Report, [242] 1691
  Stationery, [239] 1782
  Temporary Commissions, [238] 1613, 1615
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Crete, [241] 817
  Insurrection in the Greek Provinces, [238] 1748
  Treaty of Berlin—Article 18, [241] 2055, 2056 ;—Roumania, [242] 2004
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1657
Ways and Means, Comm. [237] 1452 ; [242] 1347, 1356, 1378
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 579 ; Report, 1245

**Campbell**, Mr. C. M., *Staffordshire, N.*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 3, [238] 91 ; *cl.* 14, 118

[*cont.*

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Mr. H., *Stirling, &c.*
- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1383
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Army Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 649
  - Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1423
  - Physical Examinations of Officers—Report of the Joint Committee, [242] 1399
- Army Estimates—Home Charges for Regular Forces in India, [242] 1421, 1422
  - Land Forces, [238] 695
  - Militia, &c. [240] 1444
  - Warlike Stores, [242] 1410
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 2R. [240] 1154
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 24, [240] 1688; *cl.* 33, 1697; *cl.* 36, 1705; *cl.* 57, 1738; *add. cl.* 1972, 1990; Consid. [241] 596; *cl.* 51, 829; *cl.* 88, 837
- Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1946

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of
- Army and Militia Reserves, [242] 1286
- Cyprus, Island of—Financial Arrangements, [242] 18
- Education (Scotland), 2R. [239] 276
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 2R. [239] 654
- Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1428, 1433
- Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [238] 1021
- Parliament—House of Lords—Strangers, [242] 198
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 37, [241] 2044, 2046; *cl.* 41, Amendt. 2047
- Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1), Comm. [241] 1447
- Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3), [241] 1449

*Canada, Dominion of—The Liquor Traffic—Permissive Bill*
- Questions, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 5, [239] 664; *May* 28, [240] 833

CANTERBURY, Archbishop of
- Army Reserve — Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 8
- Bishoprics, 2R. [239] 8; Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. 516
- Commutation of Tithes, Comm. [242] 206
- Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 964

**Capital Punishment Abolition Bill**
(*Mr. Pease, Mr. Leeman, Mr. M'Laren*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 19]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 13, [238] 1237
- Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Grantham*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 64, N. 263; M. 199 (D. L. 47) Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

CARDWELL, Viscount
- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [242] 855
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Army and Militia Reserves, [242] 1294
  - Army Recruiting — Fraudulent Re-enlistment, [238] 1388
  - Mutiny Act, [238] 1836
- Army—Artillery—Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns, Motion for Returns, [241] 1330
- Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions, Address for a Paper, [240] 1332
- Army Reserve — Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 9
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 33, [240] 734
- Cyprus—Island of—Financial Arrangements, [242] 28
  - Slavery, [241] 1949
- Dover Harbour, Motion for Papers, [238] 1937
- Eastern Question — Congress—Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 511
  - Negotiations, [240] 721
- Eastern Question — Russia and the Porte—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [238] 292
- Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [240] 237, 238
- Ministry, The—Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [239] 104
- Vivisection — Royal Commission — Petitions, [241] 1324, 1325

CARLINGFORD, Lord
- Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1212
- Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland), Comm. [242] 1171
- Idiots, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [242] 343, 344
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 427, 433; Schedule, 586
- Railways—Continuous Brakes, [238] 1283
  - Management of, [237] 457
- Railway Returns (Continuous Brakes), 1R. [239] 1086
- Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1169
- Tramways (Use of Mechanical Powers), Res. [242] 340

CARLISLE, Bishop of
- Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1429

CARNARVON, Earl of (†Secretary of State for the Colonies)
- Bishoprics, 2R. [239] 14
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Congress—Armenians, [240] 1244
  - Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1807
  - †Dardanelles, The—Movements of the Fleet—Resignation of Ministers,* [237] 436

[*cont.*

CARNARVON, Earl of—*cont*:
Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 856
Treaty of Berlin—Alleged Agreement between England and Russia, [242] 359
Malta—Protest of the Maltese Nobles, [241] 851
Mauritius—Coolie Immigration, [239] 652
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 816
Ministry—Ministerial Resignations, Personal Explanations, [242] 850
Science and Art—Museum of Casts from the Antique, [238] 1941
Victoria, Colony of—Ministerial Crisis, [238] 1393

CARTWRIGHT, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*
Cattle Plague, [239] 117
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 559
Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1885
Eastern Question—Russia and Roumania, [239] 671
Turkey and Greece, [237] 254, 624
Greece — Diplomatic Communications, [237] 460
National Portrait Gallery, Res. [238] 771, 1749
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, [237] 259
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 864
Turkey — Greek Provinces — Thessaly, [239] 1093

*Cattle Plague*
*Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act*, 1869—*Outbreak at Alford*, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 11, [238] 1042
*Importation of Austrian Cattle from Spain*, Question, Mr. Anderson ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 1, [241] 492
*Importation of Foreign Cattle*, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Goschen, Mr. W. E. Forster, Sir Frederick Perkins ; Answers, Lord George Hamilton, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 8, [241] 960 ; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster, Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson ; Observation, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 15, [242] 2024
*Inoculation*, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien ; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 15, [241] 1465
*Outbreak in Lincolnshire*, Question, Mr. Chaplin ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, [238] 976
*Restrictive Measures in Germany*, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 28, [239] 117
*Select Committee on Cattle Plague*, 1877—*Cattle from Ireland*, Question, Mr. Arthur Peel ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 24, [241] 123
*Cattle Plague—Exportation of Animals from Ireland to Great Britain* . [2097] [2104]
*The Paris Exhibition—English Cattle*, Questions, Mr. Greene, Mr. W. E. Forster ; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *June* 27, [241] 329

[*cont.*

*Cattle Plague*—cont.
*Transit of Cattle by Land and Sea*, Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr ; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 11, [238] 1031
Moved for Copy of Orders issued by the Privy Council to regulate the transit of cattle by land and sea (*Earl De La Warr*) ; Motion agreed to ; Ordered to be laid before the House
Parl. Papers—
Cumberland and Westmoreland . . 194
Orders in Council (England) . . . 281
Orders in Council (Ireland) . . . 301
Cattle, &c. (United Kingdom) 273, 401
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill—
Report of Lords Committee . . 154
Correspondence . . . . . . . . 222

CAVE, Right Hon. S. (Paymaster General), *New Shoreham*
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), Comm. [240] 1658
India (Finances)—Indian Exchanges, [242] 1207
Municipal Corporations Commission — Lostwithiel, [241] 762

CAVE, Mr. T., *Barnstaple*
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1427, 1428, 1433 ; Consid. Amendt. 1503, 1515
Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. [242] 1835
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1468
Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1771
Stationery Office, [240] 60, 75, 76

CAVENDISH, Lord F. C., *Yorkshire, W.R., N. Div.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 239
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. 81 ; *cl.* 11, 99 ; *cl.* 13, 112 ; *cl.* 16, 124, 127 ; *cl.* 17, 312 ; *cl.* 22, 315 ; *cl.* 27, 318 ; Amendt. 320 ; *cl.* 47, 336 ; *cl.* 65, 350 ; *cl.* 68, 460 ; *cl.* 69, 469, 473 ; *add. cl.* 501, 504, 595, 606, 613 ; Schedule 1, 883 ; Schedule 4, 890 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1910 ; *cl.* 103, Amendt. 1912 ; *cl.* 104, Amendt. 1913
Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1357
Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 14, [241] 1937
Supply—Admiralty Registry of the High Court of Justice, [240] 971
Criminal Prosecutions, Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 945, 949
Queen's Bench, &c. [240] 968
Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1016

CAVENDISH, Lord G. H., *Derbyshire, N.*
County Government, 2R. [237] 1866
Highways, Comm. [241] 458 ; *cl.* 11, 473, 478 866 ; *cl.* 18, 884, 886 ; *add. cl.* 1159, 1353

**Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.** (Surveyor General of Ordnance), *Essex, W.*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Defences of the Clyde, [238] 1752
  Department of Contracts, [241] 1852
  Rifled Ordnance, [240] 626, 1075
  Siege Guns, [240] 496
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1408, 1409
  Warlike Stores, [242] 1410, 1411, 1412
Bar Education and Discipline, [242] 642
Breech-Loading Ordnance, Res. [238] 1151
Coast Defence—Submarine Mines, [238] 1838
India—Fort George Water Supply, [238] 1743
Supply—Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [242] 1423

*Ceylon*
*Ecclesiastical Votes*, Question, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Jan* 21, [237] 250; Explanation, Mr. J. Lowther *Jan* 25, 473; Question, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 11, [238] 1045
*Food Taxes*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Jan* 24, [237] 369; Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 11, [238] 1041

**Chadwick, Mr. D.**, *Macclesfield*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. [239] 1305; Amendt. 1311, 1313; Amendt. 1314, 1315, 1317; Consid. 1419
Income Tax, Res. [238] 394

**Chamberlain, Mr. J.**, *Birmingham*
Cattle Disease—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [241] 960
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 351; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1675, 1709; *cl.* 9, 1751; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1854, 1862; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1865, 1870, 1875, 1881, 1883; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1884, 1885, 1887, 1888, 1890, 1892, 1902; *cl.* 21, 1911; Amendt. 1915, 1917; *cl.* 22, 1988, 1991, 2004, 2007; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 2012; *cl.* 37, 2087; *cl.* 38, 2088; *cl.* 55, 2113, 2125; *cl.* 64, Motion for Adjournment, 2142, 2146
242] *cl.* 68, 155, 156; Amendt. 161, 163, 165; *cl.* 70, 168; Postponed *cl.* 5, Amendt. 187; Postponed *cl.* 33, 422; *add. cl.* 439; Schedule 5, 810
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1585, 1589, 1596, 1603, 1695
Corrupt Practices at Elections Act—Carlisle, [242] 1302
County Government, 2R. [237] 1886; Comm. [238] 908
Eastern Question, Notice of Motion, [239] 1517, 1592
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 907, 911
Education Department—New Code for 1878—Attendances, [241] 811
Elementary Education Act, 1876, [237] 821
  Board School, Wymington, [239] 112
Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 785

[cont.

**Chamberlain, Mr. J.**—*cont.*
Endowed Schools (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1224
Factories and Workshops, Consid. *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, [238] 1910
Highways, Comm. [241] 457; *cl.* 11, 864; *add. cl.* 1364
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 977
Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent—The Estimate, [239] 1722
Municipal Elections—Carlisle, [241] 2051
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Select Committee, [239] 471
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 996
Supply—Temporary Commissions, [238] 1614
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 601

**Chambers, Sir T.**, *Marylebone*
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 421
Demolition of Houses (Metropolis)—Midland Railway Company, [239] 664
Persian Legation, the Late, [239] 663
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 496

**Chancellor, The Lord** (Lord Cairns)
Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 2R. [240] 619
Army — Auxiliary Forces — Hampshire Rifle Volunteers, [242] 862
Ballymena and Larne Railway, 3R. [241] 103, 106
Bills of Sale, 2R. [240] 827
Bishoprics, Report, [239] 956, 958
Charitable Trusts, 2R. [241] 1427
Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1207
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), [241] 950
Cyprus, Island of—Financial Arrangements, [242] 30, 32
Eastern Question — Congress, The — Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 514
Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 968
Entail Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [238] 533
Forces of the Crown in Ireland, Motion for a Return, [240] 1333
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 1R. [241] 7; 2R. 443; Comm. *cl.* 5, 584; Schedule, 586, 743
Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1431
Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, 2R. [238] 1138; Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 189
Message from the Queen—Reserve Forces, Calling out of the, [239] 268; Motion for an Address, 801
Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [240] 211, 216, 217, 218, 226, 238
National Museum and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 401
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  House of Lords—Ventilation, [241] 2020
  Prorogation—Queen's Speech, [242] 2082, 2092
  Queen's Speech, [237] 2, 3
  Roll of the Lords, [237] 234
  Strangers, [242] 200

[cont.

CHANCELLOR, THE LORD—*cont.*

- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 621, 633
- Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Consolidated), 2R. [241] 485
- Patent Laws, [238] 1580
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 3R. [241] 307
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1966
- St. Katherine's Hospital—Royal Commission, 1871, [238] 1383
- Statute Law Revision (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1285
- Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877, Amendment, 2R. [241] 956
- Telegraphs, 2R. [240] 1034
- Tenant Right (Ireland), [242] 1167
- Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 1R. [237] 1601, 1616; 2R. [238] 140; Comm. 952
- Truro Chapter, Comm. *cl.* 10, [241] 119

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. Sir S. H. NORTHCOTE), *Devon, N.*

- Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1595
- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1314; Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1425
- Africa, Exploration of, [237] 458
- Africa, South—Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1635;—War Expenditure, [239] 1373
- Army and Navy Services—Excess, [239] 1692
- Asia, Central—Reported Russian Advance, [242] 1939
- Baltic Sea, [237] 1324
- Bar Education and Discipline, [238] 158
- Borneo, [240] 358
- Brewers' Licences, Res. [242] 477
- Burials, Res. [237] 1827
- Cattle Plague—Outbreak in Lincolnshire, [238] 976
- China—Chefoo Convention, [240] 260
- Civil Service Estimates, Res. [242] 1448
- Civil Service—Select Committee, 1876-1877, [237] 1424
- Colonel Wellesley, [239] 1715
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 429
- Commons, Nomination of Committee, [238] 360
- Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1632, 1639
- Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [242] 1850, 1851; Consid. 1956
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), [240] 1254, 1494; 2R. [241] 197, 198, 250; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1663, 1669, 1677, 1679, 1712, 1720; *cl.* 55, 2113, 2128, 2130; *cl.* 64, 2141, 2145; *add. cl.* [242] 447, 449
- Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Importation of Cattle, [242] 2024
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1585, 1595, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1687, 1691
- Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Treaty Obligations, [241] 1578
- Copyright and Designs Act—Marks on Pottery and China, [238] 1954
- Corrupt Practices Acts, [240] 1340
- County Government, 2R. [237] 1909, 1914; [238] 635; Comm. 936, 942, 1403
- Criminal Law (Indictable Offences), [241] 763, 1235, 1465

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*

- Currency—Small Silver Coinage, [240] 1683
- Customs and Inland Revenue Act—Depreciation of Machinery, [242] 864
- 239] Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. 1188; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1294, 1301, 1303, 1304; *cl.* 12, 1305, 1310, 1311, 1313, 1314, 1315; Amendt. 1317, 1318; *cl.* 13, 1319; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1321; *cl.* 17, 1323, 1336, 1338; *cl.* 20, 1340, 1341, 1343, 1346; *cl.* 21, 1349; Amendt. 1350; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1417, 1418, 1419, 1452; 3R. 1663, 1670, 1674, 1684; Motion for Adjournment, 1686, 1730, 1742
- Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 581
- Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1901
- Dental Practitioners, Comm. *cl.* 22, [240] 1321, 1322
- Diplomatic Appointments — Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, [240] 31; Res. 182, 183
- Dog Licences, [238] 1044
- Dog Tax—Useless Dogs, [237] 318
- Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 33
- Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 797
- Earl Russell, the Late, [240] 1084
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 610, 759, 761, 879, 880, 980, 1016, 1096, 1099
- Eastern Question, [237] 822, 823
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1494, 1614;—Production of Papers, [242] 231
  - Alleged Triple Alliance, [237] 623; [242] 391
  - Anglo-Turkish Convention, [241] 1579, 1972; [242] 39, 40, 997, 1561, 1563;—Money Vote, [241] 1335, 1336;—Negotiations, [242] 227, 228;—Tribute of Cyprus, [241] 2051
  - Appointment of Lord Napier and Sir Garnet Wolseley to Commands, [238] 453
  - Armistice, [237] 926, 1210;—Advance of the Russian Forces, 625, 728, 1326, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1851
  - Bessarabia, [237] 1735, 1736
  - Black Sea, &c. [237] 156
  - Bulgaria—Election of the Prince, [239] 1288
  - Congress, [237] 1211, 1851; [238] 978, 1048, 1365, 1368, 1404; [239] 120, 205, 288, 417, 522, 523, 524, 526, 741; [240] 748; [241] 1853;—Advance of the Russian Army, [238] 1288;—Bosnia and Herzegovina, [242] 228;—Civil and Religious Liberty in Poland, [237] 1848;—Correspondence, [240] 1252;—English Representatives, [240] 1167;—Greece, Representation of, [238] 1400, 1490; [240] 1082, 1168;—Instructions to the British Plenipotentiary, [242] 218, 219, 389, 390;—Ministerial Statement, [239] 1374, 1375; [240] 1076, 1081
  - Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 534, 1424, 1622, 1623, 1624, 1734; [238] 1755; [242] 1767
  - Gallipoli, Occupation of, [238] 62, 63, 1145
  - H.M. Government, Position of, [237] 467, 471, 472
  - Negotiations, [239] 1421, 1434, 1439

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
- Peace, Terms of—Despatch of Earl of Derby, Dec. 25, 1877, [237] 321, 322, 1535
- Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [238] 774, 798
- Roumania, [237] 925
- Russia and England, [239] 250
- Russia and Turkey, [237] 1324;—Terms of Peace, [238] 301, 379, 449, 637, 877, 1045, 1596;—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, [238] 537;—Treaty of San Stefano, [238] 1957; [239] 117, 201, 961, 1366; [241] 2056
- Russian Troops in Turkey, [241] 2058
- Suez Canal, [237] 530
- Supplementary Vote—Occupation of Constantinople by the Russians, [237] 1211, 1213
- Straits of the Dardanelles, [238] 1488
- Treaty of Berlin—Roumania, [242] 2007;—The Turkish Indemnity, [242] 521
- Turkey and Greece—Correspondence, [237] 624;—Alleged Agreement, [242] 863
- Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), 2R. [238] 1921
- Education—Inspectors of Elementary Schools, [241] 826
- Education (Scotland), [240] 746
- Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, [238] 1489
- Egyptian Finance, [239] 226
- Egyptian Obelisk (Cleopatra's Needle), [237] 1209
- Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 791
- Estimates, Discussions on the, [240] 936;—Revenue and Expenditure, [242] 1301
- Evangelical Dissenters in Russia, [240] 260
- Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2), [242] 1532
- Exchequer Bonds (£1,000,000), Comm. [238] 723
- Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1775
- Factories and Workshops, [237] 1850
- Fishery Award, [239] 286
- German Emperor, Attempted Assassination of, [240] 1169, 1256
- Germany—Religious Refugees, [237] 1206
- Grand Jury (Ireland), [238] 1297
- Greece—Diplomatic Communications, [237] 461
  - Kingdom of—Protocol, &c. [238] 875
- Greeks, The—Correspondence of Mr. Gladstone, [237] 727
- Gun Licence Act, 1870—Rabbits (Scotland), [239] 1090
- Hydrophobia, [237] 728
- Inclosure Provisional Order (Llanfair Waterdine), 2R. [240] 1319
- Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1350, 1352
- Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. [242] 1687, 1829, 1830, 1843
- Income Tax, Res. [238] 402
- India—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Finance — Anglo-Indian Balances, [242] 1298, 1299
  - Indian Budget, [241] 1467; [242] 868, 1530
  - Mission to Cabul, [242] 2017
- India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1911
- Indian Contingent—Payment—Rate of Exchange, [242] 640
- Indian Vernacular Press Act, [241] 1241; Motion for an Address, [242] 61, 117, 130

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
- Inland Revenue—Inhabited House Duty, [237] 249, 1925
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1494, 1850; [242] 229; Comm. *cl.* 8, 326, 1302
- Intermediate Education (Ireland)—The Commissioners, [241] 1469
- Interments in Churchyards, [239] 1416
- Ireland—Cashel and Sligo—Disfranchisement of, [240] 1883
- Irish Estimates, [240] 1663
- Italy—Diplomatic Relations with the Pope, [242] 2016
- Land Taxation, Res. [240] 1357
- Lord High Register for Scotland—24 & 25 Vict. c. 71, [238] 1486
- Madagascar, [240] 261
- Malta, Indian Troops in, [241] 121
- Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1532
- Martin, Mr. Wykeham, Death of, [240] 1052
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 98, 101
- Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, [238] 260
- Message from the Queen—Marriage of H.R.H the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 43, 232, 239, 242; Res. 256; Report, 395
- Message from the Queen—Reserve Forces, [239] 289, 297, 298; Motion for an Address, 858, 942, 1028
- Metropolis—London Bridge, [239] 1884
- Metropolis Water Companies, [242] 1949
- Metropolis Water Works Purchase, 2R. [238] 1235
- Military and Naval Expenditure, [240] 254
- Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1519, 1520, 1521, 1722, 1723, 1885; [240] 624, 625, 745;—Numbers, [239] 1718
- Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 336, 347, 390, 554, 585
- Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1210
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 2001; *cl.* 18, 2028, 2030, 2031; *add. cl.* [239] 166
- Naval Stations in the Pacific—Esquimalt Harbour, [239] 1283
- Naval Strength of the Country—Arming the Mercantile Marine, [239] 854
- Navy — H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [239] 119
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1125
- Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-77, Res. [242] 1693, 1694
- Paris Exhibition, 1878—Assistance to English Artizans, [240] 28
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Breach of Privilege, [239] 670
  - Business of the House, [237] 256, 319, 1736; [238] 1046, 1048, 1401; [239] 122, 1285, 1288, 1450; [240] 361, 498, 835, 836, 837, 931, 1074, 1075, 1257, 1343, 1567, 1615, 1888; [241] 327, 328, 330; [242] 230, 391, 392, 393, 1533, 1641
  - Debates, Reports of, [237] 1207; [238] 1487
  - Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, [240] 1076, 1179
  - Easter Recess, [238] 1291; [239] 963, 1390

[*cont.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer—cont.
  Morning Sittings, [239] 288, 1234; [240] 1684
  Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1381, 1382, 1383, 1385, 1387, 1389, 1393, 1439, 1440
  Order of Business, [238] 453, 455; [241] 765, 766, 2063, 2064
  Orders of the Day, [237] 378
  Private Bills, [238] 1958
  Privileges of Members, [240] 652
  Public Business, [241] 132, 499, 1239, 1246; —Amendments on Supply, [238] 1400; —Mines, [238] 1487
  Public Petitions—Indian Press Law, [240] 1682
  Scotch Business of the House, [240] 26
  Whitsuntide Recess, [240] 498, 620, 1344
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 248
Parliament—New Writ for Clare County—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Res. [242] 46, 47, 136
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. Amendt. [239] 1400, 1408
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1472; Amendt. 1478
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1096, 1097, 1104
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 417
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 379
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Committee, [238] 366
Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1740, 1963, 1975
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 89, 151, 153; Report, 262
Parliamentary Reporting, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 853; Nomination of Select Committee, 1677, 1679
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment—The 23rd Clause, [239] 1725; [242] 1769
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 943, 2062; [242] 2020
Post Office—Post Office Savings Banks, [240] 1881
Privateering, [239] 1370
Public Buildings and Offices, Report of the Committee, [239] 1451
Queen's Colleges and University (Ireland), [238] 378;—The Estimates, [240] 1612
Railway Commissioners — Continuance of Powers, [237] 250
Railway Passenger Duty, [239] 527; [242] 1869
Ritualism, Res. [241] 935
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [240] 1075
Roumania—The Jews, [239] 36;—Customs Tariff, 1717
Russia—Colonel Wellesley's Despatches, [237] 1852
Russia—Roumania, [239] 1096
Russia and Turkey—The War—Proposed Terms of Peace, [237] 375;—War Indemnity, [241] 1846

[cont.

Chancellor of the Exchequer—cont.
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1694, 1703, 1709, 1710, 1720, 1918; [238] 756; [239] 362, 371; *cl.* 1, 626, 628, 1813, 1816, 1817, 1826; [240] 32; *cl.* 1, 112; *add. cl.* 1026; Consid. [241] 414; [242] 870; 3R. 1618, 1719, 1720
  South Kensington—National Portrait Gallery, [237] 924
  Suez Canal Dues, [238] 1296
  Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 535, 569, 578, 579
    Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1483, 1487
    Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1620
    Civil Service and Revenue Departments, [239] 179, 181, 182
    Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1525
    Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [239] 169
    Diplomatic Services, [242] 1495, 1496
    Epping Forest Commission, [238] 1617
    Foreign Office, [239] 1488
    "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," [238] 1555, 1556
    House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1480
    Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [242] 1264
    Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 818
    Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1501, 1506, 1507
    Mint, including Coinage, [238] 1552, 1553
    Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 990, 991, 996
    Prisons (Ireland), Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1608, 1609, 1610
    Public Buildings, [240] 1369
    Public Offices Site, [238] 1540
    Queen's University in Ireland, [238] 1571, 1575
    Royal Palaces, [242] 1494
    Stationery Office, [239] 1792, 1794, 1804, 1807, 1809, 1811; [240] 45, 73, 79
    Supplementary Estimates, [241] 2060; [242] 526, 1179, 1180, 1182
    Treasury, [239] 1482
  Supply, Res. [238] 1048
  Supplementary Estimate, Notice of Motion, [237] 368, 375, 377;—Ministerial Statement, 534, 737, 739, 782, 895, 1024;—Personal Explanation, 1061, 1216, 1226, 1231, 1234, 1236, 1247, 1265, 1301, 1310; Comm. 1351, 1362
  Taxation (Ireland)—Volunteer Force, [241] 128
  Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1695, 1697
  Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, [242] 2016
  Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [240] 1413
  Treaty Obligations, [239] 223
  Truro Chapter, 2R. [241] 845
  Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Bosnia, Herzegovina, &c., Insurrections in, [237] 927
    Bulgaria, Religious Persecution in, [237] 1054
    Crete, [240] 255;—Employment of Bashi-Bazouks, [241] 329;—Insurrection in, 500
    Cyprus, Occupation of, [241] 1242
    Dardanelles—Entry of the Fleet, [237] 1209

[cont.

Chancellor of the Exchequer—*cont.*
Free Trade, [241] 1468
Greek Provinces—Thessaly, [239] 1094
Insurrection in the Greek Provinces, [238] 1748
Mohammedan Population of Bulgaria, [241] 489
Murder of Mr. Ogle, [240] 25, 1566, 1612
Russian Sailors, [237] 1734
Sultan, Reported Conspiracy against, [241] 1580
Treaty of Berlin—Article 18, [241] 2055
War—Austrian Interests, [237] 1733
Turkey—Murder of Mr. Ogle, Res. [242] 1999, 2001, 2002
Turkish Loan of 1855, [238] 1595 ; [240] 929, 930
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 265, 266
United States—Bland Silver Act, [238] 1290
Treaty of Washington—22nd Article—Award of the Fisheries Commissioners, [240] 1492
University Commission—The Medical Professorships, [241] 1843
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1516, 1655 ; Bill withdrawn, [242] 869
Watermen and Lightermen of the Thames, Petition, [238] 876
Water Supply (Metropolis)—Increased Rates, [241] 1848
Ways and Means—Miscellaneous Questions
Customs Department — Sir Charles Du Cane, Appointment of, [240] 1887
Dog Tax, [239] 1449
Extra Expenditure, [241] 125, 757
Financial Schedules, [239] 287
Financial Statement, [238] 976
Inland Revenue — Brewers' Licence Tax, [240] 1341
National Debt—The New Sinking Fund, [239] 856
Tobacco Duties Acts, 1830—Cultivation of Tobacco in Ireland, [241] 1968
Ways and Means, Comm. [237] 1453 ; [242] 1303, 1316, 1332, 1361, 1368, 1377
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 536, 561, 591, 596, 607, 608, 668, 669 ; Report, 750 ; Comm. 1112, 1157, 1160, 1164, 1178, 1179, 1180 ; Report, 1246
Weights and Measures, 2R. [238] 721 ; Comm. [240] 1673, 1674

Chaplin, Lieut.-Colonel E., *Lincoln*
Eastern Question—The War—Armistice, The Reported, [237] 624
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 21, Amendt. [241] 1085, 1087

Chaplin, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid.*
Cattle Plague—Outbreak in Lincolnshire, [238] 976
241]Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 344, 346,
. 350, 555; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1657, 1675, 1710;
. *cl.* 10, 1864; *cl.* 15, 1870; *cl.* 16, 1903,
. 1904; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1907, 1911, 1913,
. 1915, 1917; *cl.* 22, 1933, 1992, 1998; *cl.* 28,
. 2010; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 2013, 2015; *cl.* 30,
. 2067; *cl.* 55, 2127, 2133; *cl.* 64, 2143
242]Postponed *cl.* 33, 193; *add. cl.* 435, 442, 446

Chaplin, Mr. H.—cont.
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1689, 1695
County Government, Comm. [238] 919, 921
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, [239] Amendt. 1337, 1339 ; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1340
Eastern Question—Armistice—Advance of the Russian Forces, [237] 728
Telegraphic Communication in Turkey, [237] 726
India—The Nizam—Mr. Oliphant, [237] 529
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 324
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House, [240] 840
Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, [240] 1075, 1076, 1171
Public Business, [239] 1288
Racecourses (Licensing), 2R. [237] 647
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1000, 1023, 1235

**Charitable Trusts Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
*l.* Presented ; read 1ª* *July* 9 (No. 150)
Read 2ª *July* 15, [241] 1427
Committee * ; Report *July* 19
Order for 3R. discharged ; Bill withdrawn *July* 30, [242] 628

Charley, Mr. W. T., *Salford*
Bishoprics, Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 1668
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 970, 976 ; *cl.* 2, 1716 ; *cl.* 9, 1736 ; *cl.* 33, [242] 419 ; Schedule 5, 809 ; New Schedule, 827
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1601, 1608
India—Lord's Day Act, [238] 1491
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1916
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 695
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1527
Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 1231
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 200
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Consolidated), Comm. *cl.* 22, Motion for reporting Progress, [240] 1322
Tenant Right (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [240] 1325, 1326

*Chester Tramways Bill*
*c.* Ordered, That the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be appointed Chairman of the Committee on the Chester Tramways Bill (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *May* 16

Chichester, Earl of
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Case of Mr. Charles Armstrong, [239] 1082 ; [241] 748

**Childers**, Right Hon. H. C. E., *Pontefract*
  Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. [241] 1373; *cl.* 2, 1380, 1381, 1387
  Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 646
  Bishoprics, Comm. *cl.* 3, [242] 1650, 1654
  Civil Service — Select Committee, 1876-77, [237] 1424
  Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [240] 475
  Convict Prisons—The Commission, [237] 157
  Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1678
  Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
    Congress, The, [238] 1370
    H.M. Government, Position of, [237] 472
    Indian Contingent—Cost, [241] 1244
    Peace, Terms of—Despatch of Earl of Derby, Dec. 25, 1877, [237] 320, 321
    Reserve Forces, [239] 172
  East India (Public Works), Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 356
  Extra Expenditure—Ways and Means, [241] 124, 125, 757
  Foreign Office — Abstraction of a State Paper — Anglo-Turkish Memorandum, [241] 2058
    Temporary Writers, [241] 495, 757
  Greenwich Hospital — Age Pensions, [242] 1543
  Indian Budget, [242] 868
  Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 761
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [242] 325, 326
  Mercantile Marine—Coal Laden Ships, [241] 1967
    Spontaneous Combustion of Coal—"Annie Richmond," [241] 490
  Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent, [240] 625
  Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 431, 437
  Navy—Henwood, Mr. [242] 866
    H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, [238] 1494, 1745; [240] 35
  Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [242] 1580
    Military Pay and Allowances, [238] 1475, 1476
  Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1053
  Postal Telegraph Service — The Telephone, [238] 58
  Seamen and Marines' Widows' Pension Fund, Res. [238] 1501
  Suez Canal Dues, [238] 1295
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1010, 1020, 1071, 1245
  Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 577, 578
    Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1486, 1492
    Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 953, 957, 958, 963
    Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1629
    Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 947, 951
    Mint, including Coinage, [238] 1552
    Supplementary Estimates, [241] 2060; [242] 526, 1179, 1180

[*cont.*

**Childers**, Right Hon. H. C. E.—*cont.*
  Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 51
  Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1307, 1310, 1316, 1334, 1344, 1365
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 582, 607, 608, 668, 669, 1105, 1112

*China*
  *Outrage at Hong Kong*, Question, Sir Harcourt Johnstone; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 4, [239] 525
  *The Chefoo Convention*, Questions, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 21, [237] 248; *Feb* 11, 1423; Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 20, [240] 260; Question, Observations, The Earl of Aberdeen; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; short debate thereon *July* 23, [242] 34; Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 7, 1438;—*Import of Opium*, Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 24, [241] 127
  *The Famine*, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 27, [241] 328
    Report on ; . *P.P.* [1957] [2052] [2107]

*Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation Bill* (*Lords*) (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *August* 2, [242] 982
  Amendt. to leave out from "be," and add "re-committed" (*Mr. Plimsoll*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 130, N. 74; M. 56 (D. L. 249)
  Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *August* 7, 1425
  Amendt. to leave out from "be," and add "re-committed in respect of a new Clause (Saving rights of the General Post Office)" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived
  Words added; main Question, as amended, proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Edward Jenkins*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived
  Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Bill re-committed in respect of a new clause
  On Question, "That the Clause be read 2°;" Clause read 2°, and added to the Bill; Bill reported
  Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" (*Sir Sydney Waterlow*) *August* 8, 1502
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Thomas Cave*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 71, N. 78; M. 7 (D. L. 252)
  Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Bill put off for three months

*Christ's Hospital—Report of the Commission of Inquiry*
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 7, [237] 1205; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 24, [241] 124

CHURCHILL, Lord R., *Woodstock*
County Government, [238] 634; Comm. 900, 904
Endowed Schools (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1216, 1236
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1142
Mutiny, Comm. [238] 1982
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. Amendt. [239] 504
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1158, 1160

*Church of England*
*Queen Anne's Bounty Board*, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 22, [241] 2050
*The Burial Service*, Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 4, [237] 922
*The Preachers in St. Paul's*, Questions, Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, The Bishop of London *May* 17, [240] 126; *May* 23, 491

*Church of England—Church Livings*
Moved, "That it is desirable to adopt measures for preventing simoniacal evasion of the Law, and checking abuses in the sale of livings in private patronage" (*Mr. Leatham*) *Feb* 12, [237] 1540
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the better to enable the adoption of measures for preventing simoniacal evasion of the Law and checking abuses in the sale of livings in private patronage, it is expedient that the Law of Simony, and the circumstances under which the sale of livings in private patronage are by Law allowed, should be defined by Parliament" (*Mr. Goldney*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, [House counted out]

*Church of England—Ritualism*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 5, To leave out from "That" and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire as to the teaching and practice by Clergy of the Church of England of Doctrines and Ceremonies not authorized by Law, or contrary to the Laws and usages of the Church as by Law established" (*Mr. Edward Jenkins*) *v.*, [241] 901; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

**Church Rates (Scotland) Bill**
(*Mr. M'Laren, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Laing, Sir George Balfour*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 75]
Bill withdrawn *July* 3, [241] 688

*Civil Service, The*
*Select Committee*, 1876-77—*Employment of Soldiers and Sailors*, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 11, [237] 1424
*Writers*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 23, [242] 42

*Clare Slob Land Reclamation Bill (by Order)*
*c.* Read 3° * *May* 20

**Clerical Disabilities Bill**
(*Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Walter Powell*)
*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 57]
2R. [Dropped]

CLEVELAND, Duke of
Bishoprics, Comm. [239] 514

CLIVE, Mr. G., *Hereford*
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, [239] 665
Mines Act—Inspectors' Report, [238] 1841
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 24

*Coal Mines*—See under *Mines*

COBBOLD, Mr. T. C., *Ipswich*
Army—Officers of new Line Regiments, [239] 200
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 573
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1268
War Office Clerks, [239] 284

COCHRANE, Mr. A. D. W. R. Baillie- *Isle of Wight*
Diplomatic Appointments—Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, Res. [240] 186
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 569
Eastern Question—Negotiations, [239] 1444
  Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 779
Egyptian Obelisk (Cleopatra's Needle), [237] 1209
Foreign Office Reports, [240] 1339
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 984
Metropolis—St. James's Park, [242] 994
Navy—H.M S. "Eurydice," [241] 120
Public Buildings and Offices, Report of Committee, [239] 1450
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 17, [240] 1209, 1213, 1214
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1258
Supply—Consular Services, [240] 1285
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1267
  Public Buildings, [240] 1361, 1363, 1368

Cogan, Right Hon. W. H. F., *Kildare*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2115; *cl.* 68, [242] 150; *cl.* 71, 182
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1520
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1151
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 353, 361, 387; *cl.* 8, [240] 719
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 246
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 271

Colchester, Lord
Crete, Island of, [237] 1035
Weights and Measures, 2R. [241] 2039; Comm. *cl.* 38, [242] 208; *cl.* 50, Amendt. 209; *cl.* 53, Amendt. 210

Cole, Mr. H. T., *Penryn, &c.*
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 134
Franchise—Manufacture of Faggot Votes, [240] 1879, 1880
Navy—The "Ganges" Training Ship, [242] 2021
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [240] 719

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, N.*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 612
Education Grants in Scotland, [241] 801
Education Report (Scotland), [241] 493
Education (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 1132, 1133
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 2R. [240] 1154; Comm. [242] 613; *cl.* A, 978
Govan Burgh, 2R. [238] 142, 152
Indian Troops, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 759
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1885
Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 558
238] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. 1782; *cl.* 3, 1798; *cl.* 4, 1803
240] *cl.* 12, 1187; *cl.* 16, 1206; *cl.* 17, 1209, 1210, 1214; *cl.* 36, 1703, 1709; *cl.* 41, 1715; *cl.* 45, 1729; *cl.* 54, 1736; *cl.* 85, 1898; *cl.* 105, 1916; *cl.* 106, Amendt. 1919; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1922; Amendt. 1923, 1924, 1928, 1938, 1939; *add. cl.* 1946, 1965, 1966; Amendt. 1970, 1971, 1977, 1978, 1982
241] Consid. 598, 599, 601; *add. cl.* 640; *cl.* 51, Amendt. 828; *cl.* 88, Amendt. 830, 832, 840; 3R. 1077

**Collection of Rates (Dublin) Bill**
(*Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
*c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. James Lowther*) *June* 17, [240] 1675; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°*
Bill withdrawn * *August* 8 [Bill 220]

**Collection of Rates (Dublin) (No. 2) Bill**
(*Mr. Meldon, Major Nolan*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *July* 16 [Bill 264]
Referred to the Examiners

Collins, Mr. E., *Kinsale*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 593
Irish Fisheries—Mackerel Fishery at Kinsale, [239] 1284
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 293; Comm. [239] 341; *cl.* 1, 1814; Amendt. 1847; *add. cl.* [240] 878, 890
Tramways (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [239] 98
Turkey—The War—Blockade of the Black Sea, [237] 1205

Colman, Mr. J. J., *Norwich*
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 719

**Colonial Marriages Bill**
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Russell Gurney, Sir Thomas Chambers*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 16]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 27, [238] 406
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Gregory*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 182, N. 161; M. 21
Div. List, A. and N., 437
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee [Dropped]

*Colonial Marriage Law—Western Australia—Natal*
Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 25, [242] 225

Colville of Culross, Lord
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Powers), Res. [242] 341

*Commons Inclosure—Provisional Orders*
Select Committee appointed; Instruction to the Committee *Jan* 31, [237] 816
Moved, "That Mr. Stephen Cave be nominated a Member of the Select Committee" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *Feb* 25, [238] 358; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Goldsmid*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived; original Question put, and agreed to; Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. Fawcett, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Leveson Gower, Mr. Pell, nominated other Members of the Committee
Parl. Papers—
First Report . . . . . . . . 130
Second Report. . . . . . . . 197

**Commons Regulation (Expenses) Bill**
(*Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *July* 23 [Bill 273]
Read 2°* *July* 25
Committee *—R.P. *July* 26
Committee *; Report *July* 29
Considered *; read 3° *July* 30
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Steward*) *August* 1 (No. 181)
Read 2ª * *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 13 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 56]

**Commutation of Tithes Bill** (*Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Arthur Vivian, Mr. Monk, Mr. Rodwell*)

*c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *June* 19 [Bill 222]
Read 2°* *June* 26
Committee* ; Report *July* 4
Considered* *July* 5
Read 3°* *July* 8
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Henniker*) *July* 9 (No. 151)
Read 2ª* *July* 17
Committee ; Report, after short debate *July* 25, [242] 205
Read 3ª* *July* 29
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 284]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 42]

**Companies (Foreign Shareholders) Bill** (*Sir John Lubbock, Sir Andrew Lusk, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Charles Praed*)

*c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 14 [Bill 118]
Bill withdrawn* *May* 30

**Conge d'elire Bill** (*Mr. Monk, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Assheton*)

*c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 110]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 7, [239] 1545
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. J. G. Hubbard*) ; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c." [House counted out]
2R. [Dropped]

**Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Monk, Mr. Forsyth*)

*c.* Act read ; considered in Committee ; Resolution agreed to, and reported ; Bill ordered* *May* 13
Read 1°* *May* 14 [Bill 176]
Read 2°* *May* 27
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 26, [241] 298 ; Debate adjourned
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate *August* 9, [242] 1714
Moved, "That the Debate be further adjourned till this day" (*Mr. Monk*)
Amendt. to leave out "this day," and add "upon Thursday next" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *v.* ; Question put, "That 'this day' &c. ;" A. 32, N. 48 ; M. 16 (D. L. 268)
After short debate, main Question, as amended, put ; Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned
Bill withdrawn* *August* 10

*Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards—The Select Committee,* 1877

*Floods Prevention,* Question, Observations, The Marquess of Ripon ; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 4, [240] 1162
*Legislation,* Question, Observations, The Marquess of Ripon ; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon ; short debate thereon *Jan* 21, [237] 234

**Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill** (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *August* 9
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" 242] *August* 12, 1844
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House, having, with the assent of Her Majesty's Government, on the 7th of May last passed a Resolution that the position of the Irish National Teachers called for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government with a view to a satisfactory adjustment of their claims, this House is of opinion that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to have given effect during the present Session to such Resolution, and to have made proposals to this House for securing with certainty to the Irish National School Teachers the full amount of the result fees to be earned by them in the current year" (*Mr. Meldon*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c ;" after short debate, Question put ; A. 47 ; N. 30 ; M. 17 (D. L. 276)
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
Committee ; Report *August* 13, 1927
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *August* 14, 1956
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, Mr. Consul General Fawcett's Report upon Mr. C. C. Ogle's death is inconclusive, and that a fresh Commission of Inquiry ought to be instituted, composed of Englishmen only : who should be specially empowered to assure the witnesses of the protection of Her Majesty's Government" (*Mr. Henry Samuelson*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 3°
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *August* 14
Read 2ª* ; Committee negatived ; read 3ª *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 65]

**Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000) Bill** (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Colonel Stanley*)

*c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 13
Read 2°, after debate *Feb* 14, [237] 1624
Committee* ; Report *Feb* 15
Read 3°* *Feb* 18
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Feb* 18
Read 2ª ; Committee negatived, after short debate *Feb* 21, 46
Read 3ª* *Feb* 22
Royal Assent *Feb* 25 [41 *Vict.* c. 1]

**Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill** (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Colonel Stanley*)

*c.* Resolutions in Committee *Mar* 19
Resolutions reported, and agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* *Mar* 20
Read 2°* *Mar* 21
Committee* ; Report *Mar* 22
Read 3°* *Mar* 25

[*cont.*

*Consolidated Fund* (*No.* 2) *Bill*—cont.
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Mar* 26
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 27
Royal Assent *Mar* 28 [41 *Vict.* c. 9]

**Consolidated Fund (No. 3) Bill**
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Resolutions in Committee *May* 23
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered to be brought in upon the Fourth Resolution; read 1° * *May* 24
Read 2° * *May* 27
Committee *; Report *May* 30
Considered * *June* 3
Read 3° * *June* 4
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *June* 4
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 17 [41 *Vict.* c. 21]

**Consolidated Fund (No. 4) Bill**
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Resolution in Committee *July* 29
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 30
Read 2° * *July* 31
Committee *; Report *August* 1
Read 3° * *August* 4
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *August* 5
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 45]

*Consuls — Convention with the United States*
Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 12, [242] 1765

**Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Bill**
(*Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Mundella*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 59]
Order for 2R. read *May* 22, [240] 474
After short debate, Notice being taken, That Strangers were present (*Mr. Arthur Moore*)
Mr. Speaker stated, that it was his intention to follow the course which he had previously taken on similar occasions, and forthwith put the Question, "That Strangers be ordered to withdraw?" The House proceeded to a Division, whereupon Mr. Speaker called upon Mr. Moore to name a second Teller for the Ayes.—The hon. Member having stated that he was unable to do so, Mr. Speaker declared that the Noes had it
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

**Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)

*l.* Presented; after short debate, Bill read 1ª
237] *Feb* 12, 1485 (No. 22)
238] Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 5, 725
Committee; Report, after short debate *Mar* 7, 827; Bill re-committed
Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee (*on re-comm.*) read *Mar* 12, 1138 (No. 37)
Moved, "That the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee" (*The Lord Emly*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Order discharged; and Bill referred to a Select Committee
And, on *Mar* 15, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. President, D. Somerset, M. Salisbury, M. Ripon, M. Abergavenny, E. Spencer, E. Ellesmere, E. Feversham, V. Cardwell, L. Dunsany, L. Crofton, L. Skelmersdale, L. Ebury
Question, The Earl of Feversham; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon, 1389
Bill reported and re-committed * *April* 12 (No. 76)
*Correspondence*, Question, The Marquess of Ripon; Answer, The Duke of Richmond
239] and Gordon *May* 14, 1854
Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short
240] debate thereon *May* 17, 125
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *May* 21, 350
Committee (*on Second re-comm.*) *May* 27, 722
Report *May* 28, 827 (No. 88)
Read 3ª * *May* 31
*c.* Read 1° * (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *June* 3 [Bill 204]
Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 6, 1253; Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 14, 1494
*c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
241] *June* 24, 133
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the slaughter at the ports of landing of all fat cattle from the Continent would restrict the supply and increase the cost of food, and should therefore not be made compulsory under all circumstances by Act of Parliament" (*Mr. William Edward Forster*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Rathbone*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 25, 211; after debate, Debate further adjourned
Personal Explanation Mr. Ritchie *June* 27, 331; Debate resumed; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Rodwell*); Motion agreed to; debate further adjourned
Debate resumed *July* 1, 500; after long debate, Question put; A. 319, N. 162; M. 157; Div. List, A. and N., 570
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 8, 967

[*cont.*

*Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill*—cont.

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "having regard to the greatly enhanced price of animal food, this House is not prepared to adopt any measure which may tend further to diminish the supply of cattle from abroad" (*Mr. Torrens*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.

Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Sir
241] Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 9, 1070

*Treaty Obligations*, Questions, Mr. Mundella; Mr. Gorst; Answers, The Chancellor of the
. Exchequer *July* 16, 1577

*Salaries, Compensations, &c.*, Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker
. do now leave the Chair" *July* 16, 1582

After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Chamberlain*); after further short debate, Question put; A. 109, N. 205; M. 96 (D. L. 214)

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker,
. &c.," 1591

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no Resolution will be satisfactory which does not admit of the consideration of the claims for compensation which may be preferred by other persons and bodies than the owners of cattle, and of providing other means of paying such claims than out of the local rates and moneys to be provided by Parliament" (*Mr. Mundella*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 196, N. 126; M. 70 (D. L. 215)

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker,
. &c.," 1599

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Dr. Lush*); after short debate, Question put; A. 57, N. 130; M. 73 (D. L. 216)

Main Question again proposed, "That Mr.
. Speaker, &c.," 1607; after short debate, original Motion withdrawn; Order for Committee discharged

. Bill considered in Committee, 1608; Committee—R.P.

*Salaries, Compensations, &c.*, considered in
. Committee *July* 17, 1687

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of Salaries and Allowances of Officers and persons acting in the Veterinary Department of Her Majesty's Privy Council Office; and of the Charges and expenses incurred in the maintenance and management of that Department; also to authorize the payment of Compensations, whether out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, or otherwise, which may become payable under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for making better provision respecting Contagious and Infectious Diseases of Cattle and other Animals

Resolution to be reported

Moved, "That the Report be received To-morrow"

[*cont.*

*Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill*—cont.

After short debate, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); after debate, Motion withdrawn

Original Question put; Ordered, That the Report be received To-morrow

241] Committee—R.P. *July* 17, 1697

. Committee—R.P. *July* 18, 1854

. Committee—R.P. *July* 19, 1974

. Committee—R.P. *July* 22, 2064

242] Committee—R.P. *July* 24, 136

. Committee—R.P. *July* 26, 396

. Committee—R.P. *July* 30, 763

. Committee; Report *July* 31, 804 [Bill 286]

. Considered *August* 5, 1278

After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Meldon*); after further short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

. Adjourned debate resumed *August* 6, 1424
Read 3° * *August* 7

*l.* Order of the Day for the Consideration of the
. Commons' Amendts. read *August* 9, 1620

Commons' Amendts. considered; several agreed to, with an Amendt., and a consequential Amendt. to the Bill; and one disagreed to; and a Committee appointed to prepare a reason to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to the said Amendt.: The Committee to meet forthwith: Report from Committee of the reason prepared by them; read, and agreed to; and a message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill, with the Amendts. and reason

*c.* Lords reason and Amendts. considered *August* 12; Amendts. agreed to; Resolved, That this House doth not insist upon the Amendt. to which the Lords disagree [Bill 297]

*l.* Returned from the Commons with the Amendt. made by the Lords to the Amendts. made by the Commons and the consequential Amendt. made by the Lords to the Bill agreed to, and the Amendt. made by the Commons to which the Lords have disagreed, not insisted on (No. 194)

Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 74]

**Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill**
(*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Stacpoole, Mr. Downing, Dr. Brady, Mr. O'Connor Power, Mr. O'Clery*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 13 [Bill 113]
2R. [Dropped]

*Convict Prisons—The Commission*

Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Childers; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 18, [237] 157

**Conway Bridge (Composition of Debt) Bill** (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Gerard Noel*)

*c.* Resolution considered in Committee *April* 8, [239] 942

Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 11 [Bill 150]

Read 2°, after debate *May* 27, [240] 820

[*cont.*

*Conway Bridge (Composition of Debt) Bill*—cont.
  Committee*; Report *May* 30
  Considered* *June* 3
  Read 3°* *June* 6
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *June* 7 (No. 111)
  Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 1, [241] 485
  Committee* *July* 2
  Report* *July* 4
  Read 3ª* *July* 5
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 248]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. clxvi]

Conyngham, Lord F. N., *Clare*
  Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1163
  Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 256
  Supply—Queen's University, Ireland, Amendt. [238] 1578

*Coolies*
  *Emigration to the Mauritius*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 18, [237] 1848
  *Indian Labourers at La Réunion*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 21, [238] 59
    French Guiana—Correspondence [2053]

Coope, Mr. O. E., *Middlesex*
  Epping Forest, [237] 724; 3R. [241] 775
  Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] Amendt. 475, 477, 478; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 900
  Public Health—Ventilation of the Law and Police Courts, [238] 1044
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [238] 976

*Copyright and Designs Act — Mark on China and Pottery*
  Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 25, [238] 1954

**Coroners Bill** (*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *August* 13 [Bill 303]
  Order for 2R. read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn *August* 16, [242] 2091

*Coroners' Inquests*
  *Death of Mr. J. Fulton*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 25, [242] 221
  *Inquests on Lunatics*, Question, Colonel Brise; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 11, [239] 1090

**Corrib (Galway) River Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 17 (No. 113)
  Bill withdrawn* *June* 28

**Corrib (Galway) River Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. James Lowther*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *June* 20 [Bill 225]
  Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection *July* 4, [241] 843
  And, on *July* 9, Committee nominated as follows: — Mr. King-Harman, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. David Plunket
  Report of Select Comm.* *July* 16
  Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 17
  Read 3°* *July* 18 [Bill 265]
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *July* 19
  Read 2ª* *July* 23 (No. 166)
  Report* *July* 26
  Committee*; Report *July* 29
  Read 3ª* *July* 30
  Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxii]

*Corrupt Practices at Elections Act — Carlisle*
  Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 6, [242] 1302; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 8, 1529

Corry, Hon. H. W. Lowry, *Tyrone*
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1693

Corry, Mr. J. P., *Belfast*
  American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1654
  Belfast Improvement, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1063, 1067, 1068, 1069
  Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [239] 1962
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *add. cl.* [239] 1350
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1512; Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 309; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 322; Consid. 1790
  Ireland—Belfast, Disturbances at—The Military, [241] 1241
    Local Courts of Bankruptcy, [240] 1608
  Queen's Colleges and University (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [239] 1990

Cotes, Mr. C. C., *Shrewsbury*
  Police Superannuation, [238] 872

Cottesloe, Lord
  Criminal Law—Alleged Cruelty to a Cat, [238] 1035
  Railway Accidents, [241] 1330
    Sir Francis Goldsmid, Fatal Accident to, [241] 312

Cotton, Mr. Alderman W. J. R., *London*
  Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 428
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [241] 1731, 1735, 1743, 1749, 1751; New Schedule, [242] 828
  Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 915
  Metropolis — Islington and Deptford Cattle Markets, [241] 1851
  Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. [238] 1231

[*cont.*

Cotton, Mr. Alderman W. J. R.—*cont.*
Natal, Colony of—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 456
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. Amendt. [241] 1049
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 56

*Cotton Manufactories, The*
*The Wages Dispute—Riots in Lancashire*, Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Dodds; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross; Notice of Question, Major O'Gorman *May* 16, [240] 33; Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 17, 159
*Sheffield Magistrates*, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 27, [240] 746

### County Boards (Ireland) Bill

(*Major Nolan, Mr. Fay, Mr. O'Clery, Mr. O'Sullivan*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 64]
2R. [Dropped]

### County Courts Bill (*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Ripley, Mr. Rowley Hill*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 10]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 8, [239] 1548
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Osborne Morgan*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

### County Courts Jurisdiction Bill

(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Watkin Williams, Mr. Waddy*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 4 [Bill 100]
Order for 2R. read *Mar* 5, [238] 796; [House counted out]
Read 2° *, and committed to the Select Committee on the County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2) Bill *Mar* 15
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 5; Bill re-committed [Bill 241]
Re-committed [Dropped]

### County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2) Bill

(*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Forsyth*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 7 [Bill 102]
2R., Debate adjourned *Feb* 27, [238] 439
Debate resumed *Mar* 15, 1478; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Herschell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *April* 15, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Birley, Sir George Bowyer, Mr. Bulwer, Mr. Clive, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Hermon, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Watkin Williams, and Sir Eardley Wilmot

[*cont.*

*County Courts Jurisdiction* (*No.* 2) *Bill*—cont.
Ordered, That the Select Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records (*Sir Eardley Wilmot*) *May* 13
Report of Select Comm * *July* 5 (*P.P.* No. 267)

### County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 3) Bill

(*Mr. Watkin Williams, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Joseph Cowen*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 3 [Bill 239]
2R. [Dropped]

### County Courts (Procedure) Bill

(*Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Clive, Mr. Joseph Cowen*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 6 [Bill 125]
Read 2° *, and committed to the Select Committee on the County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2) Bill *Mar* 15
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 5

*County Expenditure—Borough Contributions*
Question, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 5, [238] 755

### County Government Bill

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

*c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) *Jan* 28, 237] 583; after debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 93]
*Petty Sessional Districts*, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 1, 820
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 14, 1651
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "with a view to simplify and strengthen local self-government, it is desirable, with as little delay as possible, to bring each sanitary district and poor law union within the area of one county, and to give to the ratepayers in and of such districts the power of directly electing members to the county board exceeding in number the representatives of justices" (*Mr. Stansfeld*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Feb* 18, 1853
After long debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after further debate, Motion withdrawn; Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put; A. 231, N. 63; M. 168 (D. L. 17); Bill read 2°
Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, 238] 634
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 7, 893

[*cont.*

*County Government Bill*—cont.
  Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Rylands*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*); after further short debate, Question put; A. 44, N. 244; M. 200 (D. L. 45)
  Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Debate adjourned
  Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
238] *Mar* 15, 1403; Question, Mr. Bowen; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 21, 1749
  *Management of Rivers*, Question, Mr. Arthur Peel; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 16, [240] 30
  Bill withdrawn* *July* 15

**County Infirmaries, &c. (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Errington*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 7]
  Moved, "That the Order for 2R. be postponed to the 19th June" *May* 29, [240] 858
  Moved, "That the Order be discharged" (*Mr. O'Sullivan*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; 2R. deferred till Wednesday, 19th June
  2R. [Dropped]

**County of Hertford and Liberty of Saint Alban Act (1874) Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Abel Smith, Mr. Cowper, Mr. Halsey*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 203]
  Read 2° * *June* 24
  Referred to Select Comm.* *June* 25
  And, on *June* 27, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Cowper, Sir Andrew Lusk, and Mr. Abel Smith
  Report of Select Comm* *July* 4
  Committee* (*on re-comm*); Report *July* 8
  Read 3° * *July* 9 [Bill 240]
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl Cowper*) *July* 11 (No. 154)
  Read 2ª * *July* 18
  Report * *July* 19
  Committee *; Report *July* 23
  Read 3ª * *July* 25
  Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 50]

**County Representative Councils (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. Butt, Mr. M'Carthy Downing*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *April* 15 [Bill 155]
  2R. [Dropped]

COURTNEY, Mr. L. H., *Liskeard*
  Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 1647; *cl.* 3, 1652
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Consid. *cl.* 60, [242] 1280
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1600
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 1300; *cl.* 15, 1321; *cl.* 17, 1328
  Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1899
  Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1057
[*cont.*

COURTNEY, Mr. L. H.—*cont.*
  Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
    Bessarabia, [237] 1735
    Russia and Turkey—Treaty of San Stefano, [238] 1957
    Treaty of Berlin—Roumania, [242] 2007
  Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), Comm. [242] 1713
  Endowed Schools Act, 1869—Timberscombe School Scheme, [242] 519
  Endowed Schools (Leeds Poors Estate), Motion for an Address, [238] 1671
  Idiots, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [241] 582
  Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 131
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1534
242] Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. 284, 300; *cl.* 6, 304, 310; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 323, 325; Schedule, Amendt. 333; Amendt. 334; Consid. 1786; *add. cl.* 1792, 1801; *cl.* 5, 1812; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1815, 1826; Amendt. 1827
  Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 1011
  Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 17, [241] 1939
  Natal, Colony of—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 465, 474
  Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-7, Comm. [242] 1617
  New Zealand—Crown Redress (No. 2) Act, [238] 1395
  Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1378
  Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1047
  Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1002, 1005
  Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 776
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 389; *cl.* 1, 1814, 1841; *cl.* 6, [240] 712
  South Africa—Transvaal Territory, [239] 856, 1885; [241] 325, 2060;—Correspondence, [242] 2061, 2071
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1234, 1285, 1288
  Supply — Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1620, 1621
    Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 181
    Royal Palaces, [242] 1690
  Treaty Obligations, [239] 220
  Truro Chapter, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 845
  Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1180
  Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1800, 1817, 1819, 1869

COWAN, Mr. J., *Edinburgh*
  Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 630

COWEN, Mr. J., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
  Army—Colonel Wellesley, [240] 1072
  Bishoprics, [242] 451; Comm. Amendt. 829; *cl.* 3, 1649; *cl.* 4, 1658, 1664, 1666; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 7, 1683; Schedule, 1685, 1686
  Christ Church, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1431
[*cont.*

Cowen, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Civil Service Estimates, Res. [242] 1454
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [240] 1494; 2R. [241] 528, 530; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1721; *cl.* 16, 1888; *add. cl.* [242] 446
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1583, 1587, 1598, 1606, 1693
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] *1548, 1582
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. [238] 1478
Eastern Question—Reserve Forces, [239] 172
  The War—Treatment of English Doctors by the Russians, [238] 1292
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [242] 1954
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 131
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. [242] 1797
Law and Justice—Jurors, [237] 1616
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 83
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1466
Parliament—Public Business, [241] 132
Prison Discipline (Ireland), [241] 1845
Public Petition—Petition for the Impeachment of the Earl of Beaconsfield, [242] 215
Railway Passenger Duty, [242] 1869
Russia—Roumania, [239] 1096
South Africa—Kaffir Outbreak, [238] 972
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1221
Supply—Admiralty Registry of the High Court of Justice, [240] 970
  County Courts, [240] 973, 979
  "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," [238] 1556
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 675
  Report, [237] 1426; [242] 1180, 1690
  Science and Art Department Buildings, [240] 1380
  Stationery Office, [240] 66, 78
Telegraphs, [242] 1641; 2R. 1698
Valuation of Property, 2R. [240] 1318; Comm. 1518
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1367

Cowper, Earl
Conservancy Boards, [240] 1163
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. [240] 1156
Railways—Continuous Brakes, [238] 1279
Science and Art—Museum of Casts from the Antique, [238] 1943; [242] 515

Cranbrook, Viscount (Secretary of State for India)
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [242] 856
Army—Artillery—Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns, Motion for Returns, [241] 1329
Army (India)—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1452
Eastern Question—Congress—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1826, 1828
  Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 1574; [242] 512
Highways, 2R. [242] 856

[*cont.*

Cranbrook, Viscount—*cont.*
India, Famine in, [241] 2034, 2036
India—Jaghire of Bungana Pally, Motion for an Address, [241] 1219
India — Taxation and Expenditure—Petition, [242] 156
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," [241] 1575
Poor Law—Boarding-out System, [242] 515
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. [241] 1438

(*See* Hardy, Right Hon. Gathorne)

Crawford, Mr. J. S., *Down*
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 491, 507

Crichton, Viscount, *Enniskillen*
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 18

**Criminal Appeals Bill**
(*Sir George Bowyer, Mr. Serjeant Simon*)
*c.* Ordered * *Jan* 22
Read 1° * *Jan* 25 [Bill 92]
2R. [Dropped]

**Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) Bill**
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
*c. Legislation*, Question, Mr. Herschell; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 18, [238] 1491
Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General*) *May* 14, [239] 1936; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 178]
240] Read 2°, after debate *June* 17, 1671
Question, Mr. B. T. Williams; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 20, 1881; Questions, Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Rathbone; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer,
241] The Attorney General *July* 4, 762; Question, Lord Selborne; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *July* 8, 950; Questions, Sir Henry James; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 11, 1235; *July* 15, 1464
  Memorandum respecting . (*P.P.* 276)
After short debate, Order for Committee read and discharged; Bill withdrawn *August* 15, [242] 2040

Criminal Law
Miscellaneous Questions
*Alleged Cruelty to a Cat*, Question, Observations, Lord Truro *Mar* 5, [238] 724; Question, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, Earl Beauchamp; short debate thereon *Mar* 11, 1032
*Assaults upon the Police in Merionethshire*, Question, Sir William Bagge; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 5, [237] 1056
*Burglaries and Robberies* (*Metropolis*), Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 7, [238] 876
*Burglars with Housebreaking Implements—Definition of "Night,"* Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 19, [241] 1970

[*cont.*

Criminal Law—*cont.*
*Case of Ellen Heeson*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 25, [241] 210
*Case of G. W. Smith*, Question, Mr. Milbank; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 6, [242] 1299
*Case of John Hennafan*, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 24, [240] 621
*Case of John Roberts*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [238] 1140
*Case of Mr. R. W. Harman*, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 5, [242] 1172
*Case of Phœbe Newton*, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 2, [241] 587
*Case of the Rev. Mr. Dodwell*, Questions, Dr. Kenealy; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 11, [239] 1094; *May* 24, [240] 622; Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 30, [242] 643
*Case of Thomas Griffiths*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 28, [240] 832
*Charge of Arson — Northwick Magistrates*, Question, Mr. Isaac; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 20, [240] 255
*Convict Letter Carriers*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [238] 1144
*Convict Prison Discipline—The Commission*, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 15, [238] 1399
*Directors of Criminal Investigations*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [238] 1145
*Imprisonment of a Child*, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 14, [237] 1620
*Prison Discipline—Flogging*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 26, [239] 34
[See title *Prisons Act*, 1877]
*Prosecution of Crime—Legislation*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 8, [242] 1526
*Reformatory Schools*, Question, Mr. Paget; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 22, [241] 2052
*Release of George Broomfield, a Lunatic Convict*, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 17, [240] 157
*Scotland—Death of Mr. G. P. Chalmers*, Question, Mr. Ramsay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 5, [238] 755
*The Betting Acts—The Advertisement Clauses*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 15, [241] 1472
*The Fenian Convict Patrick Melody*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [238] 1141
*The Queen* v. *Castro—Arthur Orton*, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 25, [238] 1947
*Vaccination Prosecutions—Prison Discipline*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 29, [242] 520

**Criminal Law Evidence Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Ashley, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Clive*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 23]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 30, [237] 657
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Serjeant Simon*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 185, N. 76; M. 109 (D. L. 7)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee

**Criminal Law Practice Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Herschell, Mr. Cole*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 69]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 15, [237] 1840
Committee [Dropped]

Cross, Right Hon. R. A. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Lancashire, S.W.*
Army Reserve, [239] 962; — Metropolitan Police, 1365
Artizans Dwellings Act, 1875—Operation in Ireland, [241] 1335
241] Bishoprics, 2R. 1026, 1029
242] 450, 451; Comm. 842; *cl.* 3, 1649; *cl.* 4, 1656, 1661, 1665, 1666; *cl.* 5, 1671; *cl.* 6, 1677, 1678; *cl.* 7, 1681; *cl.* 8, 1685; Schedule, 1686
Christ's Hospital, [237] 1205;—Commission of Inquiry, [241] 124
Church of England—Burial Service, [237] 922
Queen Anne's Bounty Board, [241] 2051
Church of Scotland—Opening of the General Assembly, [240] 927
City Parochial Charities—The Commission, [241] 327
Coal Mines—See under Mines Regulation Act, 1872
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 998, 1019
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1608, 1696
Convict Prisons—The Commission, [237] 157
Coroners, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [242] 2091
Coroners—Inquests on Lunatics, [239] 1090
Coroners' Inquests—Death of Mr. J. Fulton, [242] 221
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Carlisle, [242] 1302, 1530
Cotton Manufactories—Riots in Lancashire, [240] 33, 160;—Sheffield Magistrates, [240] 747
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), 2R. [240] 1673
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
Arson, Charge of, [240] 256
Betting Acts—Advertisement Clauses, [241] 1472
Burglaries and Robberies (Metropolis), [238] 876
Convict Letter Carriers, [238] 1145
Convict Prison Discipline—The Commission, [238] 1399
Directors of Criminal Investigations, [238] 1146

[*cont.*

- **Cross**, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
  - Dodwell, Rev. Mr., Case of, [239] 1094; [240] 622; [242] 643
  - Ellen Heeson, Case of, [241] 210
  - Fenian Convict Patrick Melody, [238] 1141
  - George Broomfield, Release of, [240] 158
  - Harman, Mr. R. W., Case of, [242] 1173
  - Imprisonment of a Child, [237] 1620
  - J. W. Smith, Case of, [242] 1300
  - John Hennafan, Case of, [240] 621
  - John Roberts, Case of, [238] 1140
  - Phœbe Newton, Case of, [241] 587
  - Police, Assaults upon, in Merionethshire, [237] 1056
  - Prison Discipline—Flogging, [239] 34
  - Prosecution of Crime, [242] 1526
  - Reformatory Schools, [241] 2052
  - Scotland—Death of Mr. G. P. Chalmers, [238] 755
  - Thomas Griffiths, Case of, [240] 832
  - Vaccination — Prosecutions, Prison Discipline, [242] 521
- Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876—Licences, [238] 1043; [239] 1092
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1667
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 611, 612, 744, 745, 753, 754, 911, 976
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Congress at Berlin—Papers, [241] 1245
  - Negotiations, [239] 1432
  - Rumoured Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 965, 966
  - Russia and England, [239] 259, 260
- Education (Scotland), 2R. [242] 775, 870; Consid. 1711
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 612, 617; *cl.* 7, 622; *cl.* 11, 624; *cl.* 14, 625; *cl.* A, 978
- Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [242] 1955
- Explosives Act, 1875 — Mining Cartridges, [239] 1227, 1228
- 237] Factories and Workshops, 2R. 1478, 1480
- 238] 62; Comm. 82; *cl.* 3, 86, 87, 89, 91; *cl.* 5, 93; *cl.* 6, *ib.*; *cl.* 10, 95; *cl.* 11, 97, 98, 99, 100; *cl.* 13, 104, 110, 112, 116, 117; *cl.* 14, 118, 119; *cl.* 15, 121; *cl.* 16, 123, 124, 126, 127; *cl.* 17, 302, 304, 306, 310, 311; *cl.* 22, 314, 315, 316; *cl.* 27, 318, 320, 321; *cl.* 29, 327; *cl.* 30, 328; *cl.* 32, 330; *cl.* 37, 331; *cl.* 38, 332; *cl.* 39, 334; *cl.* 40, *ib.*; *cl.* 47, 335, 336, 337, 338; *cl.* 50, 339; *cl.* 52, Amendt, 340; *cl.* 54, *ib.*; *cl.* 60, 341; *cl.* 64, 343; *cl.* 65, Amendt. 344, 345, 347, 348, 353, 355; Amendt. 357; *cl.* 66, 456; *cl.* 67, 457; *cl.* 68, 460, 465; *cl.* 69, 466, 469, 471, 473, 476; *cl.* 76, 477; *cl.* 88, 481, 482; *cl.* 99, 486, 489; *cl.* 100, Amendt. 497, 498; *add. cl.* 499, 500, 503, 504, 506, 589, 591, 592, 597, 601, 603, 604, 607, 610, 611, 614; Schedule 1, *ib.* 878, 879, 882, 884, 885; Schedule 2, 886; Schedule 3, 888, 890; Schedule 4, Amendt. *ib.*; New Schedule, 891, 892; Consid. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1910; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 17, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 25, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 31, Amendt. 1911; *cl.* 32, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 37, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 48, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 50, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 51, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 67, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 72, Amendt. 1912; *cl.* 80, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 91, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 106, Amendt. 1913; Schedule 1, Amendt. *ib.*; Schedule 3, Amendt. *ib.*
- 239] 3R. 264
- Fisheries—Denmark—Re-appearance of the Herrings, [237] 1534
- Fishery Inspectors—Estuary of the Thames, [242] 997
- Franchise — Manufacture of Faggot Votes, [240] 1879
- Frauds by Fiduciary Agents, [238] 1146
- Freshwater Fish Protection, 2R. [239] 1191; Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 1036
- German Empire—The Netherlands, [241] 1469
- Herring Fisheries, [237] 1618
- Herring Fishery Commission, Report, [239] 1690
- Highways, Lords' Amendts. Consid. [242] 1855
- Hypothec (Scotland), 2R. [237] 363
- Inclosure Provisional Order (Llanfair Waterdine), 2R. [240] 1318
- Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1349
- Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 132
- Industrial Schools, [239] 856
- Inland Revenue — Out-door Licences, [240] 1885
- Isle of Man—Small Pox, Outbreak of, [237] 528, 624;—Vaccination, [238] 1840, 1841
- Judicial Body (Scotland), [241] 1850, 1851
- Judicial Statistics—Convict Prisons, [242] 1174
- Law and Justice—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Assizes and Quarter Sessions, [240] 1605
  - County Court Judges, [238] 154
  - Grantham County Court—Case of Margaret Carroll, [240] 833
  - Halifax Bench of Magistrates, [241] 492
  - High Court of Justice, [240] 1072
  - Imprisonment for Debt, [240] 1353
  - Judicature Act — Rule 1, Order 36 — Surrey Assizes, [242] 518
  - Judicature Acts—Assizes and Quarter Sessions, [238] 759
  - Jurors, [237] 1616
  - Jurymen, Fines on, [241] 1236
  - Magistrates, Appointment of, [242] 1216
  - Northern Circuit—Assizes, [240] 38
  - Police Magistracy—Mr. Benson, [240] 157
  - Prison Discipline—Personal Search, [241] 1847
  - Queen *v.* Bradlaugh and Besant, [238] 156
  - Queen *v.* Castro, [241] 20
  - Scotland—Office of Lord Clerk Register, [239] 37
  - Surrey Assizes, [238] 378
- Licensing—Devonport Watch Committee, [238] 298
  - Licensed Houses, [238] 975
- Licensing Laws Amendment, [241] 1576
- Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 713, 714, 721
- Local Taxation, [239] 1720
- Locomotive Accident near Leeds, [240] 257
- Lunacy Laws, [242] 866
- Lunatic Asylums—Post-Mortem Examinations, [240] 742
- Magistrates (Summary Jurisdiction), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [242] 2091
- Merchant Seamen's Act—Insubordination on Shipboard, [238] 1142

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
  Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
    Coffee Stalls in the Streets, [240] 1878
    Demolition of Houses—Midland Railway Company, [239] 664
    Detective Police—Report of Commission, [238] 377
    Free Porters of the City of London, [239] 663
    Government of London, [241] 1236
    Gray's Inn Road, [240] 259
    Parochial (Metropolitan) Charities, [237] 531
    Public Health—Suburban Interments, [239] 1227
  Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. [239] 759
  Metropolitan Board of Works and the Water Companies, [237] 530
  Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [238] 298
  Military Forces—Expenses of Indian Contingent, [239] 1597
  Military Forces of the Crown, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 438, 499, 511, 512, 542, 574, 581
  Mines Regulation Act, 1872—Miscellaneous Questions
    [238] 1144
    Accidents in Mines, [238] 1493 ; — Life Brigades in Mining Districts, [238] 1490
    Blantyre Colliery Explosion, [238] 447, 1487, 1592
    Blasting—Apedale Explosion, [239] 202
    Colliery Accidents, [238] 1299
    Dinas Collieries, [242] 1868
    Eddlewood Colliery Explosion, [240] 159
    Explosions in Mines, [241] 326 ;—Clause 32, [241] 1970 ; [242] 641
    Haydock Colliery Accident, [240] 1880 ; [242] 525, 997, 1553, 1555
    High Blantyre Colliery Explosion, [237] 250 ; [239] 1882
    Homer Hill Colliery Accident — Case of Thomas Shaw, [242] 2018
    Mine Inspectors, [238] 535
    Reports of Inspectors, [238] 1289
  Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 87
  Municipal Elections—Carlisle, [241] 2052
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2016 ; *add. cl.* [239] 163, 166
  National Gallery, [241] 796
  Navy—Clare, Mr. John, Case of, [238] 1380
  Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    Business of the House, [237] 256 ; [241] 331, 1246, 1336
    Clare County Writ, Report, [242] 1522
    Members for the Scottish Universities—Expenses of Election, [240] 740
    Privileges of Members, [240] 656
    Public Business—Simony Legislation, [237] 158
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 135, 136
  Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Ballot Act, [241] 322
  Parliamentary Elections (Metropolis), Comm. [237] 364, 365
  Parochial Charities of the City of London—Commission, [240] 926 ; [241] 1244, 1852
  Parochial Charities of the City of London, Res. [239] 1698

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
  Penal Servitude Commission—Fenian Convicts, [238] 1758
  Police Superannuation, [238] 875 ; [239] 203
  Police Superannuation Funds, [241] 492
  Prison Discipline (Ireland), [241] 1845
  Prisoners, Treatment of, [240] 1682, 1683
  Prisons Act (1877)—Miscellaneous Questions
    Governors of Gaols, [239] 1720
    Letters to Prisoners' Friends, [239] 959
    Plank Beds, [242] 1175
    Prison Discipline, [242] 216, 217
    Regulations, [237] 1049 ; [239] 1716
    Visiting Committee, [237] 820
  Prisons (Ireland) Act—Prison Pillows, [242] 1765
  Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877—Cell Accommodation, [238] 449
    Prison Board Clerks, [239] 1369
  Public Petitions Committee, Report, [239] 1225
  Public Worship Regulation Act—Petitions and Presentments, [242] 1945
  Registration of Land, &c. [237] 369
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [237] 433
238] Comm. *cl.* 4, 1805, 1807, 1808, 1809 ; *cl.* 11, 1824 ; *cl.* 12, Motion for reporting Progress, 1826
240] 1083 ; *cl.* 16, 1206 ; *cl.* 36, 1701, 1702 ; *cl.* 41, 1718 ; *cl.* 45, 1730 ; *cl.* 54, 1736 ; *cl.* 57, 1738 ; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1923, 1935 ; *add. cl.* 1959, 1960, 1969, 1988
241] Consid. 605 ; *cl.* 3, 644 ; *cl.* 42, 652 ; *cl.* 88, 837, 838, 840
  Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875—Violet Powder, [240] 1072
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1694 ; *cl.* 1, [239] 1828 ; *cl.* 6, [240] 446 ; *cl.* 8, 717, 718, 719 ; Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 1299 ; *cl.* 1, 1309, 1313 ; *cl.* 2, 1317
  Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Endowed Schools, [238] 1948 ; [241] 132
    Grocers' Licences, [237] 1850 ; [240] 261
    Office of Lord Clerk Register, [240] 1883
    Poor Law, [238] 1287 ;—Deportation of Irish Paupers, [237] 1539
    Scotch University Commission, [238] 873
    Solway Commissioners, [240] 262
  Scotland—Religious Denominations, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1790, 1793
  Sergeant M'Carthy, The Late, [237] 622, 726, 1052 ; [238] 1294 ; [239] 119 ; Motion for an Address, [241] 1420
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 750, 752, 754, 756, 799, 850, 1020 ;—Personal Explanation, 1065 ; [242] 1181
  Supply—Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [240] 1019
    Convict Establishments, [240] 1004, 1007
    County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1010, 1012
    Home Office, [239] 1484, 1485
    Police Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 999
    Police Courts in London and Sheerness, [240] 995
    Prisons (Ireland), Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1593, 1596, 1597, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1607

[*cont.*

CROSS, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 949
Truro Chapter, 2R. [241] 844
Turkey—Asiatic Dominions of the Sultan, [241] 1469, 1470
Under Secretaries of State, [239] 1691; 2R. [240] 822, 823, 824
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1945, 1947

CROSS, Mr. J. K., *Bolton*
Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1993
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 40, [238] 334

*Cruelty to Animals Act*, 1876—*Licences*
Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 11, [238] 1042; Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 11, [239] 1091
Return . . . . . . . . . *P.P.* 193

### Cruelty to Animals Bill

(*Mr. Holt, Mr. Charles Wilson*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 36]
2R. [Dropped]

*Cruelty to Animals—Vivisection*
Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer, Earl Beauchamp *July* 25, [242] 214
Then an Address for, Return of Licenses granted under the Act 39 and 40 Victoria chap. 77 to amend the Law relating to Cruelty to Animals (*The Lord Steward*)

CUNINGHAME, Sir W. J. M., *Ayr, &c.*
Education (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* A, [242] 1709
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [242] 621, 622
Hypothec (Scotland) (No. 3), 2R. Amendt. [239] 510
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [237] 425
238] Comm. 1777; *cl.* 4, 1799; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1811; Amendt. 1813; *cl.* 8, 1819
240] *cl.* 12, 1190, 1194, 1195; *cl.* 15, 1201; *cl.* 36, 1703; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 1734; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1936; *add. cl.* 1976

*Currency, The—Small Silver Coinage*
Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 18, [240] 1683

### Customs and Inland Revenue Bill

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *April* 5 [Bill 146]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 11, [239] 1181
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House regrets that it should be proposed to raise that portion of the Ways and Means of the year which is to be met out of indirect taxation by increasing the Tobacco Duties, which are already so high as to cause an enormous amount of smuggling, and so assessed as that the Tobacco commonly consumed by the poor is taxed at 500 per cent upon its value, and that commonly consumed by the rich at not more than 5 per cent" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 164, N. 31; M. 133 (D. L. 102)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"
239] *April* 15, 1289
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient to employ the police as prosecutors for the recovery of Excise penalties" (*Mr. Hopwood*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to; Committee; Report, 1292
Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *April* 16, 1413; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *April* 16, 1417; Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered; Amendts. made
Observations, Question, Mr. Dodson; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 6, 1452
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *May* 9, 1650
Amendt. to leave out "now read 3°," and add "re-committed, in order to amend it, so as to establish a difference of two shillings per pound between the Duty on unmanufactured tobacco and cigars, instead of one shilling and ten pence, as provided by the Bill" (*Mr. Ritchie*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 184, N. 82; M. 102 (D. L. 114)
Main Question, "That the Bill be now read 3°," proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after debate, Question put; A. 85, N. 170; M. 85 (D. L. 115)
Main Question, "That the Bill be now read 3°," again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Hussey Vivian*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Main Question, "That the Bill be now read 3°," again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be adjourned until Monday" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned till Monday next
Debate resumed *May* 13, 1725; after long debate, Question put; A. 111, N. 19; M. 92 (D. L. 116); Bill passed
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *May* 14
Read 2ª* *May* 16
Committee*; Report *May* 17
Read 3ª* *May* 20
Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. 15]

*Customs Department*
- *Extra Clerks*, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *April* 11, [239] 1090
- *Position of Outport Clerks*, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 14, [239] 1884; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 12, [242] 1763
- *The Playfair Commission*, Question, Mr. Kirk; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Feb* 22, [238] 155

*Customs Re-organization*
- Question, Mr. Harcourt; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 27, [241] 322

*Cyprus, Island of*—see title *Turkey—The Eastern Question*

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C., *Buteshire*
- Education Department — Promotions, [241] 1579
- Education (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 1134
- Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, [238] 1489
- Irish Estimates, [240] 1665
- Navy—Charges for Pilotage, [238] 535
  - H.M.S. "Nelson," [237] 1847
- Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1764
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [238] 1792, 1795; *cl.* 12, [240] 1191; *cl.* 98, 1903; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1936
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1848
- Scotland—Grocers' Licences, [237] 1850
- Supply—Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1250
- Under Secretaries of State, 2R. [240] 823

DAVENPORT, Mr. W. BROMLEY-, *Warwickshire, N.*
- Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 600
- Supplementary Estimate, Personal Explanation, [237] 1066
- Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 574

DAVIE, Sir H. R. F., *Haddington*
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 628

DAVIES, Mr. D., *Cardigan*
- Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 138
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2122; Postponed *cl.* 33, [242] 426
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1188
- Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res. [241] 784
- Highways, 2R. [239] 1258; Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 890
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. [242] 273
- Joint Stock Companies Acts, 1862 and 1867, Res. [239] 1710
- Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1905
- Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 682

[*cont.*

DAVIES, Mr. D.—*cont.*
- Supplementary Estimate, Comm. [237] 1415
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 960
  - Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 945, 948
  - Stationery Office, [239] 1794
- Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 23
- Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1131

**Debtors Acts Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Marten, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Sir Henry Jackson*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 7 [Bill 104]
Read 2° * *Feb* 13
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3° * *July* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Limerick*) *July* 18
Read 2ª *July* 25, [242] 207 (No. 163)
Committee * *July* 30
Report * *August* 1
Read 3ª * *August* 2
c. Lords Amendts. [Bill 291]
l. Royal Assent *August* 13 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 54]

DELAHUNTY, Mr. J., *Waterford Co.*
- Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1598; Motion for Adjournment, 1600
- Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1699, 1704
- Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 683
- Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. Amendt. [240] 129, 156

DE LA WARR, Earl
- Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 5
- Cattle Plague—Transit of Cattle by Land and Sea, [238] 1031, 1032
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Armistice—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1321
  - Congress—Treaty of San Stefano, [240] 1247
  - Correspondence, [237] 913
  - Russia and Turkey—Terms of Peace, [238] 371, 949
- Employers Liability for Injuries to Servants, [239] 1361, 1713
- German Navy—"Der Grosser Kurfürst," Destruction of, [240] 1033
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. Amendt. [241] 737
- Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [238] 1029
- Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [239] 1; [240] 349, 1155
- Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. Amendt. [240] 1156; Report, [241] 1; 3R. Amendt. 205
- Railway Returns (Continuous Brakes), 2R. [239] 1273; Comm. Schedule 3, Amendt. 1361
- Railways—Continuous Brakes, [238] 1276
- Vivisection, Address for Papers, [241] 753, 755; [242] 214

DENISON, Mr. C. BECKETT-, *Yorkshire, W.R., E. Div.*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1377
Asia, Central—Russian Military Expedition, [242] 1179, 1764, 1936, 1947
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1729
Eastern Question—Congress, The—Advance of the Russian Army, [238] 1287
Instructions to the British Plenipotentiary, [242] 219
India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 454, 458
Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 755
Mercantile Marine — Eddystone Lighthouse, [238] 297
Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 806
Parliament — Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1387
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1478
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 639
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1233
Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 574, 575, 576
Law Charges, [238] 1558

DENISON, Mr. W. BECKETT-, *East Retford*
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1650
Contracts for Watering the Streets, [240] 257
Endowed Schools (Leeds Poors Estate), Motion for an Address, [238] 1658

DENMAN, Lord
Bishoprics, 3R. [239] 1864
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 1281
Eastern Question — Austro-Hungarian Monarchy — Speech of the Earl of Derby, Explanation, [239] 1363
Conference, The Presidency, [238] 1038
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte, Res. [237] 526
Locomotives on Highways (Scotland), 2R. [242] 1498; Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1630; 3R. Amendt. 1751
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 852
Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [240] 243
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 632
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 3R. [242] 2009

**Dental Practitioners Bill**
(*Sir John Lubbock, Sir Philip Egerton, Mr. Gregory, Dr. Lush*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 30 [Bill 96]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 19, [237] 1990
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Dr. Cameron*); after short debate, Question put; A. 27, N. 49; M. 22 (D. L. 20)

*Dental Practitioners Bill*—cont.
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*); after short debate, Question put; A. 11, N. 61; M. 50 (D. L. 21
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Read 2° * *Mar* 15
Committee *; Report *May* 14 [Bill 177]
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 6, [240] 1319
Read 3°* *June* 13
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Marquess of Lansdowne*) *June* 17
Read 2ª *June* 27, [241] 299 (No. 123)
Committee*; Report *June* 28 (No. 140)
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 4, 743
Read 3ª * *July* 5
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 254]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 33]

DERBY, Earl of (†Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
†Crete, Island of, [237] 1037
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
†[237] 1031, 1199, 1202, 1204, 1484, 1485
†Armistice, The, [237] 911;—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, [237] 1841
†British Ambassador at the Porte, Personal Vindication, [237] 1843
†British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 689, 690, 691, 715, 1318, 1321, 1422, 1842, 1843; [238] 44
†Conference, The, [237] 1598, 1599, 1601; —Greece—Correspondence, [237] 612, 916, 920; [238] 1021;—The Presidency, [238] 1039
Congress—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1787, 1809, 1814;—Thessaly, [242] 518
†Gallipoli, Occupation of, [237] 1920
†Greek Provinces of Turkey, [238] 263
†Russia and Persia, [238] 950
†Russia and Turkey—Terms of Peace, [238] 374, 530, 615, 949, 1480, 1581
†Russian Armies, Advance of, [237] 818
†Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 850, 865
†Turkish Fleet, [238] 443
†Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Conference, Address for Correspondence, [238] 1731, 1736
†Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte, Res. [237] 520, 524
†Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte, Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [238] 285
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 789
Ministry, The—Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [239] 100

**Destitute Children (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Arthur Moore, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Meldon*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 60]
2R. [Dropped]

DEVON, Earl of
Truro Chapter, Comm. *cl.* 10, [241] 119

**Dickson, Mr. T. A.,** *Dungannon*
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1648
Dover and Calais Mail Contract, Res. [240] 1237
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1536
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 494
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 389 ; *add. cl.* [240] 1031
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 946
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1694

**Digby, Mr. K. T.,** *Queen's Co.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 183

**Dilke, Sir C. W.,** *Chelsea, &c.*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1314
Army Reserves—Metropolitan Police, [239] 1365
Asia, Central—Reported Russian Advance, [242] 1764, 1927, 2087
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. Amendt. [239] 1357
Borneo and Sulu, [239] 857
British Borneo Company—Consul at Sindak, [240] 1881
Cattle Disease—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [241] 960
Christ's Hospital, [237] 1205
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1644, 1645
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2,
241] Amendt. 1608, 1630; Motion for reporting
. Progress, 1675 ; *cl.* 5, 1725 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt.
. 1726, 1732, 1739, 1741, 1742, 1749, 1752 ;
. *cl.* 10, 1860 ; *cl.* 15, 1871 ; *cl.* 22, 2004 ; *cl.* 29,
. Amendt. 2011, 2014, 2016 ; *cl.* 30, Amendt.
. 2071, 2074, 2077, 2078, 2080 ; *cl.* 31,
. Amendt. *ib.*, 2081 ; *cl.* 54, Amendt. 2093 ;
. Amendt. *ib.*, 2094 ; Amendt. *ib.*, 2095 ;
. *cl.* 55, 2131 ; *cl.* 64, Motion for reporting
. Progress, 2141, 2143
242] *cl.* 68, 161 ; Postponed *cl.* 5, 187, 188 ; *cl.* B,
. Amendt. 427, 428, 431, 432 ; Amendt. 433 ;
. *add. cl.* 448, 769, 770, 772 ; New Schedule,
. 823, 828
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1583, 1593, 1605 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1687
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Carlisle, [242] 1529
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. [238] 1479
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Comm. Bill withdrawn, [242] 2040
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. Amendt. [239] 1181
Cyprus, Island of—Health of the Troops, [242] 2023
Dental Practitioners, Comm. *cl.* 22, [240] 1321
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 802
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 559, 564, 611
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Armistice, The—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1331, 1624
Bessarabia, [237] 1735

[*cont.*

**Dilke, Sir C. W.**—*cont.*
Congress—Representation of Greece, [240] 1082, 1168 ; [242] 1767
Convention with Turkey—Money Vote, [241] 1335, 1336
Russia and Turkey—Terms of Peace, [238] 876
Russian Forces within the Neutral Zone, [237] 1851
Turkey—Greeks in Bulgaria, [238] 1289
Education—Inspectors of Elementary Schools, [241] 826
Public Elementary Schools—Musical Instruction, [242] 1527
Egypt—France and England, Correspondence between, [237] 1052
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), Comm. Amendt. [242] 1713
Epping Forest, Comm. [241] 573 ; 3R. 769
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1769
Greece and Crete, [238] 1955
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 475, 476, 477 ; *cl.* 20, 1080
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [237] 303 ; Comm. 813
Inclosure Provisional Order (Llanfair Waterdine), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1318
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1348, 1352
Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. [242] 1829 ; 3R. 1843
Licensing Laws Amendment, Comm. [237] 1691
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 724
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1483
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Amendt. [239] 290, 1008
Message from the Queen—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 43 ; Amendt. 231, 242
Metropolis—Hyde Park, [238] 872
Islington and Deptford Cattle Markets, [241] 1851
Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866—Eelbrook Common, Fulham, [238] 635
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 293
Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. [241] 1031
Municipal Corporations Commission — Lostwithiel, [241] 762
Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"— Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, [237] 371, 1617 ; [240] 740 ; Res. [242] 1193
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Corrupt Practices, [240] 22, 1340
Orders of the Day, [237] 378
Public Business—Kew Gardens, [241] 1464
Whitsuntide Holidays, [240] 1344
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 169, 228
Parliament—Parliamentary Reporting, Nomination of Select Committee, [240] 1677, 1679
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1477
Parliament — Public Business, Select Committee on, [241] 1238
Parliamentary Elections (Metropolis), 2R. [237] 357 ; Comm. 365

[*cont.*

**Dilke**, Sir C. W.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Ballot Act, [241] 322
  Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Ballot Papers), Leave [239] 1687
  Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Select Committee, [239] 471, 474
  Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Consolidated), Comm. *cl.* 22, [240] 1323
  Post Office—Money Order Office, [237] 1922; —Salaries, [239] 1881;—Boy Clerks, [241] 1969
  Public Health (Metropolis)—Deaths from Small Pox in London, [241] 588
  Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 620
  Racecourses (Licensing), Preamble, [240] 1489
  Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 455
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [240] 438, 439
  Smoke Nuisance Act, [239] 118
  Spain—Cuba, Insurrection in, [238] 299; [239] 1284
    Slavery in, [238] 1958
  Straits Settlements—Perak, [240] 1354; [242] 1217;—Expedition—Expenses, [240] 1254
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1100
  Supply—Houses of Parliament Buildings, [240] 1360
    Parks and Pleasure Gardens, Amendt. [242] 1687
    Prisons (Ireland), Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1608, 1609
    Report, [240] 1388
    Royal Palaces, [240] 1359; [242] 1493; Amendt. 1689
    Secret Services, [240] 663
    Superannuation and Retired Allowances, [240] 1309, 1310
  Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1695, 1700
  Training Schools and Ships, 2R. Amendt. [242] 1711
  Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Crete, [237] 1050
    Papers, The, [242] 2087
    The War—Black Sea Ports, [237] 924
  Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1572
  Ways and Means, Report, [239] 743
  Weights and Measures, Comm. [240] 1673, 1674

**Dillwyn**, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
  Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1582
  Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1422
  Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [240] 1465
  Army Supplementary Estimate for Native Indian Troops, [240] 803, 804
  Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 136
  Bishoprics, 2R. Amendt. [241] 1027; Comm. [242] 1644; *cl.* 7, 1680, 1683
  Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), [242] 1712
  Christ Church, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1434
  Civil Service Estimates, [238] 1505; Res. [242] 1442, 1443
  Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1650
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2134; *cl.* 64, 2144
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1582, 1600, 1688

**Dillwyn**, Mr. L. L.—*cont.*
  Criminal Law (Indictable Offences), Leave, [239] 1959
  Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1187; Comm. 1291; 3R. Motion for Adjournment, 1667
  Dental Practitioners, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1994
  Dublin Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1045
  Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 32
  Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
    Congress, The, [238] 1370
    Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 1579
    Correspondence, [240] 1252
    Peace, Terms of—Despatch of Earl Derby, Dec. 25, 1877, [237] 322
    Reserve Forces, [239] 171
    Russia and England, [239] 257
    Supplementary Vote—Occupation of Constantinople by the Russians, [237] 1213
    Turkey—Dardanelles—Entry of the Fleet, [237] 1208
  Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), Comm. [241] 581
  Education—Inspectors of Elementary Schools, [241] 825
  Estimates, Discussions on the, [240] 933
  Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 1036
  Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 892; *add. cl.* 1160; Motion for reporting Progress, 1161, 1162
  Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1350
  Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. [242] 1686
  India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1902
  Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 131
  Irish Estimates, [240] 1667
  Law and Justice—Judges' Substitutes, [239] 858
  Lunacy Laws, [242] 865
  Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. [240] 1483
  Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 993
  Mexico — Diplomatic Relations, Revival of, [238] 1298
  Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [240] 747
  Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 300, 348
  Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. [241] 1031
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2009, 2012; *cl.* 16, 2020; *cl.* 18, 2028, 2031; 3R. [239] 210
  Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-7, Comm. [242] 1616, 1617
  Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    Business of the House—Whitsuntide Recess, [240] 498, 620
    Debates, Reporting of, [238] 1487
    Easter Recess, [238] 1291
    Morning Sittings, [239] 1237
    Order of Business, [241] 764, 1071
    Orders of the Day—Postponement of Motions, [239] 963
    Public Business, Arrangement of, [241] 499, 1246

[cont.

[cont.

DILLWYN, Mr. L. L.—*cont.*
Parliament—Privilege—Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1404
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1096, 1399
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, [237] 262
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Select Committee, [239] 473
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 580
Public Petitions Committee, Report, [239] 1223
Public Works Loans, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [239] 619, 1255; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1354
Racecourses (Licensing), Preamble, [240] 1489
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1794
Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 776
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1715; *cl.* 6, [240] 446; *add. cl.* 865
Supply—Admiralty Registry of the High Court of Justice, [240] 971
  Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 965, 967
  Civil Service Commission, [239] 1616, 1617
  Commissioners of Charitable Donations, &c. for Ireland, Motion for reporting Progress, [241] 1550
  Harbours, &c. [238] 1536
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1456, 1458, 1461, 1462, 1466, 1472, 1473, 1476
  Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 814
  Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1497, 1507
  Metropolitan Police, [240] 996
  Natural History Museum, Erection of, [240] 1383
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [242] 1689
  Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 992
  Prisons (Ireland), Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1602, 1609
  Public Buildings, [240] 1368, 1372
  Royal Palaces, [238] 1516, 1518
  Science and Art Department Building, [240] 1379
  Stationery Office, [240] 71, 81
  Wellington Monument, [238] 1538
  Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 86, 87
  Works and Public Buildings, [240] 90
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1048
Truro Chapter, 2R. [241] 844
Under Secretary of State, 2R. [240] 822
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 506
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1943
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 53
Weights and Measures, 2R. [238] 721; Comm. [240] 1674; *cl.* 43, [241] 411

*Diplomatic Service, The—Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Minister Attaché at Vienna*
Questions, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, [239] 1714; *May* 16, 31

[*cont.*

*Diplomatic Service, The—Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Minister Attaché at Vienna*—cont.
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 17, To leave out from "That," and add "this House disapproves of the appointment of Colonel Wellesley, of the Coldstream Guards, to the post of First Secretary of Embassy at Vienna, over the heads of a large number of old and competent diplomatic servants" (*Mr. Benett-Stanford*) *v.*, 169; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 250, N. 83; M. 167 (D. L. 141)

**Disqualification of Medical Relief Removal Bill** (*Mr. Rathbone, Sir John Kennaway, Sir Charles W. Dilke*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 29 [Bill 282]
Read 2° * *July* 31
Bill withdrawn * *August* 2

*District Probate Registry, Lichfield*
Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 1, [238] 538

**Divine Worship Facilities Bill**
(*Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Birley, Mr. Rodwell*)
*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 46]
2R. [Dropped]

DODDS, Mr. J., *Stockton*
Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 3R. [240] 123
Bills of Sale, Consid. *add. cl.* [239] 1264
Cotton Manufactories—Riots in Lancashire, [240] 33
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. Amendt. [240] 1325
Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 7, [241] 1035
Ways and Means — Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 572

DODSON, Right Hon. J. G., *Chester*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), [240] 1314
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [240] 1462
Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. [239] 1516
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 504, 511; Comm. *cl.* 9, 1749; *cl.* 15, 1883; *cl.* 22, 1930, 1932; *cl.* 29, 2016
County Government, 2R. [237] 1679, 1684
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [239] 1291; *cl.* 3, 1301, 1304; *cl.* 12, 1311; *cl.* 17, 1329; *cl.* 20, 1342, 1345, 1452; 3R. 1673, 1674, 1738
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, Amendt. [241] 891; *cl.* 20, 899, 900
Inclosure Provisional Order (Llanfair Waterdine), 2R. [240] 1319
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), [240] 1349, 1352
Income Tax, Res. [238] 392
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 132

[*cont.*

Dodson, Right Hon. J. G.—*cont.*
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1530
Navy—H.M.S. "Undaunted," [237] 1849
Parliament—Debates, Reports of, [237] 1207
Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1975
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 398
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1232
Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1620
Consular Services, [240] 1286
Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1642
Privy Council Office, [239] 1495
Stationery Office, [239] 1791
Turkish Loan of 1855, [238] 1594 ; [240] 929, 930
Valuation of Property, 2R. [240] 1317
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 155
Ways and Means, Comm. [237] 1453
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 569, 572

Donoughmore, Earl of
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1165
Weights and Measures, 2R. [241] 2040 ; Comm. *cl.* 78, Amendt. [242] 211, 213

Dorchester, Lord
Eastern Question, [237] 1204
Turkish Fleet, [238] 441, 444
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte, Res. [237] 517, 527
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [238] 283
Italy—Victor Emmanuel, Funeral of, [237] 454
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," [240] 1063, 1067

Douglas, Sir G. H. S., *Roxburghshire*
Army—Good Conduct Medals, [242] 1949
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, [239] 1329
Dog Tax—Useless Dogs, [237] 317
India—Fort George Water Supply, [238] 1742
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 40, Amendt. [240] 1712

*Dover Harbour*
Moved that there be laid before the House, Copy of the recent Reports on Dover Harbour (*The Earl Granville*) *Mar* 25, [238] 1927 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Downing, Mr. M'Carthy, *Cork Co.*
Civil Bill Ejectments—Returns, [237] 373
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2110, 2118, 2120, 2122, 2129 ; Postponed *cl.* 5, [242] 190 ; *add. cl.* 448
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), [240] 358
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 310
Ireland,—Miscellaneous Questions
Disturbances in, [240] 262
Orange Processions, [242] 387
Peace Preservation Acts—County of Cork, [242] 995
Poor Law—Pauper Children in Cork Industrial Schools, [240] 741

[*cont.*

Downing, Mr. M'Carthy—*cont.*
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. Amendt. [241] 1141
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 730
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1140, 1198
Martin, Mr. Wykcham, Death of, [240] 1051
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 48, [239] 140, 141 ; *cl.* 56, 144 ; *cl.* 57, 148
Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1388
Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 132
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1404
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 83
Poor Law—Removal of Irish Paupers, Res. [242] 996
Poor Law—Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 653, 670, 685, 686
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, Res. [242] 259
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ire-
237] land), 2R. 300
239] Comm. 358 ; *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 1812, 1813, 1835, 1844 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 1845, 1847, 1848, 1853
240] Amendt. 95 ; *cl.* 6, 705 ; *add. cl.* 864, 865, 871, 919, 921, 922, 923 ; Amendt. 924
241] Consid. 1280 ; *add. cl.* 1300 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1303, 1309
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 687, 699, 701
Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1017
Works and Public Buildings, Motion for reporting Progress, [240] 94
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 264, 270
Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1577
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 144

**Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Bill**
(*The O'Conor Don, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Gray, Mr. MacCarthy*)
*c.* Motion for Leave (*The O'Conor Don*) *June* 24, [241] 201 ; Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * [Bill 227]
Read 2° * *July* 5
Committee * ; Report *July* 15
Considered * *July* 17
Read 3° * *July* 22
*l.* Read 1ᵃ * (*Lord Carlingford*) *July* 23 (No. 168)
Read 2ᵃ * *August* 2
Committee ; Report *August* 5, [242] 1171
Read 3ᵃ * *August* 12
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 300]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 59]

**Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill**
(*Colonel Stanley, Mr. James Lowther*)
*c.* Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 28 [Bill 136]
Read 2° * *April* 10

[*cont.*

*Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill*—cont.
Committee *; Report *May* 6
Read 3° * *May* 8
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 13
Read 2ª * *May* 21 (No. 82)
Committee *; Report *May* 23
Read 3ª * *May* 24
Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. xxxviii]

*Drumcondra, Clonliffe, and Glasnevin Township Bill (by Order)*
*c.* Considered * *May* 30

*Dublin Southern District Tramways Bill (by Order)*
*c.* Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 5, [237] 1038
Leave given to the Select Committee on Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills to make a Special Report, so far as relates to the Dublin Southern District Tramways Bill *April* 1
Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed

*Dublin Tramways Bill (by Order)*
*c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Young*) *Mar* 26, [239] 21
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. M. Brooks*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *April* 5, 662; after short debate, Question put; A. 87, N. 45; M. 42 (D. L. 98)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

*Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill (Lords) (by Order)*
*c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 16, [240] 11
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Maurice Brooks*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 11, [241] 1234

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant, *Elgin, &c.*
Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1867
Diplomatic Appointments—Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, Res. [240] 179
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 583
East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 425
East India (Public Works), Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 352
Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 18, Amendt. [242] 1127, 1128; *add. cl.* 1133, 1134, 1136, 1138, 1139
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 619

[*cont.*

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant—*cont.*
India—Deccan Riots Commission, [242] 1868
Khelat—Occupation of Quetta, [237] 723
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 485
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 902
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1273

Duff, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Harbours (Scotland), [240] 164
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1315
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [237] 429; Comm. *cl.* 3, [238] 1798; *cl.* 4, 1808; *cl.* 6, 1817; Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [241] 644
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [241] 1941, 1944, 1946

*Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, Marriage of H.R.H. the*

Lords

Message from the Queen

242] Royal Message read by the Lord Chancellor *July* 23, [242] 1
Ordered, that the said Message be taken into consideration on Thursday next
Order of the Day for the Queen's Message to be taken into consideration, read *July* 25, 202
Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message of Tuesday last considered accordingly
Then an humble Address of thanks and concurrence ordered, *nemine dissentiente*, to be presented to Her Majesty thereupon; the said Address to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves
The Queen's Answer to the Address reported *August* 1, 850

Commons

Message from Her Majesty brought up, and read by Mr. Speaker *July* 23, 43
Moved, "That this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee to take into consideration Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Motion agreed to; Committee thereupon on Thursday
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 25, 231
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the consideration of Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be deferred until there be laid before this House a Return showing in tabular form (1) the Princes; (2) the Princesses of the Blood Royal, being Members of the Royal Family of England (excluding the Sovereign for the time being and Queens Consort or Dowager), from the accession of His Most Gracious Majesty King William the Third to the present time; specifying, with regard to such of them as succeeded to the throne, the date of such accession, and, with regard to such of them as contracted marriages with the consent of the Sovereign for the time being, the

[*cont.*

*Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, Marriage of H.R.H. the*—COMMONS—cont.

date of each such marriage; and also showing separately, with regard to every Prince or Princess, the several applications (if any) made to Parliament for grants, or confirmations of grants, out of the public revenues, and the results of such applications, adding in each case a Copy of the Royal Message by which such application to Parliament was made" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 320, N. 33; M. 287 (D. L. 235)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Her Majesty's Message
242] considered in Committee, 256

Moved, "That the annual sum of Ten Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, towards providing for the Establishment of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne and Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, the said annuity to be settled on His Royal Highness for his life, in such manner as Her Majesty shall think proper, and to commence from the day of the marriage of their Royal Highnesses, such annuity to be in addition to the annuity now enjoyed by His Royal Highness under the Act of the thirty-fifth year of Her present Majesty" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); after short debate, Motion agreed to

Moved, "That Her Majesty be enabled to secure to Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes, in case she shall survive His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, an annual sum not exceeding Six Thousand Pounds during her life, to support Her Royal dignity;" Motion agreed to

Resolutions reported *July* 26, 393

Question proposed, "That the Resolutions be agreed to;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

## Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment) Bill

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 277]
242] Read 2°, after short debate *July* 29, 527
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 31, 778
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Plimsoll*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 151, N. 13; M. 138 (D. L. 248)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *August* 1
Read 2ª * *August* 2 (No. 180)
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª *August* 6, 1281
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 46]

DUNBAR, Mr. J., *New Ross*
Army—Royal Warrant, 1877, [237] 1209

DUNDAS, Hon. J. C., *Richmond*
Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1344, 1349

DUNRAVEN, Earl of
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [238] 51
Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1200
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1421
  Russia and Persia, [238] 950
  Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 870
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Conference, Address for Correspondence, [238] 1726, 1731
Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [238] 279
National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 408

DUNSANY, Lord
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 1R. [237] 1502; 2R. [238] 735
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Conference, The, [237] 1601
  Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 1572
  Dardanelles, The—Movement of the Fleet—Resignation of Ministers, [237] 453
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 440
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [239] 513
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 3R. [241] 306

DURHAM, Bishop of
Bishoprics, 2R. [239] 17

DYKE, Sir W. H. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Kent, Mid*
Inland Revenue—Distributor of Stamps in Kerry, [239] 116
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 367
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Select Committee, [239] 472
Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 215

EARP, Mr. T., *Newark*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 16, [241] 1902
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 784

## *East London Railway (Payment of Debts) Bill (by Order)*

*c.* Read 2°, after short debate *July* 11, [241] 1227
Ordered, That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection *July* 16
And, on *July* 17, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Stephen Cave, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Sampson Lloyd

*East Retford Borough Bill (by Order)*
c. Lords Amendts. considered * *July* 8

Ebury, Lord
Bishoprics, 2R. [239] 13

*Ecclesiastical Benefices*
Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the law and existing practice as to the patronage, sale, exchange, and resignation of ecclesiastical benefices, and to recommend remedies for abuses if any are found to exist" (*The Lord Archbishop of York*) *Mar* 8, [238] 954; after debate, Motion amended, and agreed to
Queen's Answer to Address reported *Mar* 14, 1275

**Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance) Bill**
(*Mr. Leighton, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Whitwell*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 4 [Bill 99]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 22, [238] 1913
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Monk*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *April* 2, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Thomas Acland, Mr. Birley, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cowper, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Hall, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Monk, Earl Percy, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Wait, Sir Sydney Waterlow, and Mr. Whitwell; *April* 11, Mr. Bristowe *added*, Mr. Cowper *disch.*
Report of Select Comm.* *June* 28 (*P.P.* 253)
As amended by Select Committee [Bill 231]
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 1, [241] 580; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on going into Committee [Dropped]

*Ecclesiastical Commission — Case of Mr. Charles Armstrong*
Question, Observations, The Earl of Sandwich; Reply, The Earl of Chichester *April* 11, [239] 1081; Observations, The Earl of Sandwich, The Earl of Chichester; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 4, [241] 744
Correspondence . . . . . *P.P.* 74

Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W., *Stirlingshire*
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1466
Parliament — Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1050

[*cont.*

Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W.—*cont.*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [238] 1770, 1778; *add. cl.* [240] 1988
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1836
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1176; [242] 1362

Education
Miscellaneous Questions
*Education Department*
*Education Code*, 1878—*Art.* 17 (*G*)—*Educational Returns*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 21, [238] 1751;—*Art.* 19, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 21, [238] 1753; — *Attendances*, Observations, Mr. Chamberlain *July* 4, [241] 811
*The Education Minute*, 1878—*New Schools*, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 24, [241] 125;—"*Unnecessary Schools*," Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 16, [241] 1576

*Grants to Elementary Schools*, Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 4, [239] 531
*Inspectors of Elementary Schools—Training*, Observations, Mr. Rathbone; Reply, Lord George Hamilton; short debate thereon *July* 4, [241] 822
*Promotions*, Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 16, [241] 1579
*Religious Instruction*, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 4, [239] 530
*School Board Elections*, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 4, [239] 529
*School Board Schools and Savings Banks*, Observations, Mr. Pell *July* 4, [241] 820
*School Boards—Assimilation of Education Rate*, Question, Mr. Goddard; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 22, [238] 1839
*School Fees*, Question, Mr. Pell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 4, [241] 761
*Teachers and School Returns*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 16, [239] 27
*The Education Votes—Financial Statement*, Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 17, [240] 1606
*The London School Board—Religious Teaching*, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 4, [239] 531
*The London School Board Training Ships*, Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; Observations, The Earl of Redesdale *August* 8, [242] 1500; Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *August* 9, 1631
*The Report*, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 15, [242] 2024

[*cont.*

EDUCATION—*cont.*

*Elementary Education*

*Education* (*Scotland*) *Act* (1872) — *School Sites*, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 5, [237] 1048;—*The Board*, Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, [238] 1489

*Elementary Education Act*, 1876—*School Certificates of Birth*, Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 4, [239] 528;—*Sec.* 4, Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 1, [237] 821

*Public Elementary Schools — Musical Instruction*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 8, [242] 1527

*Wymington Board School*, Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 28, [239] 112; Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 8, [242] 1524

Parl. Papers—

| | |
|---|---|
| Report of Committee of Council, 1877-8 | [2048] |
| New Code (England), 1878 | [1946] |
| Minute thereon | [2017] |
| Minute, Art. 7 (b) | [2069] |
| New Code (Scotland), 1878 | [1947] |
| Instruction to Inspectors | [1964] |
| Minute (Time Tables) | [2016] |
| Regulations (Age, Attendance, &c.) | [2018] |
| Expenditure and Results | [2026] |
| Education Codes, 1873-8 | *P.P.* 158 |
| Circular (Religious Instruction) | 167 |
| (Music) Memorials | *P.P.* 264 |

*Elementary Education Act*, 1870

*School Inspection*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 4, [239] 525

*Superior Elementary Education — Bradford School Board*, Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 16, [239] 1371

Parl. Papers—

| | |
|---|---|
| Education Board—Fourth Report | [1897] |
| „ „ Fifth Report | [2024] |
| Report of Committee of Council, 1877-8 | [2049] |
| Code of Regulations, 1878 | [1947] |
| Grants and Results, 1877 | [2002] |

*Education—*(*New Code*)—*Article "b," sec.* 7

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be graciously pleased to direct the amendment of the New Code of Regulations of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, by the omission of Article 'b' of section 7 of the said Code" (*Mr. Pease*) *May* 28, [240] 842; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Education Code — Elementary Natural Science*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 4, To leave out from "That," and add "it would be desirable to modify the Code of Education by adding Elementary Natural Science to the subjects mentioned in Article 19, c. 1" (*Sir John Lubbock*) *v.*, [241] 777; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 68, N. 37; M. 31 (D. L. 195)

**Education (Scotland) Bill** [H.L.]

(*The Lord President*)

*l.* Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *Mar* 22, [238] 1827 (No. 47)
Read 2ª, after debate *April* 1, [239] 274
Committee *April* 9, 949
Report * *April* 11 (No. 69)
Read 3ª * *April* 12
*c.* Read 1° * (*Lord Advocate*) *April* 16 [Bill 156]
Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 27, [240] 745
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *July* 30, [242] 774
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. J. W. Barclay*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee; Report *August* 2, 1126 [Bill 292]
Considered, after short debate *August* 9, 1701; after further short debate, Bill read 3°
*l.* Commons Amendts. (No. 196)
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 78]

EGERTON, Hon. A. F. (Secretary to the Board of Admiralty), *Lancashire, S.E.*

Admiralty—Accountant General of the Navy, [241] 855
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1377
Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1339
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  Case of Mr. John Clare, [238] 1336
  H.M.S. "Eurydice," [242] 1566
  Naval Review at Portsmouth, [242] 1527
  Rams of Iron-clads, [240] 1168
  Training Ships (Ireland), [241] 450
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1106, 1107
Navy Estimates—Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, [238] 1471
Supply—Stationery Office, [240] 69
Turkey—Cyprus, Occupation of, [241] 1243

EGERTON, Hon. Admiral F., *Derbyshire, E.*

Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1580
Navy—"Independencia," The, [238] 1743
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1307

EGERTON, Sir P., *Cheshire, W.*
Supply—Natural History Museum, [240] 1384

EGERTON, Hon. Wilbraham, *Cheshire, Mid.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 170; Comm. *cl.* 55, 2120
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 7, [241] 471; *cl.* 20, 1080; Amendt. 1081; *add. cl.* 1156
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 59

EGYPT
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
*Correspondence between France and England,* Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 5, [237] 1052
*Egyptian Finance,* Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 28, [239] 116; Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 29, 206; Observations, Mr. Rylands; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 29, 224
*Mr. Rivers-Wilson,* Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 8, [239] 857
*Return of the Rates and Duties and Regulations of the Suez Marine Canal,* Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 1, [239] 287
*Suez Canal Dues,* Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, [238] 1295
Correspondence . . . . [2010] [2012]

*Egyptian Obelisk, The — (Cleopatra's Needle)*
Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Jan* 31, [237] 724; Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 7, 1209; Question, The Duke of Somerset; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 7, [238] 826

ELCHO, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1596, 1597
Army—Enlistment for India, [238] 664
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1420
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 643
Army Estimates—Army Reserve, [240] 1477
Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1409
Land Forces, [238] 674
Medical Establishments and Services, [240] 1438, 1443
Militia, &c. [240] 1444
Volunteer Corps, [240] 1462, 1469
Warlike Stores, [242] 1410, 1411
Works, Buildings, &c. [242] 1413
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1643
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1717; *cl.* 22, 2002; *cl.* 55, 2100, 2129; Postponed *cl.* 5, [242] 189, 191; *cl.* 33, 193
Eastern Affairs, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [242] 976, 999, 1014
Eastern Question—Fleet in the Dardanelles, [238] 1754
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 710

[*cont.*

ELCHO, Lord—*cont.*
Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 1027
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 86
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1176
Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 809
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1390
238] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. 1780; *cl.* 1, 1787; *cl.* 4, 1800, 1803; *cl.* 6, 1818; *cl.* 12, 1826
240] *cl.* 15, 1200; *cl.* 16, 1208; *cl.* 41, 1713; *cl.* 45, 1730; *cl.* 49, 1733; *cl.* 85, 1899; *cl.* 103, 1906; *cl.* 104, 1907; *cl.* 105, 1915, 1919; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1932; *add. cl.* 1943, 1947, 1990
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1242

**Elders Widows' Fund Bill**
(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Lord George Hamilton*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *June* 24 [Bill 226]
2R. deferred *June* 27, [241] 413
Read 2°* *July* 24
Committee*—R.P. *July* 29
Committee*; Report *July* 30
Considered*; read 3° *July* 31
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Viscount Cranbrook*) *August* 1
Read 2ª* *August* 2 (No. 182)
Committee*; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª* *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 47]

*Elders Widows' Fund [Deficiencies]*
Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of the Revenues of India, of such sums as may be required to make good the deficiency in the Elders Widows' Fund, and to enable the Trustees from time to time to meet the current liabilities of the said Fund, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to enable the Trustees of the Elders Widows' Fund to apply the Capital of the said Fund in aid of Income, and for other purposes relating thereto (Queen's Recommendation signified), To-morrow, at Two of the clock *July* 25
Resolution considered in Committee *July* 29
Resolution reported, and agreed to *July* 30

**Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote) Bill** (*Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Tennant*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 71]
2R. *Feb* 11, [237] 1483 [House counted out]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15; Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate resumed *June* 6, [240] 1323
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Dodds*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Question put; A. 53, N. 48; M. 5 (D. L. 169)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee" *August* 9, [242] 1713

[*cont.*

*Election of Aldermen* (*Cumulative Vote*) *Bill*—cont.
Amendt. to leave out "this day," and insert "upon Thursday next" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That 'this day,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 33, N. 48; M. 15 (D. L. 267)
Words inserted; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Bill withdrawn * *August* 15

**Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 9 (No. 67)
Read 2ª* *May* 16
Committee*; Report *May* 24
Read 3ª* *May* 27
*c.* Read 1°* (*Lord George Hamilton*) *June* 3
Read 2°* *June* 18 [Bill 201]
Committee*; Report *June* 25
Read 3°* *June* 28
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cxi]

**Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Mickleover) Bill**
(*Lord George Hamilton, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
*c.* Ordered* *May* 7
Read 1°* *May* 8 [Bill 161]
Read 2°* *May* 14
Committee*; Report *May* 23
Read 3°* *May* 24
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *May* 27 (No. 92)
Read 2ª* *June* 4
Committee*; Report *June* 6
Read 3ª* *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 17 [41 *Vict.* c. lvii]

**Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Portsmouth) Bill**
(*Lord George Hamilton, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *May* 14 [Bill 179]
Read 2°* *May* 22
Committee*; Report *May* 30
Read 3°* *June* 3
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *June* 6 (No. 108)
Read 2ª* *June* 17
Committee*; Report *June* 18
Read 3ª* *June* 20
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cvii]

**Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.) Bill** [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 9 (No. 68)
Read 2ª* *May* 16
Committee*; Report *May* 24
Read 3ª* *May* 27
*c.* Read 1°* (*Lord George Hamilton*) *May* 29
Read 2°* *June* 4 [Bill 191]
Committee*; Report *June* 13
Read 3°* *June* 14
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cx]

ELGIN, Earl of
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 2R. [239] 658; Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1076

ELLENBOROUGH, Lord
Army—Marking Deserters, [239] 105
Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions, Address for a Paper, [240] 1331
Army Recruiting—Fraudulent Re-enlistment, [238] 1384
Mutiny, Comm. [239] 396

ELLICE, Mr. E., *St. Andrews*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 85, [240] 1898

ELLIOT, Sir G. *Durham, N.*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1055
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 75
Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [239] 1601

ELLIOT, Mr. G. W., *Northallerton*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 532
Parliament—Franchise of the Reserve Men, [240] 622

ELPHINSTONE, Lord
German Navy — "Der Grosser Kurfürst," Destruction of, [240] 1033
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2014
Navy — H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [238] 1926; [239] 1, 514, 647; [240] 349, 1064, 1067, 1155; [242] 1627

EMLY, Lord
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [238] 747; Re-comm. 1138; *cl.* 78, Amendt. [240] 737
Eastern Question—Greece—Correspondence, [237] 610
Greek Provinces of Turkey, [238] 262
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 435

**Employers Liability for Injuries Bill**
(*Mr. Macdonald, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Bass*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 11]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 10, [239] 1042
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "any alteration in the Law of Liability of Employers for Injuries to those in their employ should be founded on the Report of the Select Committee of last Session on the subject; and that, considering the importance of the question, affecting, as it does, all classes of the community, any measure on the subject should be introduced by Government" (*Mr. Tennant*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

*Employers' Liability for Injuries to their Servants*
Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr; Reply, Earl Beauchamp *April* 16, [239] 1361

*Endowed Schools Act*, 1869
*Educational Endowments—Provision for Girls*, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 17, [240] 1603
*Timberscombe School Scheme*, Question, Mr. Courtney; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 29, [242] 519

*Endowed Schools Acts*
Moved, That there be laid before this House, "Return made out county by county, in continuation of Return respecting the Endowed Schools Acts, Paper No. (6), ordered to be printed on the 21st of January last, with in each case a proximate estimate of the annual endowments of (1) The number of Schemes finally approved and in force in England and Wales under the Endowed Schools Acts of 1869, 1873, and 1874; (2) The number of Schemes published by the Charity Commissioners under those Acts, but not yet finally approved; (3) The Endowed Schools not returned in (1) and (2), nor included in sect. 3. of the Endowed Schools Act, 1873, which are within the general provisions of the Endowed Schools Acts; (4) The aggregate number and income of Endowed Schools included in sect. 3. of the Endowed Schools Act, 1873: Also,
"Return, as regards (1), of the grade, determined as in Paper (6.), 1878, of each school under the Scheme in force, and proximate estimate of the number of scholars for which each such school is attended, as well as the total number and grades of such schools and the total number of scholars so estimated" (*The Earl Fortescue*) *July* 23, [242] 4; an Amendment made; words struck out, and Return, as amended, agreed to

**Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) Bill** [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
239] *l.* Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *Mar* 29, 192 (No. 56)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 5, 653
. Committee; Report *April* 11, 1072
. Read 3ª *April* 12, 1193
*c.* Read 1° * (*The Lord Advocate April* 16
240] Read 2° *June* 3, 1154 [Bill 157]
*The Commissioners*, Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 24,
241] 132
242] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 29, 612
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. J. W. Barclay*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
. Original Question put, and agreed to; Committee; Report, 621
. Considered *August* 1, 977
Read 3° * *August* 2
*l.* Commons Amendts. (No. 188)
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 48]

*Endowed Schools* (*Birmingham Scheme, &c.*)
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to refuse Her assent to the scheme of the Endowed Schools Commissioners for the management of the Free Grammar School of King Edward the Sixth in Birmingham, and for the management of the foundations of John Milward and Joanna Lench in the county of Warwick" (*Mr. John Bright*) *Mar* 5, [238] 777; after short debate, Question put; A. 70, N. 129; M. 59 (D. L. 41)

*Endowed Schools* (*Leeds Poors Estate*)
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to refuse Her assent to the scheme of the Endowed Schools Commissioners for the management of the Poors Estate, in the parish of Leeds, in the county of York" (*Mr. Barran*) *Mar* 19, [238] 1657; after debate, Question put; A. 55, N. 101; M. 46 (D. L. 60)

ENFIELD, Viscount
Parliamentary Elections (Metropolis), 2R. [237] 1845
Poor Law—Boarding-out System, [242] 514
St. Katharine's Hospital—Royal Commission, 1871, [238] 1382

**Entail Amendment (Scotland) Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Argyll*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 5 (No. 15)
Read 2ª, after short debate, and referred to a Select Committee *Mar* 1, [238] 530
And, on *Mar* 12, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, E. Doncaster, E. Minto, L. Elphinstone, L. Sundridge, L. Stewart of Garlies, L. Brodrick, L. Elgin, L. Selborne, L. Blackburn, L. Gordon of Drumearn
Report of Select Comm.* *Mar* 28 (*P.P.* 51)
Bill reported * *Mar* 28
Committee * *April* 1 (No. 52)
Report * *April* 2
Read 3ª * *April* 5
*c.* Read 1° * (*The Lord Advocate*) *April* 16
Read 2° * *June* 27 [Bill 158]
Committee *; Report *July* 1
Read 3° * *July* 2
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 28]

**Entails and Settlements Limitation Bill**
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Herschell*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 25]
2R. [Dropped]

**Epping Forest Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Noel*)
*c. Legislation*, Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Jan* 31, [237] 724

[*cont.*

*Epping Forest Bill*—cont.

Motion for Leave (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *May* 28, [240] 854; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered
Read 1° * *May* 29 [Bill 188]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *June* 17, 1620
And, on *June* 18, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Stephen Cave, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Serjeant Spinks, and Two Members to be added by the Committee of Selection
Report of Select Comm.* *June* 26 (*P.P.* 248)
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 1, [241] 573 [Bill 228]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 4, 766
Amendt. to leave out from "be," and add "re-committed, in order to insert an Amendment in Clause 30, to provide for the representation of the Metropolitan Board of Works on the Committee of Management" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 209, N. 49; M. 160 (D. L. 194)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3° (Queen's Consent signified), and passed
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *July* 5
Read 2ª *July* 11, 1201 (No. 144)
And, on *July* 16, Bill referred to a Select Committee; the Lords following were named of the Committee:—E. Sydney, V. Hutchinson, L. Skelmersdale, L. Kinnaird, L. Winmarleigh
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 19
Bill reported * *July* 19 (No. 164)
Committee * *July* 23
Report * *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 280]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxiii]

ERRINGTON, Mr. G., *Longford Co.*

Army Medical Service—Examinations, [242] 992
Charlton Charity, [240] 835
Coolie Emigration to the Mauritius, [237] 1848
Indian Labourers at La Réunion, [238] 59
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1531; Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 289
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Cavalry Force at Longford, [240] 1683
  Married Soldiers' Quarters—Longford Barracks, [237] 1846
  Post Office — Telegraphic Department — Communication with Granard, [240] 1885
  Registration of Deeds in Ireland, [242] 1273
  Riots at Belfast, [241] 498
Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1231
Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1098
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1570, 1571
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1112, 1152
Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2), [241] 100
Medical Reform—Bills before Parliament, [241] 759
Sierra Leone, [239] 412

[*cont.*

ERRINGTON, Mr. G.—*cont.*

Supply—Science and Art Department, Amendt. [242] 1257, 1260
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 946
Windward Islands—Barbadoes, [242] 1178

ESLINGTON, Lord, *Northumberland, S.*

Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1313
Navy Estimates—Military Pensions and Allowances, [238] 1471, 1474
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1244; Comm. 1381

ESTCOURT, Mr. G. B. S., *Wiltshire, N.*

Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1341, 1344

EVANS, Mr. T. W., *Derbyshire, S.*

Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 22, [241] 1983; *cl.* 30, 2076; *cl.* 55, 2125; Schedule 5, [242] 817
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 734,
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 83
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 317; *cl.* 7, 324
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 499
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1504

EWART, Mr. W., *Belfast*

Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1981
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 296

EWING, Mr. A. ORR-, *Dumbartonshire*

Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1187; Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1311, 1314
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 11, 100, 102; *cl.* 22, 316; *cl.* 27, 325; *cl.* 38, 333; *cl.* 47, 335, 336, 337; *cl.* 99, 487; *add. cl.* 610
Govan Burgh, 2R. [238] 148
238] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1792, 1795, 1797; *cl.* 4, 1800, 1808; *cl.* 6, 1817; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1819, 1820; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1825
240] *cl.* 12, 1183, 1191, 1193, 1194; Amendt. 1196; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1204, 1206; *cl.* 24, 1688; *cl.* 25, 1692; *cl.* 33, 1696; *cl.* 38, Amendt. 1710; *cl.* 41, 1713, 1715; *cl.* 97, 1901; *cl.* 103, 1906; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1922, 1923, 1937; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1974
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 348
Scotland — Religious Denominations, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1774
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1138

## Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2) Bill

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Resolutions considered in Committee * *August* 6
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *August* 7 [Bill 295]
Read 2° * *August* 8

[*cont.*

*Exchequer Bills and Bonds* (*No.* 2) *Bill*—cont.
Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 8, [242] 1532
Committee*; Report *August* 9
Read 3°* *August* 12
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *August* 13
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *August* 14
Read 3ª* *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 64]

**Exchequer Bonds and Bills (£6,000,000) Bill** (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Colonel Stanley*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 107]
Read 2°* *Feb* 14
Committee*; Report *Feb* 15
Read 3°* *Feb* 18
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Feb* 18
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *Feb* 21
Read 3ª* *Feb* 22
Royal Assent *Feb* 25 [41 *Vict.* c. 2]

**Exchequer Bonds (£1,000,000) Bill**
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Colonel Stanley*)
*c.* Resolutions in Committee *Feb* 27
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 28 [Bill 121]
Read 2°* *Mar* 1
Committee; Report *Mar* 4, [238] 722
Read 3°* *Mar* 7
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Mar* 8
Read 2ª* *Mar* 11
Committee*; Report *Mar* 12
Read 3ª* *Mar* 14
Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [41 *Vict.* c. 7]

**Exchequer Bonds (No. 2) Bill**
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
*c.* Resolutions considered in Committee* *May* 23
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered to be brought in upon the first three Resolutions; read 1°* *May* 24
Read 2°* *May* 27 [Bill 186]
Committee*; Report *May* 30
Read 3°* *June* 3
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *June* 4
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *June* 6
Read 3ª* *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 17 [41 *Vict.* c. 22]

EXCHEQUER, CHANCELLOR of the (*see* CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER)

EXETER, Bishop of
Endowed Schools Act, Motion for Returns, [242] 8
Truro Chapter, 2R. [240] 1875

**Expiring Laws Continuance Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Matthew Ridley*)
*c.* Motion for Leave (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *August* 7; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *August* 8, [242] 1610
Moved, "That Leave be not given" (*Major O'Gorman*); Question put; A. 61, N. None (D. L. 254)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered
Read 1°* *August* 9 [Bill 296]
Read 2°, after short debate *August* 12, 1769
Committee; Report, after short debate *Aug* 14, 1951; after further short debate, Bill read 3°
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *August* 14
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 70]

*Explosives Act*, 1875
*Conveyance of Explosives*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 7, [237] 1207
*Mining Cartridges*, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 12, [239] 1227
*Stowage of Gunpowder on Shipboard—The "Pereora,"* Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, Lord Henniker *July* 23, [242] 13

EYTON, Mr. P. E., *Flint, &c.*
Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 932

**Factories and Workshops Bill**
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 3]
237] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 11, 1454
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in any measure for the consolidation and amendment of the Law relating to Factories and Workshops, it is desirable, in the interests alike of employers and employed, that all trades and manufactures employing the same class of labour should be placed upon the same footing, and under the same protective and restrictive regulations" (*Mr. Tennant*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
. Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, 1850; Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 21, 62
238]
. Order for Committee read *Feb* 21, 63
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to insert provisions in the Bill for regulating the hours of labour and securing the attendance at school of children employed in agriculture" (*Mr. Fawcett*); after debate, Question put; A. 93, N. 208; M. 115 (D. L. 23)
Committee—R.P.
. Committee—R.P. *Feb* 25, 302
. Committee—R.P. *Feb* 28, 456
. Committee—R.P. *Mar* 1, 589
. Committee; Report *Mar* 7, 877
. Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *Mar* 22, 1909 [Bill 126]

[*cont.*

*Factories and Workshops Bill*—cont.
Moved, "That the further proceeding on Consideration of the Bill, as amended, be adjourned" (*Mr. Chamberlain*); Motion withdrawn; Amendments made
239] Read 3°, after short debate *Mar* 29, 261
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *April* 1 (No. 57)
Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 9, 943
Committee*; Report *April* 12
240] Read 3ª *May* 16, 1; after short debate, Bill passed
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 183]
*l.* Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. 16]

Fawcett, Mr. H., *Hackney*
Central Asia—Reported Russian Advance, [242] 1942
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1721, 1723; *cl.* 33, [242] 410
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1187; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1298, 1303
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 996, 997, 1302, 1555, 1563
Negotiations, Motion for Adjournment, [239] 1422, 1440, 1449
Notices of Motions, [239] 1592
Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 801
Russia and England, [239] 257
Epping Forest, 3R. Amendt. [241] 766, 771
Exchequer Bonds (£1,000,000), Comm. [238] 722
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. Amendt. 63, 64, 73, 85; *cl.* 13, 106, 115; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 124, 126; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 302, 303, 304, 308, 311; *cl.* 65, 348; *cl.* 99, 493; *add. cl.* 596, 603, 610, 612, 614
239] 3R. 261
Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. [241] 1031; *cl.* 7, 1034, 1035; *cl.* 11, Amendt. *ib.*, 1036; *add. cl.* 1037
Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. [242] 1829; Amendt. 1830; *cl.* 1, 1837; Schedule, Amendt. *ib.*, 1838, 1841, 1842
India—Miscellaneous Questions
Cabul, Mission to, [242] 2016
Famine, The, [242] 642
Indian Army, [240] 1166
Indian Budget, [241] 1467
Indian Taxation, Petition presented, [238] 1596
Khelat—Occupation of Quetta, [237] 462
Public Meetings, [239] 666, 667
Vernacular Press Act, [241] 1241
India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 417, 425, 470
India—East India (Public Works), Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [237] 335, 356
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. Amendt. [242] 1891
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 490
Indian Press Law, Res. [238] 1605; Motion for an Address, [242] 96
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [242] 281; *cl.* 5, 289; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 313, 318; *cl.* 7, Motion for reporting Progress, 320, 322; Consid. *cl.* 6, 1819
Licensing Laws Amendment, Comm. [237] 1692
Lower Thames Street, Dirty Condition of, [242] 1947
[*cont.*

Fawcett, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1530, 1532
Message from the Queen—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, Report, [242] 394
Metropolis Water Supply, [239] 1285
Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. [238] 1232; [239] 758, 759
Metropolitan Water Companies, [242] 1948, 1949
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1885; [240] 624, 745, 748
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 291; Motion for Adjournment, 347, 362
Parliament—Order of Business, [241] 764, 1071
Saturday Sitting, [242] 393
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1477
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1098, 1388; Amendt. 1389, 1398
Parochial Charities of the City of London—Commission, [240] 926; [241] 327, 1244, 1852
Parochial Charities of the City of London, Res. [239] 1701
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 941, 942
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1183, 1189
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [240] 110; *cl.* 3, 440
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1217, 1227; Comm. 1398, 1401
Ways and Means, Report, [239] 746

Fay, Mr. C. J., *Cavan Co.*
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1571
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [239] 1604
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 728
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 184
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 90
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1587
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1693
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 265
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 23

Ferguson, Mr. R., *Carlisle*
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1848

Feversham, Earl of
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Select Committee nominated, [238] 1389
Eastern Question, [237] 1203
Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 863
Eastern Question — Russia and the Porte—Res. [237] 518

Fielden, Mr. J., *Yorkshire, W.R., E. Div.*
Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1470; Comm. *cl.* 10, [238] 94; *cl.* 22, 316; *cl.* 27, 319; *cl.* 30, 328; *cl.* 38, 333; *cl.* 47, 336; *cl.* 68, 464; *cl.* 100, 498

*Fiji—Status of the Natives*
Question, Dr. O'Leary; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 8, [242] 1532

*Fisheries*
*Denmark — Re-appearance of the Herring*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 12, [237] 1534
*Fishery Inspectors — The Estuary of the Thames*, Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 2, [242] 997

FITZMAURICE, Lord E. G., *Calne*
County Expenditure—Borough Contributions, [238] 755
County Government, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1691, 1853, 1912, 1913
Eastern Question—Congress, The, [238] 1353
Roumania, [237] 925
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), Comm. [240] 1657
Persia—Visit of the Shah, [240] 928
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1068, 1230

FLETCHER, Mr. I., *Cockermouth*
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1528
Northern Circuit—Assizes, [240] 39

*Floods Prevention—Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards*
Question, Observations, The Marquess of Ripon; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 4, [240] 1162

FLOYER, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
County Government, Comm. [238] 923
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 887; *add. cl.* 1347
Supply—Local Government Board, [238] 1551
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1519; *cl.* 8, [241] 55

*Food and Drugs Act*, 1875—*Adulterated Liquor*
Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 7, [239] 1518

FORBES, Lord
Locomotives on Highways (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 1631
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 3R. [241] 304
Vivisection, Address for Papers, [241] 755

**Foreign Jurisdiction Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª * *July* 8 (No. 147)
Read 2ª * *July* 11
Committee *; Report *July* 12
Read 3ª * *July* 15
*c.* Read 1º * (*Mr. Attorney General*) *July* 19
Read 2º * *August* 5 [Bill 267]
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Considered *; read 3º *August* 10
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 67]

*Foreign Office, The*
*Abstraction of a Document—The Memorandum of Agreement between England and Russia*, Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *July* 1, [241] 480; Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 22, 2058
*Foreign Office Reports*, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 7, [240] 1339
*Temporary Writers*, Questions, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Childers, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Mr. Bourke *July* 1, [241] 494; Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 4, 757

FORSTER, Sir C., *Walsall*
Burials, [237] 1056
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1426, 1427, 1436
Employers Liability for Injury, 2R. [239] 1053
Factories and Workshops, Comm. Schedule 1, Amendt. [238] 880
German Emperor, [240] 1169
London and North-Western Railway (Reddish to Leeds), 2R. Amendt. [238] 971
Parliament — Privilege — Petitions — Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [238] 1485
Parliament — Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1738, 1967; [239] 1220, 1223
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 390
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 942, 1042
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [238] 875, 1293

FORSTER, Right Hon. W. E., *Bradford*
Cattle Disease—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [241] 961, 962
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1433; Consid. 1521
Christ's Hospital — Commission of Inquiry, [241] 124
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1649
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. Amendt. 145, 225, 242, 250, 350, 565; Comm. 976, 977, 990, 1026, 1070; *cl.* 2, 1609, 1610, 1658, 1713, 1718; *cl.* 3, 1725; *cl.* 9, 1734, 1741, 1742, 1746, 1752; *cl.* 10, 1861; *cl.* 15, 1879; *cl.* 16, 1893, 1895, 1899, 1900, 1905; *cl.* 21, 1917, 1919, 1922, 1923; *cl.* 22, 1925, 1931; Motion for reporting Progress, 1935, 1977, 1989, 1990, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005; *cl.* 24, 2008; *cl.* 29, 2016; *cl.* 30, 2069, 2074, 2075, 2078, 2079; *cl.* 31, 2081; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 2084; *cl.* 34, 2085; *cl.* 53, 2091, 2092; *cl.* 54, 2095; *cl.* 55, 2096, 2117, 2135; *cl.* 64, 2144, 2145
242] *cl.* 68, 146; Amendt. 160, 161; *cl.* 70, Amendt. 166, 169, 170, 172, 174; *cl.* 71, 181; Postponed *cl.* 33, Amendt. 396, 402, 405, 406, 426; *cl.* B, 429; *cl.* D, 435; *add. cl.* 437; Motion for reporting Progress, 445, 446, 447, 449, 768, 771, 772; Schedule 3, 806; Schedule 5, Amendt. 813, 814, 816, 822; New Schedule, 827

[*cont.*

**Forster**, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Importation of Cattle, [242] 2024
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1584, 1587, 1593, 1600, 1607, 1687, 1688, 1689, 1697
  Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 792
  Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1013, 1014, 1016
  Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
    Anglo-Turkish Convention — Negotiations, [242] 227, 228
    Berlin Congress — Correspondence, [240] 1252;—Papers, [241] 1245
    Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 1069
    Dardanelles—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1424
    Ministerial Statement, [239] 1374, 1375
    Russia and Turkey—Terms of Peace, [238] 300, 301, 379
  Education Department—Report, [242] 2024
  Education—Inspectors of Elementary Schools, [241] 825
  Education Minute, 1878—New Schools, [241] 125
  Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), Comm. [242] 1713
  Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 845
  Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res. [241] 788
  Emperor of Germany, Attempted Assassination of, [240] 1256
  Employers' Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1071
  Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 790
  Endowed Schools (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1232
  Endowed Schools (Leeds Poors Estate), Motion for an Address, [238] 1665
  Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1466
  Highways, Comm. *cl.* 26, [240] 1346
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 309
  Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1524
  Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 554
  Natal, Colony of—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 473, 474
  Paris Exhibition—English Cattle, [241] 330
  Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    Business of the House, [237] 256; [240] 835, 1256; [241] 330; [242] 1769
    Easter Recess, [239] 1392
    Public Business, [239] 1288
  Parliament — Private Bills—Bradford Tramway Companies, [238] 1956
  Parliament—Privilege—Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1409
  Parliament — Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1741, 1971
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, [237] 261
  Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 548
  Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 94
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 375, 381, 382, 386; *cl.* 1, 635
  South Africa—Outbreak of the Native Tribes, [237] 255
  Spain and China—Emigration Treaty, [241] 1468
  Straits Settlements—Perak, [242] 1219
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 624; Amendt. 729, 752, 756, 841, 842, 1213, 1216, 1227; Comm. 1402
  Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 572
    Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1470, 1471
    Civil Service Estimates, [242] 1227
    Public Education in England and Wales, &c. [242] 1238
  Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Asia Minor—The Lazes, [242] 2022, 2023
    Slavery and the Slave Trade, [241] 1247, 1248
  Turkey—Murder of Mr. Ogle, Res. [242] 1968, 1998, 1999
  Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 492, 507

**Forsyth**, Mr. W., *Marylebone*
  Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. [239] 1516
  Burials, Res. [237] 1782
  Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 424
  Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 674
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, [239] 1327
  Eastern Question—Congress, The, [239] 524
    Notice of Motion, [239] 1592
  Greece — Kingdom of — Protocol, &c. [238] 875
  Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 412
  Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1396
  Parliament — Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1970
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 893
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 984
  Supply — Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1619
    Law Charges, [238] 1558
    Stationery Office, [239] 1788
  Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 494

**Fortescue**, Earl
  Army—Competitive Examinations for Commissions, [240] 352
  Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions, Address for a Paper, [240] 1329
  Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards, [237] 244; [240] 1163
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [238] 743; Commons' Amendts. Consid. [242] 1620, 1626
  Eastern Question—British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 710
  Education Department—London School Board Training Ships, [242] 1500, 1502, 1631
  Endowed Schools Act, Motion for Returns, [242] 4, 11, 13
  Highways, Report, [242] 1285

FORTESCUE, Earl—*cont.*
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [237] 316;—Shelters, [241] 955
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 2R. [240] 1241; Comm. [241] 107; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 114, 116, 117; 3R. 304; Re-comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 307, 310; Commons Amendts. Consid. 1437
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [240] 1159; *cl.* 4, 1162
Weights and Measures, 2R. [241] 2042; Comm. *cl.* 38, Amendt. [242] 208

FRASER, Sir W. A., *Kidderminster*
Detective Police (Metropolis)—Report of Commission, [238] 377
Eastern Question—Russia and Turkey—Treaty of Peace, [238] 637
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 702
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 412
Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1967
Post Office—Dover and Calais Mail Contracts, [240] 494; Res. Amendt. 1237
Racecourses (Licensing), Comm. *cl.* 6, [240] 1489
Supply—Law Charges, [238] 1559
Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1497
Miscellaneous Expenses, [238] 1615
Supply, Res. [238] 1048

*Fraserburgh Harbour Bill (by Order)*
c. Read 3° * *June* 6

*Frauds by Fiduciary Agents—Legislation*
Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [238] 1146

FREMANTLE, Hon. T. F., *Buckinghamshire*
Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 213

FRENCH, Hon. C., *Roscommon*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2101, 2103, 2106, 2122
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 724, 734
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 23, [239] 59
Removal of Paupers, [241] 324; Res. 676
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, [239] 1847; *add. cl.* [240] 872, 1022
Supply—Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1015
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 605

FRESHFIELD, Mr. C. K., *Dover*
Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1364
Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, Re-payments to, [238] 1618

**Freshwater Fish Protection Bill**
(*Mr. Mundella, Mr. James Duff, Mr. Michael Bass, Mr. Spencer Stanhope*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 19 [Bill 131]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee, after short debate *April* 11, [239] 1190
And, on *May* 15, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Arthur Bass, Mr. Bristowe, Sir Robert Buxton, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Dodds, Mr. James Duff, Mr. Stafford Howard, Mr. Isaac, Mr. William Lowther, Sir Andrew Lusk, Lord Muncaster, Mr. Mundella, Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Rodwell, and Mr. W. S. Stanhope
Report of Select Comm. * *July* 2 (*P.P.* 261)
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 8, [241] 1031; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Committee; Report [Bill 235]
Read 3° * *July* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Morley*) *July* 11
Read 2ª *July* 22, 2036 (No. 155)
Committee * *July* 25 (No. 173)
Report * *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 30
c. Lords Amendts. [Bill 289]
l. Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 39]

*Friendly Societies*
*Friendly Societies Act*, 1875—*Leeds County Court*, Question, Mr. Ashbury; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 21, [238] 61
*Poor Law Amendment Act*, 1876, Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 4, [237] 923

GALLOWAY, Earl of
Army—Mutiny Act, [238] 1831, 1836
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [239] 1072; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1075, 1076; *cl.* 12, 1081
Entail Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [238] 534
Mutiny, 2R. [239] 280

GALWAY, Viscount, *Nottingham, N.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 20, [239] 1343

GARNIER, Mr. J. CARPENTER-, *Devon, S.*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1040
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 868

**Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill**
(*Mr. J. G. Talbot, Viscount Sandon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 15 [Bill 153]
Read 2° * *May* 13
Committee *; Report *May* 22
Considered * *May* 23
Read 3° * *May* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *May* 27 (No. 93)
Read 2ª * *June* 3
Committee *; Report *June* 4
Read 3ª * *June* 6
Royal Assent *June* 17 [41 *Vict.* c. lvi]

**Gasworks Clauses Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 21 (No. 31)

**General Police and Improvement Provisional Order (Paisley) Bill**
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 170]
Read 2° * *May* 16
Committee *; Report *May* 24
Read 3° * *May* 27
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Steward*) *May* 28 (No. 91)
Read 2ª * *June* 6
Committee *; Report *June* 7
Read 3ª * *June* 17
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ciii]

**General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862, Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Orr Ewing, Colonel Mure*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *April* 8 [Bill 148]
Read 2° * *May* 6
Committee *; Report *June* 6
Considered * *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 14
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Rosebery*) *June* 17 (No. 124)
Read 2ª *July* 4, [241] 744
Committee * *July* 5
Report * *July* 8
Read 3ª * *July* 9
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 255]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 30]

*Germany*
240] *Attempted Assassination of the Emperor of Germany*, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Marquess of Salisbury *June* 3, 1060; Statement, Mr. Bourke, 1078; Questions, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Newdegate; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 4, 1169; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 6, 1256
*Religious Refugees*, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 7, [237] 1206
*The German Empire—The Netherlands*, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 15, [241] 1469
*The German Navy—Destruction of the Ironclad "Der Grosser Kurfürst,"* Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer, Lord Elphinstone *May* 31, [240] 1033; Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith, 1037

*Gibraltar*
*Sanitary Condition*, Question, Mr. Goddard; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 22, [238] 1839
*The Trade Ordinance*, Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Jan* 21, [237] 251
Further Correspondence . . *P.P.* [2145]

GIBSON, Right Hon. E., (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 3R. [240] 122
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1971
Charlton Charity, [240] 835
Collection of Rates (Dublin), [240] 1167; Leave, 1676
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, [239] 1095, 1365
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 486, 487, 495
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [242] 1801, 1802; *cl.* 5, 1811; *cl.* 6, 1821
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Appointment of a Coroner for Westmeath, [239] 1287
  Criminal Law—Prison Discipline, [242] 867
  Disturbances in, [240] 262
  Irish Fisheries—Mackerel Fishery at Kinsale, [239] 1285
  Landed Estates Court, [238] 1047
  Local Courts of Bankruptcy, [240] 1608
  Londonderry and Belfast—Pay of Constabulary, [242] 870
  Orange Processions, [242] 387
  Peace Preservation Act, [242] 41
  Poor Law—Pauper Children in Workhouses—Industrial Training, [242] 2059
  Registration of Deeds—Report of the Royal Commission, [240] 35, 159
  Stipendiary Magistrates, [242] 1854
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1940, 1955
Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1548
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. [239] 475
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 731
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 505
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1194
Parliament—Business of the House, [241] 450
Parliament—New Writ for Clare County—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Res. [242] 47
Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland), Comm. [242] 1614
Public Health (Ireland), Comm. [238] 722; [240] 497; *add. cl.* 1992; 3R. [241] 199
Public Works Loans (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment, Comm. [241] 200
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 469
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 382, 383, 392, 393; Amendt. 394; *cl.* 1, 1843, 1846; Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 1316
Statute Law Revision (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1258
Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [238] 1557
  Land Judges Offices, Ireland, [242] 1272
  Registration of Deeds in Ireland, [242] 1274, 1276, 1612
  Temporary Commissions, [238] 1612, 1613, 1614
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 1049
Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1584

GIFFARD, Sir H. S. (see SOLICITOR GENERAL, The)

**Giles**, Mr. A., *Southampton*
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 987
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 363
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1605

**Gilpin**, Colonel Sir R. T., *Bedfordshire*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 366

**Gladstone**, Right Hon. W. E., *Greenwich*
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1632, 1639
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1667
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1689
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, [239] 666
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] * 672, 684, 744, 745, 754, 758, 759, 1099
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Anglo-Russian Agreement—Production of Papers, [242] 230, 231
  Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 40
  Armistice—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1329
  Congress, The, [239] 416, 475, 521, 522, 523, 532, 733
  Instructions to the British Plenipotentiary, [242] 219, 220
  Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 767, 774
  Rumoured Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 966
  Russia and Bessarabia, [239] 476
  Russia and England, [239] 255
Indian Press Law, Res. [238] 1600; Motion for an Address, [242] 48, 61, 124
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1497
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, [239] 294; Motion for an Address, 869
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 336, 387, 400, 511, 562, 593
"Nineteenth Century"—Article on "Liberty in the East and West" (Mr. Gladstone)—Mr. Hanbury's Motion, [240] 1617
Parliament—Breach of Privilege, [239] 671
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1474
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1099, 1101, 1102
Parliament — Public Petitions—Indian Press Law, [240] 1681
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 104
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 250
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1782
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 369, 379; *cl.* 1, 645
Supplementary Estimate, Motion for Adjournment, [237] 910, 928, 960, 974, 975, 1002, 1024, 1229, 1241; Comm. 1360, 1362, 1378, 1408, 1410; Report, 1444, 1446

[*cont.*

**Gladstone**, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 564, 580
  Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1245
Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [240] 1408
Turkey—The War—Austrian Interests, [237] 1733
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 501
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 555, 557, 561; [242] 1319

**Glebe Loans (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Kavanagh*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 9]
Read 2°* *Feb* 6
Committee *Feb* 19, [237] 1994
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. Monk*); Question put, and negatived
Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Dodds*); Question put, and negatived; Bill reported
Considered* *Feb* 22
Read 3°* *Feb* 27
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl Belmore*) *Feb* 28 (No. 32)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 4
Committee*; Report *Mar* 5
Read 3ª* *Mar* 7
Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [41 *Vict.* c. 6]

**Goddard**, Mr. A. L., *Cricklade*
Gibraltar—Sanitary Condition, [238] 1839
School Boards—Education Rate, [238] 1839

*Gold and Silver Hall Marking*
Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the operation of the Acts relating to the Hall Marking of Gold and Silver manufactures" (*Sir Henry Jackson*) *April* 15, [239] 1359
And, on *May* 27, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Bates, Colonel Blackburne, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Hamond, Mr. Thomson Hankey, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Muntz, Sir Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Onslow, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Torr, and Mr. Whitwell; *June* 19, Mr. Puleston added
Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Twenty Members" (*Major Nolan*) *June* 24, [241] 201; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Sir Joseph M'Kenna added
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 31 (*P.P.* 328)

**Goldney**, Mr. G., *Chippenham*
Church Livings, Res. Amendt. [237] 1559
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 16, [241] 1892, 1901; *cl.* 22, 1994; *cl.* 59, 2137
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1604
County Government, Leave, [237] 596
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1313, 1315, 1318
Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 25
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 736
Factories and Workshops, Comm. [238] 63, 72, 73, 77

[*cont.*

**Goldney**, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Heralds' College, Res. [238] 406
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 893; *cl.* 20, 1080
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 910
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 307
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 619
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 250
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1091
Supply—Charity Commission, [239] 1611, 1612
  Foreign Office, [239] 1486, 1487
  Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1500
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1645
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1133; [242] 1318

**Goldsmid**, Mr. — *Afterwards* Sir J., *Rochester*
Army Rank—Clerks of the Royal Engineer Department, [237] 1620
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 1511, 1513
Commons, Nomination of Select Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [238] 358, 362
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 762
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Bessarabia, [237] 1736
  Reserve Forces, [239] 171
  Russia—Terms of Peace, [238] 1595
241] Highways, Comm. 455; *cl.* 11, 872; *cl.* 18, 887, 889; Amendt. 894, 896; *cl.* 20, 901, 1078, 1082, 1083; *cl.* 21, 1087, 1089, 1090, 1091; *cl.* 22, 1095, 1096; *cl.* 23, 1098; *cl.* 24, 1100, 1101; *cl.* 25, 1102; *add. cl.* 1357, 1360
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1532, 1533
Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, [238] 260
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 922
Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1397
Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1051
Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1964
Public Offices—Purchase of Land, [238] 1043
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [239] 353, 354, 361, 384; *cl.* 1, 623, 644; Consid. [241] 1298
Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, [239] 180
  Diplomatic Services, [238] 1606
  Local Government Board, [238] 1551
  Queen's University, Ireland, [238] 1571
Turkey—Cyprus, Occupation of, [241] 1243
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 16, [241] 65

**Gordon**, Sir A., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
Army—Courts of Inquiry and Courts Martial, [238] 1489
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [238] 700
  Militia, &c. [240] 1445
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 358
Danube Commission, [238] 636
Dominion of Canada—Permissive Bill, [239] 664; [240] 833

[*cont.*

**Gordon**, Sir A.—*cont.*
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, Res. [239] 1261
Eastern Question—Peace, Conditions of, 1877, [237] 1536, 1537
  Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 775
Gun Licence Act, 1870—Rabbits (Scotland), [239] 1089
Harbours (Scotland), [240] 167
Herring Fishery, [237] 1618
India—Native Indian Forces—Terms of Service, [240] 498
India Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 130
Law and Justice (Scotland)—Office of Lord Clerk Register, [239] 37
Military Forces Localization Act—Comptroller and Auditor General's Report, [240] 1416
Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent, [240] 24; Res. 541
Mutiny Act—Military Law, [238] 299
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 262
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [240] 1769, 1797
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [238] 1790; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1812; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1822; *cl.* 49, [240] 1733; *cl.* 105, 1913; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1920, 1922; Amendt. 1926; *add. cl.* 1982, 1983; Consid. *cl.* 3, [241] 643
Supply—Fishery Board, Scotland, [240] 684, 700
  Stationery Office, [239] 1793
Turkey—Cyprus, Occupation of, [241] 1243

**Gorst**, Mr. J. E., *Chatham*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1615, 1654; *cl.* 22, 1990; *cl.* 30, 2075, 2078, 2079; *cl.* 55, 2128; *cl.* 70, [242] 169; Postponed *cl.* 5, 188; Amendt. 193; *cl.* B, 430; *add. cl.* 439
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1590, 1600
Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Treaty Obligations, [241] 1577
Criminal Law—Mr. R. W. Harman, Case of, [242] 1172, 1173
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1186; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1297, 1302
Dockyards, H.M.—Writers, [237] 529
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1053
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 17, 310, 312; *cl.* 22, 315; *cl.* 27, 319; Amendt. 320; *cl.* 30, 328; *cl.* 32, Amendt. 329; *cl.* 37, 331, 332; *cl.* 65, 346; *cl.* 67, 457; *cl.* 69, 470; *cl.* 100, 498
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 70
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 287, 289; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 313
Merchant Seamen, Leave, [237] 309; 2R. 609
National Debt—The New Sinking Fund, [239] 856
Navy—Chief Engineers, [242] 992
  H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, [237] 532; [240] 35, 1254; Res. [242] 1183, 1191, 1204

[*cont.*

GORST, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [238] 1125, 1300, 1311, 1333
Navy Estimates—Departmental Statement, [238] 1442
Scientific Departments, [238] 1470
Seamen and Marines, [238] 1469
Parliament—Privilege, [239] 535
Standing Orders—Hybrid Bills, [238] 1837
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1477
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 410
Supply—Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 943
House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1473, 1475
Law Charges, [240] 942
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 575, 1181; Report, 1239
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1844

GOSCHEN, Right Hon. G. J., *London*
Cattle Disease—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [241] 961
County Government, Leave, [237] 594; 2R. 1898
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1309; *cl.* 17, 1326; *cl.* 20, 1343
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 609
Eastern Question—Anglo-Turkish Convention—Despatch of May 30, [241] 2062; [242] 39, 40
Epping Forest, Comm. [241] 574; 3R. 769, 774
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 730, 731
Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. [238] 1232
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [238] 1959
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1119, 1120
Navy Estimates—Departmental Statement, [238] 1413
Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 812
Parliament—Order of Business, [241] 763
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 226, 228
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, [241] 855; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1038, 1042, 1044
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 754, 887, 896, 903, 977, 1238
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1521
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1175, 1178

GOULDING, Mr. W., *Cork*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1971

GOURLEY, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
Bathing Accidents, Fatal—Scarborough, [241] 1466
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 997
Criminal Law—Vaccination Prosecutions—Prison Discipline, [242] 520
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, [239] 1325
Declaration of Paris, Res. Amendt. [238] 1850

[*cont.*

GOURLEY, Mr. E. T.—*cont.*
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Blockade of the Black Sea, [237] 1322
Constantinople—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1734; [242] 1767
Navigation of the Danube, [238] 539
War, The—Suez Canal, [237] 530
Explosives Act, 1875—Conveyance of Explosives, [237] 1207
Fishery Award, [239] 285
Merchant Seamen, Leave, [237] 312; Select Committee, [240] 1609
Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1030
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
Channel and Particular Service Squadrons, [242] 1768
Coal Contracts, [238] 158
Mediterranean Squadron, [237] 461, 462
Sailing Regulations of the Fleet, [240] 1879
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1303
Russia—Purchase and Equipment of Privateers, [240] 357
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1523
Report, [240] 1153
United States—Treaty of Washington—22nd Article—Award of the Fisheries Commissioners, [240] 1492

*Govan Burgh Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 22, [238] 142

**Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
*c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. James Lowther*) *Feb* 28, [238] 507; after debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 120]
Questions, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Rylands; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 1297; Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 21, [240] 358; Question, Mr. D. Taylor; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 11, [241] 1240
Bill withdrawn* *July* 11

GRANT, Mr. A., *Leith*
East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 443
India—Trade between India and China, [239] 1286
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 45, [240] 1728; *cl.* 83, Amendt. 1893; *add. cl.* 1972; Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 617, 630; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 644]
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1532

GRANTHAM, Mr. W., *Surrey, E.*
Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. [239] 1512
Burials, Res. Amendt. [237] 1822
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. Amendt. [238] 1253
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 711
Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1933
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] *425
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1289

**Granville, Earl**
- Bishoprics, Report, [239] 957
- Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [238] 47
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [238] 753 ; Comm. 828
- Criminal Law—Alleged Cruelty to a Cat, [238] 1035
- Cyprus, Island of—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Financial Arrangements, [242] 22, 27
  - Sanitary Condition, [241] 1435
  - Slavery, [241] 1225, 1948
- Dover Harbour, Motion for Papers, [238] 1927
- Earl Russell, the Late, [240] 1033
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions [237] 1199, 1483, 1484
  - Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1569, 1570 ; [242] 381, 382
  - Armenians, [240] 1246
  - Armistice, The, [237] 911 ;—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, 1318, 1321 ; —Treaties of 1856 and 1871, 1841
  - Conference, The, [237] 1599 ; — Greece, [238] 1021
  - Congress at Berlin, [241] 1201, 1426 ; — Anglo-Turkish Convention, [241] 1050 ; [242] 484 ;—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1774, 1779, 1809, 1810, 1811; —Ministerial Statement, [240] 1056, 1060
  - Dardanelles, The—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1421, 1842, 1843 ; — Resignation of Ministers, 449, 452, 453
  - Greece—Correspondence, [237] 617
  - Message from the Crown, [239] 185, 186
  - Movements of the Fleet, [238] 43
  - Papers, [237] 154
  - Prince Gortchakoff's Circular and Memorandum, [239] 1219
  - Russian Armies, Advance of, [237] 818
  - Russia and Turkey—Terms of Peace, [238] 529, 615, 949, 1480, 1580
  - Treaty of Berlin—Port of Batoum—Personal Explanation, [242] 336, 338
- Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte, Res. [237] 511, 514
- Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Conference, Address for Correspondence, [238] 1720, 1722
- Emperor of Germany, Attempted Assassination of, [240] 1060
- Foreign Office—Abstraction of a Document—Memorandum of Agreement between England and Russia, [241] 480
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), [241] 742, 848
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, Comm. [240] 618
- Message from the Queen—Calling out of the Reserve Forces, [239] 185, 186, 272, 274 ; Motion for an Address, 777
- Metropolis—Hyde Park—Shelters, [241] 955
- Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [239] 1713 ; [240] 217, 244, 248
- National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 410
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [237] 818, 910
  - Easter Recess, [238] 1381
  - House of Lords—Strangers, [242] 201 ;—Ventilation, [241] 2018

[*cont.*

**Granville, Earl**—*cont.*
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 625, 633
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 16, 18, 30, 33, 36
- Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Consolidated), 2R. [241] 485
- Patent Laws, [238] 1579
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. [241] 1439
- Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 204
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1965
- Science and Art—Museum of Casts from the Antique, [238] 1945 ; [242] 516

**Gray, Mr. E. D.**, *Tipperary*
- Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1597
- Collection of Rates (Dublin), Leave, [240] 1676
- Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 25, 26

238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 17, 307 ;
. *cl.* 29, Amendt. 327 ; *cl.* 65, 349 ; Amendt.
. 351, 353, 356, 357 ; *cl.* 67, 457 ; *cl.* 99,
. Amendt. 483 ; *add. cl.* 602 ; New Schedule,
. 891, 893 ; Consid. *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1910 ;
. *cl.* 91, Amendt. 1912 ; *cl.* 104, Amendt. *ib.*
239] 3R. 266

- Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 519
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Board of Works—Report of the Commission, [238] 155 ; [240] 1882
  - Cashel and Sligo, Disfranchisement of, [240] 1883
  - Collection of Rates (Dublin), [240] 1257
  - Dublin Metropolitan Police—Annual Return, [238] 539
  - Irish Constabulary Fund, [237] 1055
  - Lord Justice Christian, [237] 531
  - Post Office—Mr. John Daly, Case of, [240] 1603, 1604
  - Public Health, Dublin, [238] 1746
  - Royal College of Science, Dublin, [237] 620
  - Royal Constabulary — New Code, [238] 1295 ;— Payments for Special Services, [237] 458
  - Science and Art Museum, Dublin, [141] 1467
- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1929, 1971
- Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1527 ; Motion for Returns, [241] 583, 584
- Irish Estimates, [240] 1668
- Local Government and Taxation of Towns (Ireland), [238] 261
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 807, 812
- Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 365
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 203
- Parliamentary Reporting, Nomination of Select Committee, [240] 1678
- Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 551
- Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 67, 97

[*cont.*

GRAY, Mr. E. D.—*cont.*
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 580
Public Health (Ireland), Comm. [238] 722; *add. cl.* [240] 1992
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1835, 1844
Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, [239] 180, 183
Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 696, 697, 702
Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1642
Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1552, 1554, 1560, 1562, 1563
Stationery Office, [239] 1787, 1789, 1791, 1793, 1798, 1799, 1803, 1806
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1588
Turkey — Reported Defensive Treaty with, [241] 952
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 275
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 153

*Greece*
*Alleged Agreement with Turkey,* Notice of Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 1, [242] 863
*Diplomatic Communications,* Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 25, [237] 460
*Protocols, &c.* 1826 *to* 1830, Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 7, [238] 875
Papers (Greece, No. 1) . . . . [1974]
*The Treaties of* 1856, Observations, The Duke of Argyll; Reply, The Earl of Derby; debate thereon *Mar* 7, [238] 830
Parl. Papers—
Correspondence (Turkey, No. 19) [1968]
The Congress (Ditto, No. 20) [1969]
Doctors Leslie, &c. (Ditto, No. 21) [1970]

*Greece—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—The Negroponte Correspondence*
Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 31, [237] 727
Moved, "That this House, having had laid before it the Correspondence between Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople and the Foreign Office, relating to certain charges which had been made against the Right honourable the Member for Greenwich, based on his Letters to a M. Negroponte, views with regret the part taken in the matter by Her Majesty's Ambassador" (*Mr. Evelyn Ashley*) *Mar* 12, [238] 1156; after long debate, Question put; A. 132, N. 206; M. 74 (D. L. 46)

*Greece and Crete*
Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 21, [238] 60; Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 25, 1955

GREENE, Mr. E., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1977
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 609, 976
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 491, 492
Paris Exhibition—English Cattle, [241] 329
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 89
Ritualism, Res. [241] 924
St. Kitt's, Taxation in, [242] 641
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [240] 109
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 811
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 498
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1144
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1859

*Greenwich Hospital Fund—Naval Pensions*
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 14, [237] 1617
Order in Council . . . . . *P.P.* 302

*Greenwich Out-Pensioners*
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 5, [237] 1047

GREGORY, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
Bills of Sale, Consid. *add. cl.* [239] 1264
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 1508
Colonial Marriages, 2R. Amendt. [238] 406
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [241] 1749; *cl.* 16, 1898; *cl.* 22, 2004; *cl.* 29, 2012; Amendt. 2015; *cl.* B, [242] 432; *cl.* D, Amendt. 433, 436; Schedule 5, 814, 817
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1567
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. [238] 1479
County Government, 2R. [237] 1881
Criminal Law — Burglaries and Robberies (Metropolis), [238] 876
Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1875
Dental Practitioners, Comm. *cl.* 22, [240] 1321
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1052
Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1554
High Court of Justice, [240] 1071
241] Highways, Comm. 464; *cl.* 11, 474, 477, 478, 861, 869; *cl.* 18, 884; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1081, 1083; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1088; Amendt. 1091; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1095; *cl.* 24, Amendt. 1099, 1100; *add. cl.* 1362, 1365
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [242] 1790
Joint Stock Companies Acts, 1862 and 1867, Res. [239] 1705
Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1898
Libel Law Amendment, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 1477
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 419
Parliament — Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 397
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 273
Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties, Res. [240] 635
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1255

[*cont.*

GREGORY, Mr. G. B.—*cont.*
  Railway Accidents, 1877—Continuous Footboards, [242] 1525
  Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. Amendt. [241] 1168
  Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 954, 965, 967
    Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 945
    Land Registry, [240] 984
    Law Charges, [240] 941, 943
    Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1766
    Public Buildings, [240] 1366
    Queen's Bench, &c. [240] 968
    Woods, Forests, &c. Office of, [240] 84, 88
  Valuation, 2R. [237] 1594
  Ways and Means, Report, [239] 1245; Comm. [242] 1365, 1366

GREY, Earl
  Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions, Address for a Paper, [240] 1330
  Eastern Question — Congress, The — Alleged Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1061, 1570, 1571
    Ministerial Statement, [240] 1059
  Message from the Queen—Calling out of the Reserve Forces, [239] 269
  Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. [241] 113; 3R. 307

GUINNESS, Sir A. E., *Dublin*
  Army—Royal Engineer Department, [239] 1092
  Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 19
  Post Office—Surveyor General's Clerks—Dublin and Edinburgh, [242] 1945

**Gun Licence Act (1870) Amendment Bill**
(*Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Mark Stewart*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 53]
  2R. [Dropped]

*Gun Licence Act,* 1870—*Rabbits (Scotland)*
  Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, [239] 1089

GURNEY, Right Hon. R., *Southampton*
  Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 676

**Habitual Drunkards Bill**
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Ashley, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Edward Jenkins, Mr. William Holms, Mr. Richard Smyth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 27]
  Read 2°, after long debate *July* 3, [241] 688
  Committee *; Report *July* 9 [Bill 250]
  Bill withdrawn * *August* 9

*Habitual Drunkards* [*Stamp Duty*]
  Considered in Committee *July* 25
  Resolved, That it is expedient to impose a Stamp Duty on Licences to keep Retreats for the reception of Habitual Drunkards, and also on every Patient admitted into such Retreat, and for the renewal of such Licences, which may become payable under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to facilitate the control and cure of Habitual Drunkards
  Resolution reported, and agreed to *July* 26

HALIFAX, Viscount
  India—The Deccan—Removal of Mr. Oliphant, [238] 1924

HALL, Mr. A. W., *Oxford*
  Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 527
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1109

HALSEY, Mr. T. F., *Herts*
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 523

HAMILTON, Lord C. J., *Lynn Regis*
  Hydrophobia, [237] 728
  Law and Justice (Ireland)—Mr. Justice Keogh, Charge of, [238] 1948
  Turkey—Trade in the Black Sea, &c. [237] 1621

HAMILTON, Lord G. F. (Under Secretary of State for India, *afterwards* †Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Middlesex*
  †Austrian Cattle from Spain, Importation of, [241] 493
  †Bethnal Green Museum, Res. [240] 37
  †Cattle Disease—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [241] 960
  †Charity Commission—North Sunderland Harbour, [240] 1607
  Education Department—Miscellaneous Questions
    †Education Minute, 1878—New Schools, [241] 125; — "Unnecessary Schools," 1577
    †Financial Statement, [240] 1606
    †Inspectors of Elementary Schools, [241] 823
    †Promotions, [241] 1579
    †Public Elementary Schools—Musical Instruction, [242] 1528
    †School Fees, [241] 761
  †Education Report (Scotland), [241] 493
  †Elementary Education Act, 1870—Superior Elementary Education, [239] 1371
    †Wymington, [242] 1524
  †Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 850
  †Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res, [241] 789, 792
  †Endowed Schools Act, 1869—Timberscombe School Scheme, [242] 519
  †Endowed Schools Commissioners—Educational Endowments, [240] 1603

[*cont.*

Hamilton, Lord G. F.—*cont.*

- India—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Bengal—Enhancement of Rent, [237] 463 ; —Native Police of, 1053
  - Bombay Town Hall, [239] 415, 416
  - Ecclesiastical Salaries, [237] 248
  - Famine—The Census, [238] 1742
  - Indian Budget, 1878-9, [238] 1753
  - Indian Finance—Civil Expenditure, [237] 1423
  - Indian Labourers at La Réunion, [238] 59
  - Irrigation Reports, [237] 1924
  - Jowakis, [238] 301
  - Khelat—Occupation of Quetta, [237] 320, 462, 723
  - Licence Tax Act, [238] 1758
  - Local Service and Staff Corps, [237] 1923
  - Lord's Day Act, [238] 1491
  - Madras Harbour, [237] 819
  - Maharajah Scindia, The, [237] 249 ; [238] 1757
  - Nizam, The—Mr. Oliphant, [237] 529
  - Press Law, [238] 1592
  - Private Corbett, Case of, [237] 254
  - Salt Laws, [238] 1484
  - Sir John Strachey's Speeches, [237] 1535
  - Taxation, [238] 156, 157, 450
  - West Frontier Policy, [237] 246
- India—East India (Appointment of Mr. M. Macpherson), Res. [237] 1975
- India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 459
- India—East India (Public Works), Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 323, 331, 355
- India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 478, 490, 1323
- Indian Press Law, Res. [238] 1603, 1606
- †Ireland—Science and Art Museum, Dublin, [241] 1467 ; [242] 864
- †Medical Reform—Bills before Parliament, [241] 760 ; [242] 523
- †Metropolis—Union of Benefices Act, [239] 1370
- †Paris Exhibition—English Cattle, [241] 330
- †Select Committee on Cattle Plague, 1877—Cattle from Ireland, [241] 124
- †South Kensington Museum—National Portrait Gallery, [240] 25
- †Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [242] 1219, 1227
  - †Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1252, 1256
  - †Science and Art Department, &c. [242] 1259
- †Teachers and School Returns, [240] 27

Hamilton, Marquess of, *Donegal Co.*

- Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, [239] 416
- Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1585
- Tramways (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [239] 100

Hamilton, Mr. B., *Berwickshire*

- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 613

Hamilton, Mr. I. T., *Dublin Co.*

- Army—Royal Engineers, [239] 117

Hammond, Lord

- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [242] 855
- China—Chefoo Convention, [242] 37
- Cyprus, Island of—Financial Arrangements, [242] 25
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 514
  - Armistice—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1315
  - Correspondence, [237] 920
  - Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 851
  - Treaty of Berlin—Agreement between England and Russia, [242] 379
- Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Conference, Address for Correspondence, [238] 1723
- Foreign Office—Abstraction of a Document—Memorandum of Agreement between England and Russia, [241] 482
- Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, Comm. [238] 951

Hamond, Mr. C. F., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*

- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1028

Hampton, Lord

- Army—Competitive Examinations for Commissions, [240] 354
- Army Examinations—Literary and Physical Competitions, Address for a Paper, [240] 1328
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 309

Hanbury, Mr. R. W., *Tamworth*

- Eastern Question—Congress—Greece, [238] 1400, 1490
  - Peace, Terms of—Despatch of Earl Derby, Dec. 25, 1877, [237] 321
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 21, [241] 1092
- Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 970
- "Nineteenth Century"—The Article on "Liberty in the East and West" (Mr. Gladstone)—Mr. Hanbury's Motion, [240] 1069, 1070, 1170, 1616, 1617
- Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 552
- Russia and Turkey—The War—Proposed Terms of Peace, [237] 374
- Turkey—The War—Russian Sailors, [237] 1733
- Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. Amendt. [240] 1815

Hankey, Mr. T., *Peterborough*

- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1386
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1307
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 21, [241] 1088, 1089 ; *cl.* 22, 1094
- Inland Revenue—Inhabited House Duty, [237] 249
- Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, [239] 292
- Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 14, Amendt. [241] 1936

[*cont.*

HANKEY, Mr. T.—*cont.*
  Parliament—Private Bills, [238] 1958
  Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 398
  Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1253; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1355
  Railway Accidents — Death of Sir Francis Goldsmid, [240] 1166
  Ways and Means—Dog Tax, [239] 1449
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 607, 1181

*Harbour and Lighthouse Returns*
  Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 1, [239] 285

*Harbour Loans*
  Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 1, [241] 489

*Harbours—North Sunderland Harbour*
  Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 17, [240] 1607

HARCOURT, Sir W. G. V., *Oxford City*
  Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [237] 1937, 1938, 1940
  Central Asia—Reported Russian Advance, [242] 1934
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 1017; *cl.* 2, 1642, 1705
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1602
  Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Bill withdrawn, [242] 2038
  Customs—Re-organization, [241] 322
  Cyprus, Island of—Health of the Troops, [242] 1946
    Sovereignty and Administration, [242] 387
  Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1854
  Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 760, 762, 1070
  Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
    Anglo-Turkish Convention—Government of Cyprus, [242] 40
    Congress, The, [238] 1359
    Negotiations, [239] 1431
  Exchequer Bills and Bonds (No. 2), [242] 1532
  Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1775
  Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 889, 894
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [242] 1792
  Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 283, 286, 328, 333, 529
  Navy — H.M.S. "Beagle"— Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, Res. [242] 1198
  Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1388
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 164
  Real Estate Intestacy, [241] 1198, 1199
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1706, 1717
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1114, 1120, 1121, 1227, 1247
  Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 575, 577

[*cont.*

HARCOURT, Sir W. G. V.—*cont.*
  Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 3R. [242] 2038
  Turkey—Asia Minor—The Lazes, [242] 2021, 2023
  Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 22

HARCOURT, Lt.-Col. E. W., *Oxfordshire*
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 178, 552, 555

HARDCASTLE, Mr. E., *Lancashire, S.E.*
  Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 791
  Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1057
  Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 50, [238] 339; *add. cl.* 609
  Highways, Comm. *cl.* 19, [241] 897
  Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1350
  Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1927
  Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [237] 356
  Manchester Corporation Water, Instruction, [237] 1724
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 771

HARDINGE, Viscount
  Army Examinations — Riding and Athletics, [240] 351

HARDY, Right Hon. Gathorne (Secretary of State for War) *afterwards* †Secretary of State for India), *Oxford University*
  Army—Miscellaneous Questions
    Army Clothing, [238] 451
    Army Equipment—First and Second Army Corps, [238] 377
    Army Rank—Clerks of the Royal Engineer Department, [237] 1620
    Auxiliary Forces, [238] 448
    Auxiliary Hospital, Woolwich, [237] 1210
    Brigade Depôts—Cavalry Officers, [237] 251;—Quartermasters, [239] 35
    Commissariat Department, Officers of, [239] 201
    Courts of Inquiry and Courts Martial, [238] 1489
    Defences of the Humber, [238] 636
    Heavy Artillery, [239] 37
    India—Artillery Pensions, [238] 1045
    Ireland — Married Soldiers' Quarters — Longford Barracks, [237] 1847
    Kaffir Outbreak—Army Surgeons, [237] 1619
    Landguard Fort, [238] 153
    Medical Department — Candidates, [237] 1849
    Military Service, [238] 300, 658, 663
    Officers of new Line Regiments, [239] 200
    Perak Expedition—Allowances to Officers, &c. [237] 533
    Royal Engineers, [239] 117
    Royal Warrant of 1877—Article 88, [237] 722, 1209
    Veterinary Department, [238] 1398

[*cont.*

HARDY, Right Hon. G.—cont.
- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 642, 646
- Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, [238] 718
  - Divine Service, [238] 718
  - Land Forces, [238] 665, 690, 712
- Eastern Question—Reserve Forces, [239] 170, 172
  - Russia and Turkey—Treaty of San Stefano, [238] 1957
- †India—Famine in Bombay, [239] 960
  - †Public Meetings, [239] 667
- †Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 924, 1021
- Mutiny Act—Military Law, [238] 299

238] Mutiny, Comm. 1977, 1982, 1983; *cl.* 1, 1984, 1998, 1999, 2000; *cl.* 2, 2002; *cl.* 4, *ib.*; *cl.* 16, 2004, 2006, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2015; *cl.* 17, 2024; *cl.* 18, 2026, 2027; *cl.* 19, 2030

239] *cl.* 22, 39, 43, 44, 46, 47; *cl.* 23, 55, 56, 59; *cl.* 26, 126; *cl.* 39, 129; *cl.* 41, 134; *cl.* 44, 135; *cl.* 48, 138; *cl.* 56, 142, 143, 144, 146; *cl.* 57, 147; *cl.* 97, 150; *add. cl.* 157, 168; 3R. 208, 211

- Parliament—Mutiny Bill, [238] 446
  - Orders of the Day, [237] 378
- Scotland—Defences of the Firth of Forth, [238] 1399
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 937, 959, 960, 975, 977; Personal Explanation, 1058, 1062, 1065, 1067, 1068, 1223
- Supply—Report, [238] 945
- Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 268
- War Office Clerks, [239] 284

[*See* CRANBROOK, Viscount]

HARDY, Mr. A. GATHORNE-, *Canterbury*
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* B, [242] 431
- Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 718
- Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 91
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 259, 265

HARDY, Mr. J. S., *Rye*
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 763
- Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 132
- Railway Time Tables, [239] 1690

HARMAN, Mr. E. R., KING-, *Sligo*
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 990; *cl.* 68, [242] 149; *cl.* 71, 179, 182
- Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, Res. [239] 1261, 1262
- Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 1035
- Ireland—Inland Navigation, [241] 1465
  - Registry of Deeds—The Royal Commission, [240] 158
- Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1229
- Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1109
- Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1131

[*cont.*

HARMAN, Mr. E. R. KING-—*cont.*
- Mutiny and Marine Mutiny Acts, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1192
- Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 671
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 357; *cl.* 1, 640, 1813, 1836, 1849, 1851; [240] 117; *cl.* 6, 445, 446; *add. cl.* 873, 898, 919
- Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 697
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1679

HARRISON, Mr. J. F., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
- India—Irrigation Reports, [237] 1923
- Law and Justice—County Court Judges, [238] 153
- Public Parks (Scotland), 2R. [237] 359

HARROWBY, Earl of
- Bishoprics, Report, [239] 958
- Church of England—Preachers in St. Paul's, [240] 126, 491
- Eastern Question—Congress—Treaty of San Stefano, [240] 1249
- Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 964
- Parliament—House of Lords—Strangers, [242] 201

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of, *New Radnor*
- Burials, Res. [237] 1833
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 197; Comm. 1023; *cl.* 2, 1677
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1604
- County Government, 2R. [237] 1907, 1915; Comm. [238] 942, 1403
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1669, 1685
- Earl Russell, the Late, [240] 1084
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 527, 611, 753, 758, 1118
- Eastern Question, [237] 823
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1614
  - Appointment of Lord Napier and Sir Garnet Wolseley to Commands, [238] 453
  - Armistice, The, [237] 926;—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1325, 1330, 1622, 1623
  - Congress, The, [237] 1851; [238] 977; [239] 204, 288; [240] 748
  - Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 965, 966, 1972, 1973
  - Gallipoli, Occupation of, [238] 62, 63
  - H.M. Government, Present Position of, [237] 464, 467, 470
  - Instructions to the British Plenipotentiary, [242] 220
  - Ministerial Statement, Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1079
  - Negotiations, [239] 1420
  - Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 792
  - Reserve Forces, [239] 170
  - Russia and England, [239] 247, 260

[*cont.*

**Hartington**, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*
- Russia and Turkey—Congress, [239] 120 ;—Treaty of Peace, [238] 637
- Supplementary Vote—Occupation of Constantinople by the Russians, [237] 1211, 1214
- Estimates, Discussions on the, [240] 937
- Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 133
- Martin, Mr. Wykeham, Death of, [240] 1054
- Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, [239] 289 ; Motion for an Address, 1014, 1021
- Military Forces—Expenses of Indian Contingent, [239] 1597, 1721, 1724, 1884
- Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent, [240] 161 ; Res. 264, 379, 601
- Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1205
- Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [239] 168
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Breach of Privilege, [239] 670
  - Business of the House, [237] 256 ; [240] 498
  - Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1440
  - Order of Business, [241] 764, 2063, 2064
  - Orders of the Day—Postponement of Motions, [239] 963
  - Public Business, [239] 1450 ; [241] 132
  - Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 77
- Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 240
- Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1472
- Queen's Message — Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, Res. [242] 258
- Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1794
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [240] 122
- 237] Supplementary Estimate, 375, 377 ; Ministerial Statement, 534 ; Personal Explanation, 1062 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1222, 1235, 1304 ; Comm. 1339
- 242] 1181
- Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 561
  - Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1460, 1465
- Turkey—Asiatic Dominions of the Sultan, [241] 1470
- Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 269

**Hatherley**, Lord
- St. Katherine's Hospital—Royal Commission, 1871, [238] 1384
- Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. [238] 141

**Havelock**, Sir H. M., *Sunderland*
- Admiralty and War Office Re-organization—Clerks of Royal Engineer Department, [240] 1037
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Commissariat Department, Officers of, [239] 201
  - Enlistment for India, [238] 665
  - Equipment—First and Second Army Corps, [238] 376

[*cont.*

**Havelock**, Sir H. M.—*cont.*
- Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1407, 1408
  - Land Forces, [238] 704, 707
  - Warlike Stores, [242] 1411
- Consuls—Convention with the United States, [242] 1765
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 667
- India—Mission to Cabul, [242] 2017
- Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 760
- Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1688 ;—Pay of Officers, 1718
- Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 422
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1994, 1997 ; *cl.* 48, [239] 140 ; *cl.* 56, 144 ; *cl.* 57, 148
- Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 808
- Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1385
- Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1483, 1484
  - Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1530
  - Colonial Local Revenue, [240] 1306
- Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1359, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1364, 1365, 1366, 1373

**Hay**, Admiral Right Hon. Sir J. C. D., *Stamford*
- Breech-Loading Ordnance, Res. [238] 1150
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 920
- Eastern Question—British Subjects in Constantinople, [237] 723
  - Negotiations, [239] 1440
- Greenwich Hospital — Age Pensions, [242] 1544
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1318
- Navy — H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, Res. [242] 1199
- Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1423
  - Military Pensions and Allowances, [238] 1474
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 778, 1234
- Turkey—British Fleet in the Sea of Marmora, [240] 1256
- Vote of Credit and the Navy Estimates, [238] 877

**Hayter**, Colonel A. D., *Bath*
- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Militia, [240] 1418
  - Militia Colonels, [242] 525
  - Northampton Militia, [240] 1344
  - Retirement of Officers, [242] 224
- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 644
- Army—Physical Examinations of Officers—Report of Joint Committee, [242] 1397
- Army Estimates—Militia, &c. [240] 1444
  - Volunteer Corps, [240] 1456
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Congress—Correspondence, [240] 1252
  - English Representatives, [240] 1167
  - Russia and Turkey—Batoum, [242] 2018

[*cont.*

Hayter, Colonel A. D.—*cont.*

- India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1917, 1927
- Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 756
- Mutiny, Comm. [238] 1977
- Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1478
- South Africa—Kaffir War—Officers on Special Service, [240] 1389
- Supplementary Estimate, Comm. [237] 1380
- Supplementary Estimates, &c. [242] 1182
- Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1267
    - Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [240] 1386
    - Supplementary Army Estimates, [242] 1177; Amendt. 1456, 1463, 1474, 1493
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    - Crete and Mitylene, [241] 957
    - Crete — Employment of Bashi-Bazouks, [241] 329;—Insurrection in, [241] 499
    - Sultan, Reported Conspiracy against the, [241] 1580
- Turkey—Murder of Mr. Ogle, Res. [242] 1984

Henniker, Lord

- Commutation of Tithes, Comm. [242] 205
- Explosives Act—Stowage of Gunpowder on Shipboard—The "Pereora," [242] 17
- Innkeepers, 2R. [241] 1052
- Locomotion—Railway Passenger Duty, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 281
- Parliament—Private Bills—Standing Orders, [237] 912
- Railway Returns (Continuous Brakes), 1R. [239] 1083; Comm. Schedule 3, 1361
- Railways—Miscellaneous Questions
    - Continuous Brakes, [238] 1280
    - Management of, [237] 456, 457
    - Railway Accidents, [241] 1331; — Sir Francis Goldsmid, Accident to, [241] 317
- Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1), Comm. [241] 1441, 1447; [242] 213, 1284
- Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3), Comm. [242] 1499
- Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Res. [242] 342
- Weights and Measures, 2R. [241] 2038, 2044; Comm. *cl.* 38, [242] 209; *cl.* 50, 210; *cl.* 53, 211; *cl.* 78, 212

Henry, Mr. Mitchell, *Galway Co.*

- Army—Medical Service, [240] 1880
- Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 845
- Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1430
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 559; Comm. *cl.* 16, 1886, 1887; *cl.* 21, 1917; *cl.* 55, 2120, 2121, 2123, 2126, 2128, 2133
- County Government, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 935, 936, 943
- Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 683
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1683, 1745
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    - Criminal Law—Prison Discipline, [242] 867
    - Geological Survey of Ireland—The "Freeman's Journal," [237] 372
    - Peace Preservation Act (1875)—Searches for Arms, [241] 125, 126

[*cont.*

Henry, Mr. Mitchell—*cont.*

- Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1555, 1559
- Ireland — University Education Res. [240] 1136
- Judicial Statistics—Convict Prisons, [242] 1174
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 497
- Mutiny, Comm. [238] 1983; *cl.* 1, 1990, 1991, 1998, 1999; *cl.* 16, 2005, 2011, 2018, 2022; *cl.* 22, [239] 43, 49; *cl.* 23, 55, 56, 57; *cl.* 39, 129; *cl.* 48, 137; *add. cl.* 156, 161, 164, 165
- National Portrait Gallery, Res. [238] 776
- Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1418
- Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 838
- Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1056
- Parliament—New Writ for Clare County—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Res. [242] 47
- Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 416
- Parliament — Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 394
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Amendt. [237] 120, 136, 138, 179 180, 213
- Prison Act, 1877—Miscellaneous Questions
    - New Rules, [242] 1437, 1438
    - Plank Beds, [242] 1174
    - Prison Discipline, [242] 216, 217;—Personal Search, [241] 1846, 1847
- Prisons (Ireland) Act—Miscellaneous Questions
    - Discipline, [241] 1845
    - Inspectors, [242] 1763
    - Pillows, [242] 1764, 1765
- Sergeant M'Carthy, Case of, Motion for an Address, [241] 1390, 1414, 1424
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1246, 1295, 1296
- Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 686, 690, 692, 695, 702
    - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 679
    - Stationery Office, [240] 49, 53, 54, 57, 61, 64
    - Superintendence of Prisons, &c. Ireland, [242] 1592, 1593, 1597, 1599, 1605, 1607; Amendt. 1608
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1698
- Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 499
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 599, 606

*Heralds' College*

- Moved, "That the Heralds' College, or College of Arms, if recognized as a public department, ought to be under efficient public control" (*Mr. Goldney*) *Feb* 26, [238] 406
  [House counted out]

Herbert, Mr. H. A., *Kerry Co.*

- Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 19

[*cont.*

Herbert, Mr. H. A.—*cont.*
Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1557
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 906, 913

Herbert, Mr. S., *Wilton*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1983

Hermon, Mr. E., *Preston*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 513 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1707
Dublin Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1046
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 65, [238] 347 ; *cl.* 69, 471 ; Schedule 1, 884
Financial Schedules, [239] 287
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 21, Amendt. [241] 1091
Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, [239] 296
Mutiny, 3R. [239] 210
National Gallery, [241] 793
Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1048
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 162
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1186
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 85, [240] 1899
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1389
Supply—County Courts, [240] 980
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1456
  Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 84
Ways and Means, Report, [239] 745

*Herring Fishery Commission, The*
Question, Sir Alexander Gordon ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 14, [237] 1618
*The Report—Legislation*, Question, The Marquess of Lorne ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 10, [239] 1690
  The Report . . . . . . . *P.P.* [1979]
  Herring Fishery (Sweden) . . . [1955]

Herschell, Mr. F., *Durham*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1986
Breach of Promise of Marriage, [241] 588
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1640, 1650, 1724
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 1478, 1480
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), [240] 1671
Criminal Law Consolidation, [238] 1491
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 668
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1314, 1317 ; *cl.* 13, 1320
India—Jowaki Afreedis Expedition, [240] 1605
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 131
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 307 ; Consid. *cl.* 6, 1818
Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1923
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 515
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1829, 1851
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 808
Supply—Natural History Museum, Erection of, [240] 1383
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [242] 1688

*Hertford College—University Tests Act,* 1871
Question, Mr. Watkin Williams ; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 9, [239] 1593

Hervey, Lord F., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 849
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 306
National Gallery, [241] 794
National Portrait Gallery, Res. [238] 770
Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle," Execution on, [238] 1744
Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 841
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 626
Supply—Public Buildings, [240] 1370
  Treasury, [238] 1544

Heygate, Mr. W. U., *Leicestershire, S.*
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 411
Dog Licences, [238] 1044
Egyptian Obelisk (Cleopatra's Needle), [237] 724
Factories and Workshops, Comm. Schedule 2, [238] 887
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1132
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 203
Railways (Continuous Brakes), [238] 451
Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1015

Hibbert, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [237] 1969
Church Livings, Res. [237] 1555
County Boards Bill—Petty Sessional Districts, [237] 820
County Government, Leave, [237] 606 ; 2R. 1686
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Leave, [239] 1957
Customs and Inland Revenue Act—Depreciation of Machinery, [242] 864
237] Factories and Workshops, 2R. 1476
238] Comm. *cl.* 13, 108, 114 ; *cl.* 16, 126 ;
, *cl.* 22, 314 ; *cl.* 65, 347 ; *cl.* 88, 482 ;
, *cl.* 99, 490 ; *add. cl.* 590 ; Schedule 4,
, Amendt. 890
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 4, [241] 466, 468 ; *cl.* 7, 472 ; *cl.* 9, *ib.* ; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 474, 475, 478, 868, 876 ; *cl.* 31, 1108 ; *add. cl.* 1366
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 487
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 300
Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. [241] 1030
Parliament—Public Business—Amendments on Supply, [238] 1400
Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1056
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. Amendt. [237] 409, 418
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 396
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1040
Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 541, 559
Prisons Act—Visiting Committees, [237] 820
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 674

[*cont.*

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T.—*cont.*
Supply—Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [240] 1018, 1019
Convict Establishments, [240] 1006
County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1010
Police Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 998
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 55; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 60; *cl.* 16, 62, 65
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1135
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1855

HICK, Mr. J., *Bolton*
Isle of Man—Vaccination, [238] 1840

**Highways Bill** (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 95]
237] Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Jan* 31, 722
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 18; Debate adjourned
239] Debate resumed *April* 12, 1257; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
240] Committee; Report *June* 7, 1345
241] *Bicycles on Highways*, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 27, 324
. Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 28, 450
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House regrets to find in the Highways Bill, as now proposed to be re-committed, no adequate provision for obtaining from those classes whose traffic most conduces to the wear and tear of the main roads in England and Wales, some proportionate contribution towards the maintenance of such roads; and that, in the opinion of this House, no settlement of this question can be final or complete which does not include such provision" (*Mr. Reginald Yorke*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 256, N. 47; M. 209 (D. L. 189)
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P. [Bill 214]
. Committee—R.P. *July* 5, 857
. Committee—R.P. *July* 9, 1078
. Committee—R.P. *July* 9, 1153
. Question, Mr. Thornhill; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 11, 1241
. Committee; Report *July* 12, 1337 [Bill 261]
242] Considered *July* 24, 194; after short debate, further Proceeding adjourned
Further Proceeding resumed *July* 25; Amendts. made; Amendt. in page 13, line 27, after "shall," insert "so far as practicable;" Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and negatived; other Amendts. made
Read 3° * *July* 26
. Read 1ª * (*Viscount Cranbrook*) *July* 29 (No. 177)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 1, 856
Committee * *August* 5 (No. 192)
. Report *August* 6, 1285
Read 3ª * *August* 8

[*cont.*

*Highways Bill*—cont.
*c.* Lords Amendts. considered, and agreed to, with Amendts., and consequential Amendts. *August* 12, [242] 1855
*l.* Returned from the Commons with the Amendts. agreed to, with Amendts., and consequential Amendts. *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 77]

**Highways (South Wales) Bill** (*Mr. Hussey Vivian, Mr. Christopher Talbot, Mr. Dillwyn, Viscount Emlyn*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 160]
Read 2° * *May* 14
Committee *; Report *May* 23
Considered * *May* 27
Read 3° * *May* 29
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl Cawdor*) *May* 31 (No. 98)
Read 2ª * *June* 25
Committee * *June* 27
Report * *June* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 1
Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 34]

HILL, Mr. A. Staveley, *Staffordshire, W.*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 928
Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1925, 1936
Licensing Laws Amendment, Comm. [237] 1692
Supplementary Estimate, Comm. [237] 1394
Valuation, 2R. [237] 1594

HILL, Mr. T. R., *Worcester*
Supply—Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 1001

HOGG, Lt.-Colonel Sir J. M'GAREL-, *Truro*
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 1647
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [241] 1740; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1920, 1921; *cl.* 32, Amendt. 2082, 2083; *cl.* 44, Amendt. 2089; *cl.* B, [242] 428
Contracts for Watering the Streets, [240] 257
County Government, 2R. [237] 1890
Epping Forest, 3R. [241] 722
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 29, Amendt. [241] 1103
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 696
Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
Euston Square—The Gardens, [241] 126
Newspaper Kiosques, [237] 1729
Thames Embankment—New Opera House, [237] 1208; [242] 1639
239] Metropolis Management and Building Acts
. Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 755;
. *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 10, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 15,
. Amendt. 756; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 757; *cl.* 20,
. Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 22, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 23,
. Amendt. *ib.*
Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. [238] 1217, 1232; Bill withdrawn, [240] 493
Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 14, [241] 1937, 1939

[*cont.*

HOGG, Lieut.-Colonel Sir J. M.—*cont.*
Metropolitan Building Act, 1855—All Saints' Church, Lambeth, [238] 540
Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866—Eelbrook, Common, Fulham, [238] 635
Monuments Metropolis, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 736

HOLKER, Sir J. (*see* ATTORNEY GENERAL, The)

HOLLAND, Sir H. T., *Midhurst*
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 415
Natal—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 460
South African Confederation—Outbreak of the Native Tribes, [237] 625

HOLMS, Mr. J., *Hackney*
Army—Militia Reserve, [239] 855
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [238] 682, 690, 707
Constantinople, British Subjects in, [238] 452
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 226; Comm. *cl.* 2, Motion for Adjournment, 1676; *cl.* 68, [242] 159
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 1301
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 924
Factories and Workshops, Comm. Schedule 1, [238] 614
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 543, 544
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1520
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 23, [239] 54
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1228
Turkey—British Subjects in Constantinople, [237] 1847
Turkey—Free Trade, [241] 1468

HOLMS, Mr. W., *Paisley*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1589
Education (Scotland), Consid. [242] 1703; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1710
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 10, 95; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 100, 101, 102; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 108, 113; Amendt. 116; *cl.* 16, 122; *cl.* 17, 307; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 318; *cl.* 47, 336; *cl.* 69, 469
Locomotives on Highways (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [242] 979; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 980
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 347
Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 360, 1615
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1738
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 12, [240] 1191; *cl.* 41, Amendt. 1713, 1715; *cl.* 83, Amendt. 1892
Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875—Scotland, [240] 495
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1853
Supply—Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1012; Amendt. 1013, 1016
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1124; [242] 1329

HOLT, Mr. J. M., *Lancashire, N.E.*
Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876—Licences, [239] 1091
Italy—Diplomatic Relations with the Pope, [242] 2016
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1431
Turkey—Religious Persecution in Bulgaria, [237] 1054

HOME, Captain D. Milne, *Berwick*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Yeomanry Sergeant-Majors, [240] 1607
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* Amendt. [241] 616

**Homicide Law Amendment Bill**
(*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Whitwell*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 13 [Bill 108]
2R. [Dropped]

HOPE, Mr. A. J. B. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1989
Burials, Res. [237] 1781, 1804, 1805
Church Livings, Res. [237] 1564
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 422
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 22, [241] 1096
National Portrait Gallery, Res. [238] 759, 776
Parliament—Orders of the Day, [237] 378
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 411
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 390
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1170
Ritualism, Res. [241] 927
South Kensington—National Portrait Gallery, [237] 924; [240] 24
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 782
Supply—Public Buildings, [240] 1372
  Public Offices Site, [238] 1539
  Royal Palaces, [238] 1517
  Wellington Monument, [238] 1537
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1849

HOPWOOD, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 1646; *cl.* 3, 1651, 1654; *cl.* 4, 1655, 1659; Amendt. 1665; *cl.* 5, 1673; *cl.* 6, 1677
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [240] 478
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 1013
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1568
County Government, Comm. [238] 919
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Bill withdrawn, [242] 2039
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. Amendt. [239] 1289; *cl.* 17, 1322, 1334
Dog Licenses, [241] 323
Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 778
Epping Forest, 3R. [241] 776
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1772; Comm. 1951; Schedule, 1955
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 10, 99; *cl.* 13, 106; *cl.* 16, 122; *cl.* 17, 307, 310, 311; *cl.* 65, Amendt. 343, 345, 351; *cl.* 68, 465; *cl.* 100, 498; Consid. *cl.* 68, Amendt. 1911, 1912

[*cont.*

HOPWOOD, Mr. C. H.—*cont.*
  India (Finance)—Indian Budget, [242] 1530
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 6, [242] 1817
  Law and Justice—Manchester and Liverpool Civil Assizes, [242] 222
  Magistrates (Summary) Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [242] 2091
  Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1184
  Naval Courts Martial, [240] 1251
  Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, Res. [242] 1204
  Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1397
  Post Office—Indian Mails, [239] 1283
    Mail Contracts, [238] 973; [240] 25
  Salmon Fishery Inspectors, [242] 1531
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1220, 1308
  Supply—Convict Establishments, [240] 1005
    Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1268
    Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 998
    Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 993
    Registration of Judgments in Ireland, Motion for reporting Progress, [242] 1277
  Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1697
  Vaccination Acts, [238] 973
  Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1141; [242] 1377

**Hospitals, &c. (Scotland) Bill**
  (*Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Maitland, Dr. Cameron*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Jan* 18 [Bill 21]
  Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *April* 10, [239] 1072

HOUGHTON, Lord
  Army—Mutiny Act, [238] 1835
  Bishoprics, 1R. [238] 1484; 2R. Amendt. [239] 4, 21; Report, 957
  Eastern Question, [237] 1204
    Alleged Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1570
  Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [238] 290
  Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 959
  Greece—Correspondence, [237] 612
  Locomotion—Railway Passenger Duty, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 280
  Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 820
  Public Baths and Washhouses, 2R. [238] 1707
  Railway Returns (Continuous Brakes), 1R. [239] 1086
  Union of Parishes (Metropolis)—Destruction of City Churches, [239] 1087

**House Occupiers Disqualification Removal Bill** (*Sir Henry Wolff, Sir Charles Russell, Sir Charles Legard, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Ryder*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Jan* 18 [Bill 45]
  Read 2º, after short debate *Jan* 21, [237] 302
  Committee*—R.P. *Jan* 25
  Committee; Report *Jan* 31, 813
  Considered* *Feb* 1
  Read 3º* *Feb* 4

[*cont.*

*House Occupiers Disqualification Removal Bill*—*cont.*
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl Stanhope*) *Feb* 5 (No. 17)
  Read 2ª *Feb* 15, 1722
  Committee*; Report *Feb* 19
  Read 3ª* *Feb* 21
  Royal Assent *Feb* 25 [41 *Vict.* c. 3]

**House Occupiers Disqualification Removal (Scotland) Bill** (*Dr. Cameron, Sir Henry Wolff, Mr. Vans Agnew, Sir William Fraser, Mr. Mackintosh, Sir George Campbell*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Jan* 24 [Bill 87]
  Read 2º* *Feb* 6
  Committee*; Report *Feb* 13 [Bill 106]
  Considered* *Feb* 14
  Read 3º* *Feb* 15
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl Stanhope*) *Feb* 18 (No. 29)
  Read 2ª *Feb* 28, [238] 445
  Committee*; Report *Mar* 1
  Read 3ª* *Mar* 4
  Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [41 *Vict.* c. 5]

HOWARD, Mr. E. S., *Cumberland, E.*
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 235; Comm. *cl.* 26, Amendt. 2009; *cl.* 37, Amendt. 2086; *add. cl.* [242] 434, 436
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 21, Amendt. [239] 1348
  Lancashire and Yorkshire Water Supply, [237] 626
  Law and Justice—Reports of Divorce and Criminal Cases, [242] 1638
  Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. Amendt. [237] 1503, 1530
  Supplementary Estimate—Ministerial Statement, [237] 535

HUBBARD, Mr. E., *Buckingham*
  Supply—Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1247
  Taxation (Ireland)—Volunteer Force, [241] 130

HUBBARD, Right Hon. J. G., *London*
  Burials, Res. Amendt. [237] 1768, 1818
  Congé d'élire, 2R. Amendt. [239] 1546
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1308, 1313, 1316; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1318
  Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 849
  Gray's Inn Road, [240] 258
  Income Tax, Res. [238] 379
  India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1903
  India (Finances)—Indian Exchanges, [242] 1214
  Inhabited House Duty, [237] 1925
  Navy—The Census, [242] 1178
  Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1437
  Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    Easter Recess, [239] 1394
    Public Business, [240] 625
    Saturday Sitting, [242] 230

[*cont.*

HUBBARD, Right Hon. J. G.—*cont.*
Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties, Res. [240] 638
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1231; Comm. 1378; Report, 1451
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1492
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1647; *cl.* 2, [241] 21
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 571; Report, 1242; [242] 1341, 1344

HUNTLY, Marquess of
Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards, [237] 239, 242
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 1R. [237] 1502; Re-comm. *cl.* 33, [240] 735
Education (Scotland), 2R. [239] 280

HUTCHINSON, Mr. J. D., *Halifax*
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 1642; *cl.* 5, 1672
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 999
County Government, 2R. [237] 1662
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 67, [238] 459
Law and Justice—Halifax Bench of Magistrates, [241] 492
Magistrates, Appointment of—Withdrawal of Motion, [242] 1216
Libel Law Amendment, 2R. [237] 651, 654; [238] 1477

*Hydrophobia—Legislation*
Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 31, [237] 728

*Hypothec (Scotland)*
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the landlord's right of Hypothec for the rent of land in Scotland is detrimental to the interests of tenant farmers, and unnecessary to protect those of landlords, and ought to be abolished, due provision being made to secure the rights of parties under existing contracts" (*Mr. Vans Agnew*) *June* 25, [241] 250 [House counted out]

**Hypothec (Scotland) Bill** (*Mr. Agnew, Mr. Baillie Hamilton, Sir George Douglas*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 29]
Order for 2R. read *May* 28, [240] 857 [House counted out]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 24

**Hypothec (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill**
(*Sir George Balfour, Mr. Laing, Mr. James Barclay*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 49]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 23, [237] 362
After short debate, Moved, "That the Order be discharged" (*General Sir George Balfour*); Motion agreed to; Order discharged; Bill withdrawn

**Hypothec (Scotland) (No. 3) Bill**
(*Sir George Balfour, Lord Douglas Gordon, Mr. Laing, Mr. James Barclay*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 7 [Bill 101]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 3, [239] 508
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir William Cuninghame*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn * *June* 24

**Idiots, &c. (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. Arthur Moore, Mr. Meldon, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *April* 10 [Bill 149]
Read 2°, after short debate *June* 24, [241] 200
Committee; Report *July* 1, 581
Considered *July* 4, 845
Read 3° * *July* 5
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Carlingford*) *July* 8 (No. 148)
Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 26, [242] 343
Committee * *August* 2 (No. 187)
Report * *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 60]

*Ilen Valley Railway Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* Read 2° * *June* 27

INCHIQUIN, Lord
Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1214
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 443

**Inclosure Provisional Order (Llanfair Waterdine) Bill**
(*Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 28
Read 1° * *May* 29 [Bill 190]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 6, [240] 1318
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 14
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Steward*), and referred to the Examiners *June* 17 (No. 115)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committed * *June* 24; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection
And, on *June* 28, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Sherborne, L. De Tabley, L. Oranmore and Browne, L. Winmarleigh (chairman), L. Harlech; *July* 2, L. Blachford *added*, L. Harlech *disch.*
Report of Select Comm. * *July* 4

**Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford) Bill**
(*Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 28
Read 1° * *May* 29 [Bill 189]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 7, [240] 1348

[*cont.*

*Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford) Bill*—cont.

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); after short debate, Question put; A. 48, N. 69; M. 21 (D. L. 170)

Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Edward Jenkins*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 17, 1657

After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); Motion withdrawn

Original Question put, and agreed to; Committee; Report

Read 3°* *June* 18

*l.* Read 1ª* *June* 20 (No. 127)

Read 2ª *June* 25, [241] 208

Committee*; Report *June* 28

Read 3ª* *July* 1

Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cxiii]

**Inclosure Provisional Orders Bill** [H.L.]

(*The Lord Steward*)

*l.* Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 5 (No. 64)

Read 2ª* *May* 14

Committee*; Report *May* 23

Read 3ª* *May* 24

*c.* Read 1°* (*Sir Matthew Ridley*) *May* 29

Read 2°* *June* 21 [Bill 192]

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 9, [242] 1686; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *August* 12, 1828

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate be postponed till after the other Orders of the Day" (*Mr. Edward Jenkins*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker, &c."

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient to proceed with this Bill until evidence has been obtained from disinterested witnesses as to the desirability of sanctioning the proposed inclosures, and until the obstacles which impede the application of the Clauses for the regulation of Commons, contained in the Commons Act of 1876, have been removed by the Commons Regulation Expenses Bill now passing through Parliament" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 66, N. 22; M. 44 (D. L. 275)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee; Report

Read 3°* *August* 13

*l.* Royal Assent *Aug* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxxxiii]

INDIA

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

*Army* (*India*)

*Artillery Pensions*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 11, [238] 1044

*Native Indian Forces—Terms of Service*, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 23, [240] 498

*The Indian Contingent*, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 4, [240] 1166

[See title *Army—Military Forces of the Crown*]

*The Local Service and Staff Corps—Promotion and Retirement*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 19, [237] 1923

*The Straits Settlements—Troops in Perak—Pay and Allowances*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *August* 8, [242] 1526 [see also under *Army*]

*Bengal—Enhancement of Rent*, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 25, [237] 463;—*Medical Regulations*, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *April* 2, [239] 414

*Bombay Town Hall*, Questions, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. John Bright; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *April* 2, [239] 415

*Case of Private Corbett*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 21, [237] 254

*Civil and Military Employment — General Richard Strachey*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 15, [241] 1463

*Ecclesiastical Salaries*, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 21, [237] 248; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 16, [240] 27

*Enlistment for India*, Observations, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *Mar* 4, [238] 654

*Indian Finance*

*Anglo-Indian Balances*, Questions, General Sir George Balfour; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 6, [242] 1298

*Civil Expenditure*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 11, [237] 1423

*Indian Exchanges*, Observations, Sir George Campbell; short debate thereon *August* 5, [242] 1205

*Taxation*, Questions, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 22, [238] 156; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 28, 450;—Petition presented, Mr. Fawcett *Mar* 19, 1596

*The Indian Budget*, 1878-9—*The Financial Statement*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 21, [238] 1752; Question, Mr. Arthur Mills; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 31, [240] 1036; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 15, [241] 1467; Questions, Mr. Briggs, Mr. Childers; Answers, The Chancellor of

[*cont.*

INDIA—*Indian Finance—cont.*

the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 1, [242] 868; Questions, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 8, 1530

*The Indian Debt*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 8, [242] 1525

*The Licence Tax Act*, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 21, [238] 1758

*The Salt Laws*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 18, [238] 1484; Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 28, [241] 447; Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 12, [242] 1761

Parl. Papers—

Finance and Revenue Accounts, 1876-7, 1877-8 . . . 176
Home Accounts, &c. . 37, 118; 20, 150; 21, 290; 18, 149; 19, 271
Taxation Acts, 1878-9 . 153

*Indian Labourers at La Réunion*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 21, [238] 59

*Irrigation Reports*, Question, Mr. Fortescue Harrison; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 19, [237] 1923

*Lord's Day Act*, Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 18, [238] 1491

*Madras*

*Criminal Law—The High Court of Madras*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 4, [241] 756

*Fort George Water Supply*, Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 21, [238] 1742

*The Civil Service—Case of Mr. F. Lascelles*, Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 8, [242] 1528

*The Harbour*, Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 1, [237] 819; Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 16, [240] 24

*Wills for* 1788 *and* 1789, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 5, [242] 1176

*Native States*

*Deccan Riots Commission*, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 13, [242] 1868

*Famine in Cashmere*, Question, Mr. Ralli; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 1, [242] 865

*Khelat—Occupation of Quetta*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 22, [237] 320; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 25, 462; Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 31, 723

*Military Service in India*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 25, [238] 300

[*cont.*

INDIA—*Native States—cont.*

*Mysore*, Question, Mr. W. M. Torrens; Answer; Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 12, [242] 1763 Mysore Government . . *P.P.* 385

*The Jowaki Afreedis Expedition*, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 25, [238] 301; Question, Mr. Herschell; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 17, [240] 1605

*The Maharajah Holkar*, Question, Mr. Leith; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *August* 9, [242] 1636

*The Maharajah of Kuch Bahar*, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. E. Stahope *June* 3, [240] 1073

*The Maharajah Scindia*, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 21, [237] 249; Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 21, [238] 1757

*The Mission to Cabul*, Questions, Mr. Fawcett; Sir Henry Havelock; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 15, [242] 2016

*The Moar Succession*, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 12, [239] 1228

*The Nizam—Mr. Oliphant*, Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 28, [237] 529; Question, Observations, Viscount Halifax; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Mar* 25, [238] 1924

*The West Frontier Policy*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Jan* 21, [237] 246

*Troops of Native States*, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 3, [240] 1073

*Public Meetings*, Questions, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 5, [239] 666

*Sir John Strachey's Speeches*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 12, [237] 1535

*The Native Police of Bengal*, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 5, [237] 1053

*The Recent Famine in Western and Southern India*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 9, [239] 959; Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 27, [240] 744; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 30, [242] 642;—*The Census*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 21, [238] 1742;—*The Mortality*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 27, [241] 321; Question, Observations, Lord Napier and Ettrick; Reply, Viscount Cranbrook *July* 22, 2021

Parl. Papers—

Despatches and Correspondence [1918] [1920]
Census of Famine Districts . . . . . 298

*The Vernacular Press Act—The Press Commissioner*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 3, [240] 1071; Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 27, [241] 321; Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answers, Mr. E. Stanhope

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

*July* 1, 494; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 11, 1241

Parl. Papers—

The Native Press—Correspondence, &c. . . . . . . [2040] [2077] [2078]
Vernacular Press Act . . . . . 274

*Trade between India and China,* Question, Mr. Grant; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *April* 15, [239] 1286

*India (Civil Engineers)*

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of any correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India in Council on the subject of the excess of supply of civil engineers for service in India (*The Earl of Northbrook*) *August* 5; Motion agreed to

*India—East India—Appointment of Mr. M. Macpherson*

Moved, "That the appointment by the Indian Government of Mr. Molesworth Macpherson, first as secretary to the Legislative Council and then as deputy-secretary to the Legislative Department, constitutes an improper evasion of the Law, is unjust to the regular Civil Service of India, and is calculated to bring the Indian Administration into public discredit" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *Feb* 19, [237] 1974; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*India—East India (Increase of Taxation)*

Moved, "That this House regrets that the people of Madras and Bombay should be burdened with the increased salt duty which has been recently imposed upon them, and is of opinion that such increase would be unnecessary if the finances of India were administered with greater economy" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *April* 2, [239] 417; after long debate, Question put; A. 87, N. 163; M. 76 (D. L. 93)

Moved, "That this House, whilst admitting the expediency of creating a fund in India for the relief of famines, objects to the Trades Licence Tax, which will alone be imposed on those engaged in business, and will moreover fall upon small traders and artizans with undue severity" (*Mr. Fawcett*); Question put; A. 96, N. 159; M. 63 (D. L. 94)

Taxation Act, 1878-9 . . . (*P.P.* 153)

*India—East India (Public Works)*

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into and report as to the expediency of constructing Public Works in India with money raised on loan" (*Lord George Hamilton*) *Jan* 22, [237] 323

Amendt. at end of Question, to add, "and further to inquire into the best means to be adopted to prevent the recurrence or to mitigate the intensity of famines in India; and whether by greater economy, specially with

[*cont.*

*India—East India (Public Works)*—cont.

regard to military and other charges which are under the control of the Home authorities, a fund for the relief of famines may not be provided without subjecting the people of India to such burdensome taxation as will be imposed upon them by the contemplated increase of the salt duty" (*Mr. Fawcett*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire and report as to the expediency of constructing Public Works in India with money raised on loan, both as regards financial results and the prevention of famine" (*Lord George Hamilton*), 356

And, on *Feb* 18, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Agnew, Mr. Ashbury, Mr. Balfour, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Childers, Mr. John Cross, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Fawcett, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Onslow, and Mr. Eustace Smith; *May* 7, Lord George Hamilton *re-appointed; May* 9, Mr. Edward Stanhope, Mr. Pease *added; May* 14, Mr. Eustace Smith *disch.*, Mr. Ernest Noel *added*

Report of Select Comm. . . (*P.P.* 333)

*India—East India Revenue Accounts—The Financial Statement*

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 13, [242] 1871

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House regards with apprehension the present position of Indian finance, and in view of the power claimed by the Crown to employ any number of Indian Troops in all parts of Her Majesty's Dominions, except the United Kingdom, is of opinion that there is no sufficient security against the Military expenditure of India being unduly increased" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 59 N. 20; M. 39 (D. L. 277)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; East India Revenue Accounts considered in Committee

Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the Ordinary Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1877 was £50,399,411; the Revenue from Productive Public Works, including the Net Traffic Receipts from Guaranteed Companies, was £5,596,374, making the total Revenue of India for that year £55,995,785; that the Ordinary Expenditure in India and in England, including Charges for the Collection of the Revenue, for Ordinary Public Works, and for Interest on Debt exclusive of that for Productive Public Works, was £51,430,673; the Expenditure on Productive Public Works (Working Expenses and Interest), including the payments to Guaranteed Companies for Interest and Surplus Profits, was £6,747,890, making a total Charge for that year of £58,178,563; that

[*cont.*

*India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement*—cont.
there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £2,182,778; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,809,284
Resolution reported *August* 14

*India—Taxation and Expenditure*
Petition presented (*The Earl of Northbrook*) *August* 5, [242] 1139; after debate, Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table

*India—The Indian Press Law*
Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 19, [238] 1592
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "legislation for our Indian fellow-subjects subversive of fundamental principles of the British Constitution should not be adopted without this House being previously consulted upon the urgent necessity of such a course" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *v.*, 1596; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

*India—The Jaghire of Bungana Pally*
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Papers relating to the case of the Succession to the Jaghire of Bungana Pally" (*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 11, [241] 1206; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*India—The Salt Tax*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Jan* 25, To leave out from "That," and add "the total taxation of salt in India being already excessive should not be increased, and especially a very large additional burden on an article so essential to life and health should not be placed on the populations of Madras and Bombay at a time when they are enfeebled and emaciated by a very prolonged and severe famine" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*, [237] 473; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
*Madras—Commission on the Salt Duty*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 8, [237] 1323

*Indian Native Troops (Transport and Employment Abroad)*
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the cost of the recent movement of Her Majesty's Indian Troops from India to Malta, and to report in what respects, if any, the arrangements for employing European and Indian Native Troops together, outside the limits of India, require modification" (*Secretary Colonel Stanley*) *July* 22
And, on *July* 23, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Arbuthnot, Lord Burghley, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Childers, Mr. Deedes, Mr. Fawcett, Sir Henry Havelock, Sir John Hay, Colonel Hayter, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Marten, Mr. Richard Power, and Sir Henry Wilmot; *July* 24, Mr. Onslow, Sir Patrick O'Brien *added*
Report of Select Comm. . . (*P.P.* 321)
[See title *Military Forces of the Crown*]

*Indian Vernacular Press Act*
Orders of the Day postponed
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she will be graciously pleased to give directions that all proceedings which may be taken by the authorities under the Indian Vernacular Press Act be reported to the Secretary of State and laid before Parliament from time
242] to time" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *July* 23, 48
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *v.*, 69; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 152, N. 208; M. 56; Div. List, A. and N., 127
Question proposed, "That 'Lord Lytton,' &c." 129; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sullivan*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived
Question, "That "Lord Lytton, &c." put, and negatived

*Industrial Schools*
Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 8, [239] 855

**Inhabited House Duty Bill** (*Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Torr, Mr. Alexander Brown*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 61]
Question, Mr. A. H. Brown; Answers, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 19, [237] 1924
2R. [Dropped]

**Innkeepers Bill** (*Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Locke, Mr. Spencer Stanhope*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *June* 6 [Bill 211]
Read 2° * *June* 20
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 24
Considered * *June* 25
Read 3° * *June* 26
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Henniker*) *June* 27 (No. 136)
Read 2ª *July* 9, [241] 1052
Committee * *July* 12 (No. 160)
Report * *July* 15
Read 3ª * *July* 18
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 38]

*Intemperance*
Moved that a Select Committee be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the prevalence of habits of intemperance, and into the manner in which those habits have been affected by recent legislation and other causes" (*The Earl of Cork*) *Jan* 18; Motion agreed to

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

*Intemperance*—cont.

And, on *Jan* 21, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Abp. Canterbury, L. Abp. York, D. Westminster, E. Shaftesbury, E. Belmore, E. Onslow, E. Morley, E. Dudley, E. Kimberley, V. Gordon, V. Hutchinson, L. Bp. Peterborough, L. Bp. Exeter, L. Bp. Carlisle, L. Hartismere, L. Penrhyn, L. Aberdare, and L. Cottesloe.—The Committee to appoint their own Chairman

Report of Select Comm. . . (*P.P.* 25)

**Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill**

(*The Lord Chancellor*)

241] *l.* Presented; read 1ª *June* 21, 7 (No. 132)

. Read 2ª, after long debate *June* 28, 415

. Committee; Report *July* 2, 584

. Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *July* 4, 742

. Petition presented, Earl Granville *July* 5, 848

Read 3ª* *July* 5

*c.* Read 1°* (*Mr. J. Lowther*) *July* 9 [Bill 249]

. *The Commissioners*, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 15, 1469

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 15, 1482

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

. Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 18, 1850

Considered in Committee* *July* 22

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the extension of the several provisions of "The Irish Church Act, 1869," with respect to Advances to be made by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to the Commissioners of Church Temporalities, and with respect to the powers of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury in relation to the Money to be so raised, to the provisions of any Act of the present Session to promote Intermediate Education in Ireland

Resolution reported *July* 23

242] Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, 229

. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 25, 261

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the names of the Members of the proposed Board should be communicated to Parliament before the consideration of this Bill in Committee" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c;" after debate, Question put; A. 81, N. 23; M. 58 (D. L. 236)

. Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c," put, and agreed to; Committee; Report, 275

. Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 6, 1302

. Considered, after short debate *August* 12, 1776; after long debate, Bill read 3° [Bill 275]

*l.* Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 66]

**Interments in Churchyards Bill**

(*Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Woodd, Mr. Sampson Lloyd*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 4 [Bill 123]

2R. deferred, after short debate *April* 16, [239] 1416

2R. [Dropped]

**Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill**

(*Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Benjamin Whitworth, Mr. Dease*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 38]

2R. [Dropped]

**Intoxicating Liquors (Licences) (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Whitworth*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 70]

2R. [Dropped]

IRELAND

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

*A Departmental Commission*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 13, [242] 1869

*Appointment of a Coroner for Westmeath*, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 15, [239] 1287

*Arklow Harbour*, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 18, [241] 1848

*Blackwater Bridge, Youghal*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 6, [240] 1250

*Board of Works*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 13, [242] 1870;—*Action for Libel*, Question, Mr. Isaac; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 12, [242] 1766;—*Report of the Commission*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Feb* 22, [238] 155; Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 25, [242] 221

Report of Comm. . . . . . . [2060]

Statement of Colonel M'Kerlie . [2080]

*Civil Bill Ejectments—Returns*, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Jan* 24, [237] 373

*Collection of Rates* (*Dublin*) — *Legislation*, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *June* 4, [240] 1167; Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 6, 1257; — *The Report of the Commission*, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 24, [240] 627; Questions, Major O'Beirne; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 28, [241] 449

*P.P.* [2062]

Memorial . . . . . . . 350

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

*Commissioners of National Education (Ireland)—Agricultural Model Schools*, Question, Mr. Richard Power; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 31, [240] 1036

Parl. Papers—
Report of Commissioners, 1877-8 . 139
Forty-fourth Report . . . . . [2031]
Education (Ireland) (Irish Language Memorial) . . . . . 324

*County Government in Ireland*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 14, [237] 1619

*Dublin Metropolitan Police—The Annual Return*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 1, [238] 539

*Dublin University Commission—The Report*, Question, Observations, The Earl of Belmore; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 8, [241] 955
The Report . . . . . . *P.P.* [2045]

*Education*

*Intermediate Education—Legislation*, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 22, [238] 157; Question, Mr. P. Martin; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 22, 1838; Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 9, [239] 1593

*National School Teachers Act—Contributory Unions*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 14, [238] 1292

*The Irish Language*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 4, [241] 763

*Geological Survey of Ireland—The "Freeman's Journal,"* Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Jan* 24, [237] 372

*Industrial Schools Act (Ireland)—Rules as to Number of Children to be paid for by the Treasury*, Questions, Mr. O'Reilly; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 1, [239] 287; *April* 5, 671

*Inland Navigation*

*Drainage Board—The River Mulcair*, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 16, [241] 1580

*The Northern System*, Question, Mr. King-Harman; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 15, [241] 1465

*The Suck Drainage District*, Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Feb* 18, [237] 1848

*Inland Revenue — Dog Tax*, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 7, [239] 1517

*Ireland—Crime in*—see that title

*Ireland—Case of Sergeant M'Carthy* — see that title

*Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Perpetuity Rents*, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 6, [242] 1300

*Landed Estates Court*, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 11, [238] 1046

*Law and Justice*

*Charge of Mr. Justice Keogh at Londonderry*, Questions, Observations, Mr. Sullivan; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther; debate thereon *Mar* 25, [238] 1949; Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 26, [239] 37

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

*Lord Justice Christian*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Jan* 28, [237] 531

*Sir John Ennis*, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 15, [238] 1396

*Law and Police*

*Disturbances in Ireland*, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 20, [240] 262

*Orange Processions*, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *July* 26, [242] 387

*Procession at Londonderry*, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 28, [239] 114

*The Riots at Belfast*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 1, [241] 498; Question, Mr. J. P. Corry; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 11, 1241

*Criminal Law*

*Case of Edmond M'Grath*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Jan* 21, [237] 246

*Case of Edward O'Kelly*, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 8, [241] 958

*Convict Disturbance at Haulbowline*, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 24, [241] 121

*Convicts at Spike Island*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Jan* 29, [237] 618

*Medical Witnesses*, Question, Mr. R. Smyth; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 1, [241] 491

*Prison Discipline*, Questions, Mr. J. Cowen, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 18, [241] 1845; Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 1, [242] 867

*The Magistracy*

Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 12, [242] 1762

*Island of Arranmore*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 25, [241] 210

*Resident Magistrates—The Waterford Magistracy*, Question, Mr. Blennerhassett; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 21, [238] 1750

*Stipendiary Magistrates*, Observations, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Reply, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 12, [242] 1853

*The Officer Commanding at the Curragh*, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 24, [241] 122

*Lunatic Asylums—The Governor of Limerick Asylum*, Observations, Mr. Butt; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther; short debate thereon *May* 24, [240] 640

*Parliament—The Disfranchisement of Cashel and Sligo*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 20, [240] 1883

[*cont.*

IRELAND—cont.

*Peace Preservation Act* (1875)

Question, Major Nolan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *July* 23, [242] 41

*Searches for Arms*, Question, Mr. Biggar; 241] Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 24, 123; Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther, 125; Questions, Major Nolan; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 28, 448; *July* 1, 497; Questions, Mr. Biggar, Major Nolan; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 8, 958; Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 13, [242] 1869

*The County of Cork*, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 2, [242] 996

*Poor Law*

*Cavan Union—Case of Anne Spinks*, Question, Mr. Kavanagh; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 25, [238] 1946

*Pauper Children in Cork Industrial Schools*, Questions, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 27, [240] 741

*Pauper Children in Workhouses—Industrial Training*, Observations, Mr. Arthur Moore, Major O'Beirne; Reply, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 15, [242] 2051

*Union Workhouses*, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 29, [242] 522

*Post Office — Case of Mr. John Daly*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 17, [240] 1603;— *Telegraphic Department—Communication with Granard*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 20, [240] 1885

*Prisons Act*

*General Prisons Board—Prison Discipline*, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 25, [242] 222

*Prison Inspectors*, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 12, [242] 1763

*Prison Pillows*, Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 12, [242] 1764

*Provisional Orders for Irish Waterworks*, Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *July* 5, [241] 856

*Public Health—Death-Rate of the City of Dublin*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 7, [238] 874; Questions, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 21, 1745

*Queen's Colleges—The Civil Service Estimates*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 17, [240] 1612; —*The Irish Language*, Questions, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 5, [239] 672; *July* 4, [241] 763

*Railways—Continuous Brakes*, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 14, [238] 1294

*Registration of Deeds—Report of the Royal Commission*, Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 16, [240] 35; Question, Mr. King-

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Harman; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 17, 158

*Royal College of Science, Dublin*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Jan* 29, [237] 620; Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Feb* 26, [238] 378

*Science and Art Museum, Dublin*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 15, [241] 1467

*Taxation—The Volunteer Force—Charge on Ireland for British Volunteer Corps*, Question, Observations, Mr. O'Clery; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 24, [241] 128

*The Charlton Charity*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 28, [240] 835

*The Irish Fisheries—Mackerel Fishery at Kinsale*, Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 15, [239] 1284

*The Moycullen Dispensary*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 28, [239] 116

*The Royal Irish Constabulary*

Question, Mr. Arthur Moore; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 1, [239] 284

*Londonderry and Belfast—Pay of Constabulary*, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 1, [242] 869

*Payments for Special Services*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Jan* 25, [237] 458

*The New Code*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 14, [238] 1295

*The Royal Irish Constabulary Fund*, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 5, [237] 1055

*Ireland—Crime in*

Moved to resolve, That it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to ask for such measures as may enable them more effectually to suppress outrage and enforce security of life in Ireland (*The Lord Oranmore and Browne*) *April* 12, [239] 1195; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved for, Returns showing all crimes against human life, firing into dwelling houses, administering of unlawful oaths, demands for money, threatening letters or other intimidation, incendiary fires, robbery of arms, which have been reported by the Royal Irish Constabulary between 1st January 1875 and 28th February 1878, distinguishing so far as can be done agrarian crimes, and showing whether any person or persons have been prosecuted for such offences, and whether acquitted or found guilty (*The Lord Oranmore and Browne*); Motion agreed to; Returns ordered to be laid before the House (*P.P.* 97)

Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 5, [241] 848;—*Returns*, Question, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *May* 24, [240] 618

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

*Ireland—Endowed Schools*

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the condition, revenues, and management of the Endowed Schools of Ireland, with instructions to report how far those endowments are at present promoting or are applicable to the promotion of Intermediate Education in that Country without distinction of class or religion" (*Lord Randolph Churchill*) *June* 4, [240] 1216

Amendt. at end of Question, add "and also into the practicability of establishing schools upon the denominational system" (*Lord Charles Beresford*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

*Ireland—Forces of the Crown in Ireland*

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return of the numbers of Forces of the Crown raised and maintained on the Irish Establishment in Ireland between A.D. 1700 and A.D. 1800, distinguishing the numbers the raising and maintenance of which were authorized by the Parliament of England from the numbers not so authorized" (*Lord Penzance*) *June* 7, [240] 1333; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to (*P.P.* 186)

*Ireland—Local Government and Taxation of Towns*

Select Committee of last Session, "to inquire into the operation in Ireland of the following statutes, 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, 3 and 4 Vic. c. 108, 17 and 18 Vic. c. 103, and the Acts altering and amending the same; and to report whether any and what alterations are advisable in the Law relating to Local Government and Taxation of Cities and Towns in that part of the United Kingdom," reappointed *Feb* 22;—Committee to consist of Seventeen Members;—Mr. Assheton, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins, Mr. James Corry, Sir Arthur Guinness, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Charles Lewis, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Murphy, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Rathbone, and Dr. Ward

Report of the Committee . . *P.P.* 262
Special Report . . . . . [1965]

Observations, Mr. Gray, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach

*Ireland—National School Teachers*

Moved, "That the 'National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875,' and the other means adopted by the Government, having failed to satisfy the just demands of the Irish National School Teachers, this House is of opinion that the present position of the Irish National School Teachers, and the discontent which prevaial smongst that important body of public servants, call for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government, with a view to a satisfactory adjustment of their claims" (*Mr. Meldon*) *May* 7, [239] 1521

[*cont.*

*Ireland—National School Teachers*—cont.

After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "and the discontent which prevails amongst that important body of public servants call," and insert "calls" (*Mr. James Lowther*) *v.*; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived; word "calls" inserted

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to [See also *Consolidated Fund* (*Appropriation*) *Bill*]

*Ireland—The Case of Sergeant M'Carthy—Treatment of Political Prisoners*

Questions, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 29, [237] 622; *Mar* 14, [238] 1294; *Mar* 28, [239] 119;—*The Inquiry*, Questions, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 31, [237] 726; *Feb* 5, 1051

The Report . . . . . [1978, 1978-I]

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the death of Charles M'Carthy, lately a political prisoner in Chatham Prison, and also into the treatment of political prisoners and of military political prisoners, and of securing a proper classification of convicts according to the nature of their offences, whether political or otherwise" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*) *v.*, [241] 1390; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 101, N. 35; M. 66 (D. L. 210)

*Ireland—The Galtee Estate*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 14, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the statements as to the treatment and condition of the tenants on the estate known as the 'Galtee Estate,' in the counties of Cork and Tipperary, which were made in the evidence given during the second trial of John Sarsfield Casey in the Court of Queen's Bench in Dublin" (*Mr. Gray*) *v.*, [240] 1527; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 74, N. 50; M. 24 (D. L. 172)

Moved for, "Returns showing the following particulars, in tabular form, with reference to certain tenants on the Galtee Estates of Nathaniel Buckley, Esq. in the counties of Cork, Limerick, and Tipperary

"Of the number of ejectment Processes served in connection with the above tenancies since 1874" [and other Particulars] (*Mr. Gray*) *July* 1, [241] 583; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Ireland—The Murder of the late Earl of Leitrim*

239]Question, The Marquess of Hamilton; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 2, 416; Questions, Mr. Clive, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 5, 665; Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 11, 1095

[*cont.*

*Ireland—The Murder of the late Earl of Leitrim* cont.
239] Resolution (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *April* 12, 1259
Notice being taken, that Strangers are present, Mr. Speaker forthwith put the Question, "That Strangers be ordered to withdraw;" A. 57, N. 12; M. 45
Div. List, A. and N., 1262
After some time (Strangers having been re-admitted)
Amendt. on Committee of Supply, To leave out from "That," and add "the action of the Government in Donegal with reference to the murder of the late Lord Leitrim is unconstitutional, unsuited to promote the ends of justice, and calculated to foster disbelief in the impartiality of the Law" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Question put, and agreed to
Questions, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 16, 1365

*Ireland—University Education*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 31, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the present condition of University Education in Ireland is most unsatisfactory, and demands the immediate attention of Parliament with the view of extending more generally and equally the benefits of such education" (*The O'Conor Don*) *v.*, [240] 1038; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir George Bowyer*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, 1082
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the present condition of University Education in Ireland is most unsatisfactory, and demands the immediate attention of Parliament, with the view of extending more generally and equally the benefits of such education" (*Mr. Blennerhassett*) *v.*, [240] 1085; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 200, N. 67; M. 133
Div. List, A. and N., 1150

**Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Parnell, Mr. Fay*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 13 [Bill 116]
*Legislation*, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 14, [238] 1298
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 2, [239] 474 [House counted out]
2R. [Dropped]

**Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2) Bill** (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Errington*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 244]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 15, [241] 1564
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. James Lowther*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after

[*cont.*

*Irish Church Act* (1869) *Amendment* (*No.* 2) *Bill.* cont.
short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Errington*); Motion withdrawn
Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 36, N. 51; M. 15 (D. L. 213)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

*Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners —Sale of Lands*
Observations, Mr. Parnell; short debate thereon *May* 9, [239] 1601

*Irish Land Act* (1870)
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the working and results of the 44th, 45th, and 47th Clauses of 'The Irish Land Act, 1870,' and to report whether any further facilities should be given for promoting the purchase of land by occupying tenants" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) *Jan* 24
And, on *Feb* 7, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Chaine, Viscount Crichton, Mr. Downing, Mr. Errington, Mr. Heygate, Mr. Law, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Sir John Leslie, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Major Nolan, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Plunket, Mr. Plunkett, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Verner, and Mr. Wilson; *Feb* 19, Mr. Meldon *added;* Mr. Downing *disch.;* *Feb* 28, Colonel Taylor, Mr. Fay *added*
The Report . . . . . . . *P.P.* 249

*Irish Land Act*, 1870
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will cause an Inquiry to be made as to how far the Irish Land Act, 1870, in its present form, really secures to the Irish tenant the benefits intended to be conferred on him by it; how far Clause 3 has operated to check capricious eviction; whether, notwithstanding the provisions of the Act, excessive rents confiscating the improvements declared by it to be the property of the tenant have been exacted; and whether any, and, if so, what steps should be taken, by amending the Act or otherwise, to render it more effective" (*Mr. Errington*) *July* 9, [241] 1112; after short debate, Amendt. proposed, to leave out from "by it" to end of Question (*Mr. M'Carthy Downing*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after further debate, Question put, and negatived
Main Question, as amended put; A. 67, N. 134; M. 67 (D. L. 202)

**Irish Peerage Bill** (*Mr. Plunket, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Macartney*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 78]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 17

**Isaac, Mr. S.**, *Nottingham*
- Africa (West)—Sierra Leone, [241] 1240
- Board of Works (Ireland)—Action for Libel, [242] 1766
- Criminal Law—Arson, Charge of, [240] 255
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1309
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. Schedule 3, Amendt. [238] 889
- Racecourses (Licensing), Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1483
- Railways—Sir Francis Goldsmid, The late, [239] 1689; [241] 210
- Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 775, 777
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 344; *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 1821; Consid. [241] 1276, 1277
- Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [241] 944, 948; 1048

*Italy*
- *Diplomatic Relations with the Pope*, Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 15, [242] 2016
- *Funeral of King Victor Emmanuel*, Question, Observations, Lord Dorchester; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Jan* 25, [237] 454
- *Pope Pius IX., Death of—Sittings of the Conclave*, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 8, [237] 1325

**Jackson, Sir H. M.**, *Coventry*
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 1011; *cl.* 22, 2003, 2006
- County Government, 2R. [237] 1883
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1306
- Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1063
- Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1477; Comm. *cl.* 27, [238] 325; *cl.* 37, 331; *cl.* 65, 349, 356; *add. cl.* 499, 502; Schedule 3, Amendt. 887; 3R. [239] 266
- Joint Stock Companies Acts, 1862 and 1867, Res. [239] 1707
- Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1900
- Parliament—Orders of the Day, Postponement of Motions, [239] 963
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 961
- Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1862

**James, Sir H.**, *Taunton*
- Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. [238] 1134
- Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 131
- Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 1516
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [241] 1620; *cl.* 9, 1737; *cl.* 22, 1927, 1929
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1692
- County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. [238] 1479
- Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), [241] 1235, 1464
- Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 678

[*cont.*

**James, Sir H.**—*cont.*
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 100, [238] 498
- Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 111, 118
- Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1909, 1935, 1936
- Law and Justice—High Court of Justice—Taxing Masters' Offices, [242] 1637
- Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent, [239] 1688;—Numbers, 1717
- Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 569, 573, 574, 581
- Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1194, 1202
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 48, [239] 140; *cl.* 56, 145
- Natal—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. Amendt. [242] 458
- Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, Res. [242] 1195
- Parliament—Privilege—Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1401, 1405
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Select Committee, [239] 472
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1043
- Racecourses (Licensing), 2R. [237] 648
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1243, 1244
- Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 946, 949
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [241] 33

**James, Mr. W. H.**, *Gateshead*
- Africa (South)—Griqualand West, [241] 1243
  - Outbreak of the Native Tribes — The Zulus, [241] 19
- Eastern Question—Agreement between Russia and England, [240] 1493
  - Dalmatian Frontier, [238] 1957
- Fishery Inspectors — The Estuary of the Thames, [242] 997
- Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 700
- Malta—Taxation and Finances—Mr. Rowsell's Report, [238] 1397
- Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Albert Terrace (Hyde Park) Improvement, [237] 1052, 1053
  - Parochial (Metropolitan) Charities, [237] 531
- Parochial Charities of the City of London, Res. [239] 1694, 1704
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 264, 265
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1838
- Supply—Charity Commission, [239] 1613
  - Civil Contingencies Fund, Re-payments to, [238] 1617
  - Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1526
  - Diplomatic Services, [238] 1610
  - Marlborough House, [238] 1521
  - Royal Palaces, [238] 1519
  - Temporary Commissions, [238] 1613
- Turkey—Bulgaria, Alleged Outrages in, [237] 925
- Vaccination Acts—Case of Mr. Abel, [238] 1139
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 31

*Japan — Treaty of* 1858 — *Admission of Opium*
Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 24, [241] 127

**Jenkins, Mr. D. J.**, *Penryn, &c.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 999
Merchant Seamen, Leave, [237] 313
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," [241] 120; [242] 1564, 2045, 2050
H.M.S. "Vanguard," [239] 858
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1312
Navy—Royal Naval Reserves, Res. [242] 1538
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1438
Dockyards, &c. [242] 1577
Supplementary Estimate — Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 808
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1531
Consular Services, [240] 1287
Lighthouses Abroad, [238] 1543, 1544
Report, Amendt. [242] 1691, 1692
Suez Canal (British Directors), [238] 1611
Supplementary Estimates, &c. [242] 1180

**Jenkins, Mr. E.**, *Dundee*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1382
Army Estimates—Miscellaneous Effective Services, [242] 1419
Works, Buildings, &c. [242] 1413
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 843; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1650, 1652; *cl.* 4, 1656; Amendt. 1659, 1661; *cl.* 5, 1669; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1678, 1682; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1684, 1685; 3R. 2008
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 987; 3R. Motion for Adjournment, 1432, 1433
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1624
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1754
Cyprus, Island of—Tithes and Taxes, [242] 2015
Dublin Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1043
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 790
Eastern Question, [237] 822
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Anglo-Turkish Convention [242] 1559, 1563;—Indian Troops in Cyprus [241] 2054;—Reforms in Asia Minor, Motion for Adjournment, [242] 2088
Constantinople—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1621, 1622
Negotiations, [239] 1447
Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 766
Treaty of Berlin—Articles 2 and 61, [242] 868, 869;—Roumania, [242] 2006
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 47, [238] 335; *cl.* 65, 357
Imprisonment for Debt, [240] 1353
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1352
Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. Amendt. [242] 1828, 1830

[*cont.*

**Jenkins, Mr. E.**—*cont.*
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. [242] 269, 272; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 275, 277, 279, 282, 283, 284; *cl.* 5, 288, 302; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 310, 311, 313, 315; Amendt. 320; *cl.* 8, 326; Schedule, 330, 331, 332, 333; Consid. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1822
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, Motion for Adjournment, [239] 942, 964
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1520; [240] 161, 625
Natal—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 462
Paris Exhibition — Government Workmen, [239] 1716
Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1390, 1394
Public Business, Arrangement of, [241] 499
Parliament — New Writ for Clare County—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Res. [242] 44, 135, 136
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [238] 361, 362, 367
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 274
Prisons Act, 1877—Regulations, [239] 1716;—Rules as to Debtors, [240] 626
Public Worship Regulation Act—Petitions and Presentments, [242] 1945
Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1013
Ritualism, Res. [241] 901, 939
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. [241] 610; 3R. 1077
South African Confederation—The Zulu King, [237] 1533, 1924
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1474
County Court Buildings, [240] 1373
Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1270, 1279, 1280
House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1456; Amendt. 1458, 1459, 1472
Natural History Museum, Erection of, [240] 1382, 1383; Amendt. 1384
Public Buildings, [240] 1367
Science and Art Department Buildings, [240] 1378
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1700
Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [240] 1404
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1353; Motion for reporting Progress, 1364, 1366, 1367, 1372, 1376

**Jenkinson, Sir G. S.**, *Wiltshire, N.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [240] 1253
County Government, 2R. [237] 1877
Highways—Bicycles on Highways, [241] 324
Highways, Comm. [241] 463; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 473; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 881; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 900, 1078, 1080
Parliament—Privilege, [239] 535
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1523

**Johnston, Mr. W.**, *Belfast*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 487, 488, 495, 496
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 170, 171, 172
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [237] 269

JOHNSTONE, Sir H., *Scarborough*
China—Outrage at Hong Kong, [239] 525
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [240] 475, 478, 481
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 33, [242] 415; *add. cl.* 439
Factories and Workshops, Comm. New Schedule, [238] 891, 893
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 717
Highways, Comm. [241] 464; *cl.* 7, 470, 471; *cl.* 11, 474; *cl.* 20, 899; *cl.* 22, 1095; *add. cl.* 1345, 1366

*Joint Stock Companies Acts,* 1862 *and* 1867
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, further provision is required for securing the bonâ fide character of undertakings registered under and for enforcing the returns required by the Joint Stock Companies Acts of 1862 and 1867" (*Mr. Gregory*) *v.*, [239] 1705; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

**Judicature Acts Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Waddy, Mr. Herschell, Mr. Merewether*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 25 [Bill 91]
2R.*, Debate adjourned *Feb* 28
Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 1

*Judicial Appointments*
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient that officers elected by any representative body should, in consequence of their being so elected, be empowered to try indictable offences" (*Sir Henry James*) *May* 14, [239] 1909
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the privilege of electing the judicial officers of the Corporation of the City of London, vested in that Corporation, having been expressly approved by the Royal Commissioners appointed in 1854, this House is of opinion that no circumstances have since transpired which call for the interference of Parliament" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 57, N. 102; M. 45 (D. L. 131)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

**Jurors Remuneration Bill**
(*Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Burt, Mr. O'Connor Power*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *July* 24 [Bill 274]
2R. [Dropped]

KAVANAGH, Mr. A. M., *Carlow Co.*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1969
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 166; Comm. *cl.* 22, 1984; *cl.* 68, [242] 145; *cl.* 70, 170; *cl.* 71, 180
Glebe Loans (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1995
[*cont.*

KAVANAGH Mr. A. M.—*cont.*
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 498
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1166
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [238] 801, 802, 811, 819, 820
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 86
Poor Law (Ireland)—Cavan Union—Case of Anne Spinks, [238] 1946

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Sir U. J., *Hastings*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1314
Artizans Dwellings Act, 1875—Operation in Ireland, [241] 1334
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [241] 1736; *cl.* B, [242] 432
Dental Practitioners, Comm. *cl.* 22, [240] 1321
Education Department—Financial Statement, [240] 1606
Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res. [241] 782
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 712
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 672, 714
Metropolis—Government of London, [241] 1236
  Water Supply in South London, [241] 1237
Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 14, [241] 1938
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1388
Parochial Charities of the City of London, Res. [239] 1704
Physical Competition for the Army, [240] 1606
Pollution of Rivers Act, 1876—Legal Proceedings, [241] 1333
Supply—Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1248, 1256

KENEALY, Dr. E. V., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1384
Bar Education and Discipline, [238] 157, 1046; [242] 642
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  Dodwell, Rev. Mr., [239] 1094; [240] 622
  George Broomfield, Release of, [240] 157
  John Hennafan, Case of, [240] 621
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 671, 672
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [239] 1259, 1261
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions [237] 822
  Alleged Triple Alliance, [237] 622; [242] 390
  Bosnia and Herzegovina, [242] 228
  The Marquess of Hartington's Resolutions, [241] 2049
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 3, [238] 86; Amendt. 87, 90; *cl.* 27, 324
Income Tax, Res. Amendt. [238] 384
Law and Justice—Miscellaneous Questions
  Police Magistracy—Mr. Benson, [240] 157
  Queen *v.* Bradlaugh and Besant, [238] 561
  Queen *v.* Castro, [241] 20
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1993, 1996, 1997; *cl.* 16, 2009; *cl.* 22, [239] 52
[*cont.*

KENEALY, Dr. E. V.—*cont.*
Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, [239] 527, 528; [240] 621
  H.M.S. "Eurydice," [242] 2046
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Breach of Privilege, [239] 669, 670, 671
  Privileges of the House, [239] 1712
  Privileges of Members, [240] 643, 656
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1241
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1532
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 3R. [242] 2036
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 575

KENNAWAY, Sir J. H., *Devon, E.*
Burials, Res. [237] 1790
Eastern Question—Armistice, The—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1331
  Congress—Armenians, [240] 1068, 1168
Elementary Education Act, 1876—School Certificates of Birth, [239] 528
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 857

KENSINGTON, Lord, *Haverfordwest*
Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 356, 357

KIMBERLEY, Earl of
Africa—Cape, The—The Kaffir Outbreak, [237] 1483; [239] 1265
Ballymena and Larne Railway, 3R. [241] 106
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 1R. [237] 1502
Cyprus, Island of—Slavery, [241] 1225
Eastern Question—Congress—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1830
Endowed Schools Act, Motion for Returns, [242] 13
Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, *add. cl.* [239] 191; 3R. [240] 126
Mauritius—Coolie Immigration, [239] 650
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 837, 839, 840
Monuments (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [241] 7
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 2R. [240] 1241; Comm. [241] 112; 3R. 303
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, 2R. [240] 825; Comm. 1157; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1160; *cl.* 4, 1161; Report, [241] 2; 3R. 207
Victoria, Colony of—The Ministerial Crisis, [238] 1390, 1706; [239] 268
Vivisection — Royal Commission — Petitions, [241] 1324

KINGSCOTE, Lieut.-Colonel R. N. F. *Gloucestershire, W.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 163; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1703; *cl.* 29, 2015; *cl.* 55, 2128; Schedule 5, [242] 818
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1694
Highways, Comm. [241] 456

KINNAIRD, Lord
Public Parks (Scotland), 2R. [237] 1920; Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [238] 369, 370; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 11, Amendt. *ib.*, 371

KIRK, Mr. G. H., *Louth*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1982
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [237] 1960
Customs Department—Playfair Commission, [238] 155
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [240] 707, 710; *add. cl.* 1905

KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, Right Hon. E. H., *Sandwich*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1594
Burials, Res. [237] 1761
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1434
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 412, 432
Diplomatic Appointments—Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, Res. [240] 185
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 993
East London Railway (Payment of Debts), 2R. [241] 1230
Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1559
Highways, Comm. [240] 1345; [241] 459
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1351
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Colonial Legislation, [237] 158; — Natal, [242] 225
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [240] 835, 1343
  Order of Business, [238] 453
  Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1741
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 410
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 172
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 626, 631
South Africa, [237] 1537
  Position of Affairs, [239] 1367, 1368, 1692
Supply—Diplomatic Services, [238] 1609
Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1697, 1698
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1511, 1512; *cl.* 8, [241] 42; *cl.* 16, 62

KNIGHT, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 638
County Government, Leave, [237] 606
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 19, [241] 898; *cl.* 20, 1081; *cl.* 21, 1089, 1090; *cl.* 25, 1102
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 621
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 633
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1639

KNIGHTLEY, Sir R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 14, [241] 882
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [239] 123

KNOWLES, Mr. T., *Wigan*
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 138
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1306, 1312
Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1467; Comm. *cl.* 13, [238] 112; *cl.* 17, 310; *cl.* 27, 323; *cl.* 47, 337; *cl.* 69, 473
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 870; *cl.* 18, 885, 886, 891, 895; *cl.* 23, 1098; *add. cl.* 1111, 1153, 1154
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 81
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [239] 1238
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 32

LAING, Mr. S., *Orkney, &c.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1758
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 947
Eastern Question—Negotiations, [239] 1439
Treaty of Berlin—Turkish Indemnity, [242] 521
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 488
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 319
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 217
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1798
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 774
Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 574
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1179

LAMBERT, Mr. N. G., *Bucks*
Crime (Ireland)—Murder of the Earl of Leitrim and others, [239] 1365

**Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases Bill** (*Mr. French, Mr. Shaw, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Richard Power*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 21 [Bill 83]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 3, [241] 724
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Verner*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 78, N. 179; M. 101 (D. L. 193)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

**Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Herbert, Mr. King-Harman, Mr. Dease*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *June* 14 [Bill 218]
2R. [Dropped]

**Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Crawford, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Daniel Taylor*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 43]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 25, [237] 491
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Alfred Marten*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 66, N. 85; M. 19 (D. L. 4)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

*Land Registration (Land Titles and Transfer)*
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report whether any and what steps ought to be taken to simplify and secure the title of land and to facilitate the transfer thereof" (*Mr. Osborne Morgan*) *May* 14, [239] 1885; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire and report whether any and what steps ought to be taken to simplify the title to land, and to facilitate the transfer thereof, and to prevent frauds on purchasers and mortgagees of land"
And, on *May* 22, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Gregory, Sir Henry Jackson, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Charles Lewis, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Alfred Marten, Mr. Patrick Martin, Mr. Osborne Morgan, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Walter, Mr. Sydney Waterlow, and Mr. Percy Wyndham
The Report . . . . . . . *P.P.* 291

*Land Tax*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 7, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the present system of Land Taxation is inequitable, and requires to be amended" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *v.*, [240] 1355; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

**Land Tenure (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Downing, Mr. Butt, Lord Francis Conyngham, Mr. Shaw*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 50]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 6, [237] 1140
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir John Leslie*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 86, N. 286; M. 200 (D. L. 8)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

LANSDOWNE, Marquess of
Army—Competitive Examinations for Commissions, [240] 355
Dental Practitioners, 2R. [241] 299; Comm. 743
Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 962

LAW, Right Hon. H., *Londonderry Co.*
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 498
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 466
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 1317

LAW AND JUSTICE

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

*Appointment of Magistrates*, Withdrawal of Motion, Mr. Hutchinson ; Observations, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 5, [242] 1215

*Bankrupt Solicitors*, Question, Sir Henry Peek ; Answer, The Solicitor General *Jan* 29, [237] 619

*County Court Judges*, Question, Mr. Fortescue Harrison ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 22, [238] 153

*Divorce Court—"Hume* v. *Hume*," Question, Mr. Bowen ; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 21, [238] 59

*Fines on Jurymen*, Question, Mr. Rylands ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 11, [241] 1236

*Frauds by Fiduciary Agents — Legislation*, Question, Mr. Burt ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [238] 1146

*Grantham County Court—Case of Margaret Carroll*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 28, [240] 833

*High Court of Justice*, Question, Mr. Gregory ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 3, [240] 1071 ;—*Taxing Masters' Offices*, Question, Sir Henry James ; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 9, [242] 1637

*Imprisonment for Debt*, Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins ; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 7, [240] 1353

*Ireland—Charge of Mr. Justice Keogh at Londonderry*, Questions, Observations, Mr. Sullivan ; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther ; debate thereon *Mar* 25, [238] 1949 ; Question, Mr. Sullivan ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 26, [239] 37 ;—*Sir John Ennis*, Question, Mr. Sullivan ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 15, [238] 1396

*Judges' Substitutes*, Question, Mr. Dillwyn ; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *April* 8, [239] 858

*Judicature Acts*

*Assizes and Quarter Sessions*, Question, Mr. Rodwell ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 5, [238] 759 ; Question, Mr. Williams Wynn ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 17, [240] 1604

*Leeds Civil Assizes*, Questions, Mr. Barran ; Answers, The Attorney General *August* 2, [242] 993 ; *August* 12, 1766

*Leicester Assizes*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 8, [242] 1528

*Manchester and Liverpool Civil Assizes*, Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 25, [242] 222

*Rule I., Order* 36—*Surrey Assizes*, Question, Sir Trevor Lawrence ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 26, [238] 377 ; Question, Mr. Charles Lewis ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 29, [242] 518

*The Northern Circuit—Assizes at Manchester*, Observations, Mr. Percy Wyndham ; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross ; short debate thereon *May* 16, [240] 38

*Judicial Statistics—Convict Prisons*, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 5, [242] 1174

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE—*cont.*

*Jurors*, Question, Mr. J. Cowen ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 14, [237] 1616

*Pollution of Rivers Act*, 1876—*Legal Proceedings*, Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 12, [241] 1333

*Prison Discipline—Personal Search*, Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry ; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 18, [241] 1846
[See *Prisons Act*]

*Reports of Divorce and Criminal Cases*, Question, Mr. E. Hubbard ; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 9, [242] 1638

*Supreme Court of Judicature Act*, 1873—*Sec.* 75 — *Councils of the Judges*, Question, Mr. Waddy ; Answer, Sir Matthew White Ridley *May* 16, [240] 22

*The Halifax Bench of Magistrates*, Question, Mr. Hutchinson ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 1, [241] 492

*The Police Magistracy—Mr. Benson*, Question, Dr. Kenealy ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 17, [240] 157

*The Queen* v. *Bradlaugh and Besant*, Question, Dr. Kenealy ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 22, [238] 156

*The Queen* v. *Castro—The Witness Mina Jury*, Question, Dr. Kenealy ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 21, [241] 20

*The Scotch Judicial Bench—Lord Craighill*, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 25, [242] 229 ; Question, Mr. M'Laren ; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 26, 386

LAWRENCE, Lord
Army (India)—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1459

LAWRENCE, Sir J. C., *Lambeth*
Metropolis—Euston Square, Gardens in, [241] 126

LAWRENCE, Sir J. J. T., *Surrey, Mid.*
Isle of Man—Small-pox, Outbreak of, [237] 428
Law and Justice—Surrey Assizes, [238] 377
Parliament—Public Business—Kew Gardens, [241] 1464
Supply—Natural History Museum, [238] 1538

LAWSON, Sir W., *Carlisle*
Burial Law Amendment, Leave, [239] 1359
Coast Defence—Submarine Mines, [238] 1838
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1645
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869—Outbreak at Alford, [238] 1042
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 795
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1091, 1093
Eastern Question—Congress at Berlin, [241] 1853
The Reserves, [239] 207
Licensing—Devonport Watch Committee, [238] 298
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, Amendt. [239] 893, 1037

[*cont.*

**Lawson**, Sir W.—*cont.*
- Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1375
- Parliament — Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, Motion for Adjournment, [238] 1740, 1742, 1961; [239] 1222
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 282
- Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 215
- Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, [242] 260
- Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 775, 776
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1693, 1695, 1708, 1716
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 767; Personal Explanation, 1066, 1246, 1306

**Leatham**, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
- Church Livings, Res. [237] 1540
- Parliament—Public Business—Simony Legislation, [237] 157
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1164

**Lechmere**, Sir E., *Worcestershire, W.*
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 538
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 881

**Lee**, Major Vaughan H. V., *Somerset, W.*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, [239] 1848

**Leeman**, Mr. G., *York*
- Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1263
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1605
- Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Leave, [239] 1957
- Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1365
- Hypothec (Scotland) (No. 3), 2R. [239] 512
- Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. Schedule, [242] 1837, 1838
- Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. [241] 1030
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1194
- Superintendence of Prisons, &c. Ireland, [242] 1606
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 43, 45

**Lefevre**, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1376
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1987
- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1422
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [241] 1003
- Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), 2R. [240] 1673
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1050
- Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1059
- Epping Forest, Leave, [240] 856; 2R. 1620; Comm. [241] 574; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 576, 577, 578; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 579; Schedule, *ib.*; 3R. 773, 776
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 10, [238] 95; *cl.* 11, 99; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 117
- Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1349, 1355

[*cont.*

**Lefevre**, Mr. G. J. S.—*cont.*
- Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1349; Comm. 1659
- India—Vernacular Press Act, [241] 494; Motion for an Address, [242] 89
- Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1564, 1568, 1571
- Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1903
- Manchester Corporation Water, Instruction, [237] 1724
- Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. [238] 1234
- Navy—Boiler Committee, [241] 588
- Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1426
  - Diplomatic Services, [238] 1611
  - Military Pensions and Allowances, [238] 1472
- Parliament—Orders of the Day, Postponement of Motions, [239] 964
- Parliamentary Reporting, Nomination of Select Committee, [240] 1679
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1186
- Supplementary Estimate, Comm. [237] 1390
- Turkey—Crete, [237] 620; [238] 60; [239] 1372; [241] 819;—The Correspondence, [239] 217, 667

**Legard**, Sir C., *Scarborough*
- Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 208

*Leicester Corporation Bill* (*by Order*)
c. Considered* *June* 20

**Leighton**, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1989
- Army Reserves, Dismissal of, [242] 524
- County Government, Leave, [237] 600; 2R. 1688
- Highways, [237] 722; Comm. [241] 453; *cl.* 11, 871; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 883, 884; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1084, 1085, 1088, 1089, 1090; *cl.* 23, 1098; Amendt. 1099

**Leighton**, Mr. S., *Shropshire, N.*
- Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), 2R. [238] 1913, 1923
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, Amendt. [241] 877; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 896, 897; *add. cl.* 1158

**Leith**, Mr. J. F., *Aberdeen*
- Education (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* A, [242] 1707
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 616
- India—The Maharajah Holkar, [242] 1636
- South Africa—Outbreak of Native Tribes—Trial of Kaffir Prisoners, [241] 126

**Lennox**, Lord H. G. C. G., *Chichester*
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1081

**Leslie**, Sir J., *Monaghan*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Comm. [239] 1978
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. [242] 1786
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [237] 1159
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 812
National School Teachers (Ireland), Res. [239] 1533

*Letters Patent—The Seal*
Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 18, [238] 1489

**Lewis**, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
Absentee Proprietors (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [239] 1589
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1642
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 132
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1982
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 1521
Dublin Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1044
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 958
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1770
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 6, [238] 93
241] Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. 1488, 1494, 1536, 1850
242] 229; Comm. Amendt. 261; *cl.* 6, 316; *cl.* 7, 321, 323, 324, 325; Consid. 1777, 1779; *add. cl.* 1787, 1794, 1795, 1799, 1800, 1801; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1803; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1814, 1818; Amendt. 1823, 1827
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Inland Revenue—Dog Tax, [239] 1517
Intermediate Education — Commissioners, [241] 1469
Londonderry and Belfast—Pay of Constabulary, [242] 869
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. Amendt. [237] 1929, 1937, 1938, 1940, 1945
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [239] 1530
Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1145
Judicature Act—Rule I., Order 36—Surrey Assizes, [242] 518, 519
Judicial Appointments, Res. Amendt. [239] 1918
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 728
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 498
Parliament—Business of the House, [242] 1768
Public Business—Saturday Sitting, [242] 391
Parliamentary Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [237] 358
Public Petition—Petition for the Impeachment of the Earl of Beaconsfield, [242] 215
Queen's Colleges and University (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1991
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 291; Comm. 1702, 1710; Motion for Adjournment, 1717, 1720; [239] 322; *cl.* 1, 1821, 1828, 1850, 1851; [240] 114; *add. cl.* 923
Straits Settlements—Perak—Pay and Allowances, [242] 1527
[*cont.*

**Lewis**, Mr. C. E.—*cont.*
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 963
Stationery Office, [239] 1800, 1806; [240] 48, 52
Town Councils, Local Boards, and other Local Governing Bodies, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 825
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 264, 268
Voters (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [237] 1570, 1573
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1116

**Lewis**, Mr. H. O., *Carlow*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1980
Russia and Turkey—British Embassy, [238] 758
Russia—Poles in Turkey, [237] 1730, 1731

**Libel Law Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Hutchinson, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Cowen, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Morley, Mr. Waddy, Mr. Edward Jenkins, Colonel Gourley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 21 [Bill 81]
2R. *Jan* 29, [237] 651 [House counted out]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15, [238] 1477
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Gregory*); Question put; A. 80, N. 45; M. 35 (D. L. 48)
Adjourned Debate resumed *Mar* 29, [239] 267 [House counted out]
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

*Licensing*
*Licensed Houses*, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 8, [238] 975
*The Devonport Watch Committee*, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 25, [238] 298

**Licensing Laws Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Heath*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 21 [Bill 82]
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Feb* 14, [237] 1691; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Committee deferred
Committee [Dropped]
Question, Mr. Rodwell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 16, [241] 1576

*Life Assurance Companies Act*, 1870
*Accounts of Insurance Companies*, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 4, [239] 519
*Blake* v. *The Albion Life Assurance Society*, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 19, [238] 1590

**Lifford**, Viscount
Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1210
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [242] 1165

**Lilford, Lord**
Cyprus—Financial Arrangements, [242] 33
Slavery, [241] 1949

**Limerick, Earl of**
Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 10
Debtors Acts Amendment, 2R. [242] 207
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1166

**Lincoln, Bishop of**
Bishoprics, 3R. [239] 1861

**Lindsay, Lord,** *Wigan*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1852

**Lindsay, Colonel R. J. Loyd (Financial Secretary for War),** *Berkshire*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1593
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Army and Militia Reserves, [239] 855; [241] 1846
Cavalry Force at Longford, [240] 1683
Commander-in-Chief — Leave of Absence, [241] 1335
Militia Volunteers for Service, [239] 413, 414
Quartermasters, [239] 854, 1286
Royal Artillery, [239] 521
Army — Auxiliary Forces—Yeomanry Adjutants, Res. [242] 1395
Army Estimates—Militia, &c. [240] 1444
Bengal Medical Regulations, [239] 415
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [239] 65
Supply—Provisions, Forage, &c. [238] 1624

**Linen and Hempen Manufactures (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *May* 22 [Bill 184]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 15

**Linen and Yarn Halls (Dublin) Bill**
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 2]
Read 2°* *Jan* 24
Committee*; Report *Jan* 28
Read 3°* *Jan* 31
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *Feb* 1 (No. 11)
Read 2ª* *Feb* 7
Committee*; Report *Feb* 8
Read 3ª* *Feb* 11
Royal Assent *Feb* 25 [41 *Vict.* c. i]

**Lloyd, Mr. M.,** *Beaumaris*
Breach of Promise of Marriage, [241] 588
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1570

[*cont.*

**Lloyd, Mr. M.**—*cont.*
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. Amendt. [238] 440, 1478
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), 2R. [240] 1671, 1672
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 675
Cyprus—Health of the Troops, [242] 2089
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1773; Comm. Schedule, 1955
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 80, [238] 479
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [242] 1789; *cl.* 6, 1819; Amendt. 1823, 1824
Northern Circuit—Assizes, [240] 39
Supply — Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 688
Government Property, Rates on, [240] 1386
Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1502
Survey of the United Kingdom, [240] 1377
Treaty of Berlin—Roumania, [242] 2007
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1634
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 26

**Lloyd, Mr. S. S.,** *Plymouth*
Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. [238] 1135; [242] 1635
Bills of Sale, Comm. *cl.* 6, [239] 753; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.*; Amendt. 754; *cl.* 17, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 23, Amendt. *ib.*
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1569
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. [238] 1479
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), [241] 762
Education Department—Religious Instruction, [239] 530
School Board Elections, [239] 529
Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 853
Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 788
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 718
Mercantile Marine — Eddystone Lighthouse—Erection of a Signalling Station on the Eddystone Rocks, [238] 1398
Navy—Navigating Officers, [240] 1035
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1419
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1282
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1127; [242] 1328

**Local Courts of Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. James Lowther*)
*c.* Ordered* *April* 2
Read 1°* *April* 5 [Bill 145]
Question, Mr. J. P. Corry; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *June* 17, [240] 1608
Bill withdrawn* *August* 5

*Local Government and Taxation in London*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the present state of

[*cont.*

*Local Government and Taxation in London*—cont.
Local Government in London is unsatisfactory, and calls for reform" (*Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth*) *v.*, [239] 672; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 116, N. 73; M. 43 (D. L. 99)

*Local Government and Taxation* (*Scotland*)
Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 13, [239] 1719

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Abergavenny Union, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 7
Read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 166]
Read 2° * *May* 22
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 13
Considered *; read 3° *June* 14
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 17 (No. 116)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committed * *June* 24; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection
And, on *June* 28, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Sherborne, L. De Tabley, L. Oranmore and Browne, L. Winmarleigh (chairman), L. Harlech; *July* 2, L. Blachford *added*, L. Harlech *disch.*
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 4
Committee * *July* 5
Report * *July* 8
Read 3ª * *July* 9
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 259]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. clxiv]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Abingdon, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *April* 4 [Bill 142]
Read 2° * *April* 10
Committee *; Report *May* 8
Read 3° * *May* 9
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 13 (No. 83)
Read 2ª * *May* 20
Committee *; Report *May* 21
Read 3ª * *May* 23
Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. xxxvii]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings) Bill** (*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 7
Read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 162]
Read 2° * *May* 20
Committee *; Report *May* 29
Read 3° * *May* 30
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *May* 31 (No. 101)
Read 2ª * *June* 7
Committee *; Report *June* 17
Read 3ª * *June* 18
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cv]

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings) (Cork) Bill**
(*Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 15 [Bill 180]
Read 2° * *May* 22
Committee *; Report *June* 7
Read 3° * *June* 13
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 17 (No. 117)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committee *; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cviii]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Belper Union, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 7
Read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 164]
Read 2° * *May* 20
Order for Committee read, and discharged * *May* 23
Bill re-committed * *June* 4
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 13
Considered *; read 3° *June* 14
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 17 (No. 118)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committee *; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cix]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Birmingham, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 7
Read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 165]
Read 2° * *May* 16
Committee *; Report *May* 25
Read 3° * *May* 27
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *May* 28 (No. 95)
Read 2ª * *June* 6
Committee *; Report *June* 7
Read 3ª * *June* 17
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. civ]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Boldre, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 7

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Bournemouth, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 168]
Read 2° * *May* 22
Bill re-committed * *June* 7
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 13
Considered *; read 3° *June* 14 [Bill 213]
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 17 (No. 119)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committee *; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 27
*c.* Lords Amendts. considered * *July* 2 [Bill 213]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. clxii]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Bristol, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 13 [Bill 112]
Read 2° * *Feb* 20
Order for Committee read, and discharged * *Feb* 27
Bill re-committed * *Mar* 19
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *Mar* 25
Considered * *Mar* 26
Read 3° * *Mar* 27
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Hartismere*) *Mar* 28 (No. 53)
Read 2ª * *April* 8
Committee *; Report *April* 12
Read 3ª * *April* 15
Royal Assent *April* 16 [41 *Vict.* c. viii]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Darenth Valley) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 175]
Read 2° * *May* 20
As amended by Select Committee [Bill 206]
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 14
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 17 (No. 120)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committed * *June* 24; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection
And, on *June* 28, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Sherborne, L. De Tabley, L. Oranmore and Browne, L. Winmarleigh (chairman), L. Harlech; *July* 2, L. Blachford *added*, L. Harlech *disch.*
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 4
Committee * *July* 19 (No. 152)
Report * *July* 22
Read 3ª * *July* 23
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 276]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxi]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Dawlish, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 167]
Read 2° * *May* 14
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 14 [Bill 212]
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 17 (No. 121)
Read 2ª * *June* 18
Committed * *June* 24; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection
And, on *June* 28, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Sherborne, L. De Tabley, L. Oranmore and Browne, L. Winmarleigh (chairman), L. Harlech; *July* 2, L. Blachford *added*, L. Harlech *disch.*
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 4
Committee *; Report *July* 5
Read 3ª * *July* 8
Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. clxv]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Droitwich, &c.) Bill**
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
*c.* Ordered * *May* 7
Read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 163]
[*cont.*

*Local Government Provisional Orders* (*Droitwich, &c.*) *Bill*—cont.
Read 2° * *May* 14
Committee *; Report *May* 23
Read 3° * *May* 24
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *May* 27 (No. 94)
Read 2ª * *June* 4
Committee *; Report *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 17 [41 *Vict.* c. lvii]

**Local Government Provisional Orders (Ireland) Confirmation (Downpatrick, &c.) Bill** (*Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
*c.* Ordered * *June* 4
Read 1° * *June* 6 [Bill 210]
Read 2° * *June* 18
Bill withdrawn * *July* 3

LOCKE, Mr. J., *Southwark*
Epping Forest, Leave, [240] 856

**Locomotives on Highways (Scotland) Bill**
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Matthew Ridley*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 22 [Bill 271]
Read 2° * *July* 31
Committee; Report *August* 1, [242] 979
Considered *; read 3° *August* 2
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) *August* 5 (No. 190)
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 8, 1498
Committee; Report *August* 9, 1630
Read 3ª *August* 12, 1750; after short debate, Bill passed
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 301]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 58]

LONDON, Bishop of
Church of England—Preachers in St. Paul's, [240] 127, 492
National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 405
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1867
Union of Parishes (Metropolis)—Destruction of City Churches, [239] 1087

*London and North-Western Railway* (*Additional Powers*) *Bill* [H.L.]
*l.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *July* 4, [241] 737; after short debate, Bill read 3ª

*London and North-Western Railway* (*Reddish to Leeds*) *Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* 2R. deferred *Mar* 8, [238] 971

*London Bridge Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* Bill withdrawn * *May* 31

LONGFORD, Earl of
Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards, [237] 240, 243
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Re-comm. *cl.* 78, [240] 738
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1163

LOPES, Sir M., *Devonshire, S.*
  Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1315; Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1375
  Greenwich Hospital — Age Pensions, [242] 1542
  Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1310, 1311
  Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1635

**Lord Clerk Register (Scotland) Bill**
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, The Lord Advocate*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *May* 16 [Bill 182]
  Read 2°* *May* 27
  Bill withdrawn* *July* 16

LORNE, Marquess of, *Argyllshire*
  Herring Fishery Commission, Report, [239] 1690
  Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [238] 1789; *cl.* 6, 1815; *add. cl.* [240] 1971

LOUDOUN, Earl of
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 15

LOWE, Right Hon. R., *London University*
  Eastern Affairs, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [242] 758, 872, 879, 880
  Eastern Question — Constantinople — Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1624
  Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1066
  Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1928
  Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 720, 721
  Parliament — Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1384, 1390
  Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 178, 199
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 847, 978
  Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1493
  University Education (Ireland), Res. [240] 1045

LOWTHER, Mr. J. (†Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *afterwards* Right Hon. J. (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *York City*
  Artizans Dwellings Act, 1875—Operation in Ireland, [241] 1334
  Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1984
  †Ceylon—Ecclesiastical Votes, [237] 251, 473
    †Food Taxes, [237] 370
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [242] 1847
  Diplomatic Appointments—Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, Res. [240] 186
  Elementary Education Act, 1870—School Inspection, [239] 525
  Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 494, 496
  Food and Drugs Act, 1875 — Adulterated Liquor, [239] 1518

[*cont.*

LOWTHER, Right Hon. J.—*cont.*
  †Gibraltar—The Trade Ordinance, [237] 252
  Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 507, 528; [241] 1240
  †Hypothec (Scotland), 2R. [237] 362
  Idiots, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [241] 200; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 581; *cl.* 6, 582
241] Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. 1482
242] Comm. 270, 272; *cl.* 2, 283, 284; *cl.* 5, 297,
. 300; *cl.* 6, 303; Amendt. 304, 312, 313, 314,
. 320; *cl.* 7, 321, 323, 324; *cl.* 8, 326; Sche-
. dule, 327, 330, 331, 332, 333; Amendt. 334;
. Consid. 1776, 1781, 1796; Amendt. 1802;
. *cl.* 6, 1815, 1816; Amendt. 1820, 1823;
. Schedule, Amendt. 1824, 1827
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Belfast, Riots at, [241] 498
    Blackwater Bridge, Youghal, [240] 1251
    Collector of Rates Office (Dublin)—Report, [240] 627, 1257; [241] 449
    Commissioners of National Education — Agricultural Model Schools, [240] 1036
    Convict Disturbance at Haulbowline, [241] 122
    Criminal Law—Edward O'Kelly, Case of, [241] 958;—Medical Witnesses, [241] 491
    Departmental Commission, [242] 1869
    Drainage Board—The River Mulcair, [241] 1581
    Dublin Metropolitan Police—Annual Return, [238] 539
    Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, [239] 416, 665, 666
    Education—Irish Language, [241] 763
    General Prisons Board—Prison Discipline, [242] 223
    Grand Jury Law Amendment, [240] 358
    Industrial Schools Act, [239] 287, 671
    Inland Revenue—Dog Tax, [239] 1518
    Intermediate Education, [238] 1838; [239] 1594
    Irish Church Act, [238] 1298
    Law and Justice — Mr. Justice Keogh, Charge of, [238] 1948; [239] 37;—Sir John Ennis, [238] 1396
    Law and Police—Procession at Londonderry, [239] 115
    Lunatic Asylums—The Governor of Limerick Asylum, [240] 642
    Magistracy, The, [242] 1762
    Magistracy — Island of Arranmore, [241] 211;—Resident Magistrates—Waterford Magistracy, [238] 1750; — The Officer Commanding at the Curragh, [241] 122
    Moycullen Dispensary, [239] 116
    National School Teachers Act—Contributory Unions, [238] 1292
    Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act—Searches for Arms, [241] 123, 125, 448, 497, 498, 959; [242] 1870
    Peace Preservation (Ireland) Acts—County of Cork, [242] 996
    Poor Law—Cavan Union—Case of Anne Spinks, [238] 1946;—Pauper Children in Cork Industrial Schools, [240] 741, 742;—Union Workhouses, [242] 522
    Prisons Act — Prison Inspectors, [242] 1763;—Pillows, 1765
    Public Health, [239] 1883; — Death-Rate of the City of Dublin, [238] 874, 1747

[*cont.*

**Lowther**, Right Hon. J.—cont.
- Queen's College—Irish Language, [239] 672
- Royal Irish Constabulary, [239] 285;—New Code, [238] 1295
- Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1233, 1236
- Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1557, 1558, 1561; Motion for Returns, [241] 583
- Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. Amendt. [239] 1536
- Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1139
- Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. Amendt. [241] 1564, 1571
- Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [239] 1605;—Perpetuity Rents, [242] 1301
- Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1143, 1146
- Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 733
- †Malta—Food Taxes, [237] 370
  - †Revenue and Taxation—Maltese Nobility, [237] 255
- †Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Colonial Legislation, [237] 158
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 820
- Parliament—Public Business, [238] 157; [240] 1343
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Select Committee, [239] 473
- Political Prisoners, 2R. [241] 735
- Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 91, 94
- Prisons Act, 1877—New Rules, [242] 1437, 1438
- Public Health (Ireland), Comm. [238] 722
- Racecourses (Licensing), 2R. [237] †645; Comm. *cl.* 1, [240] 1484, 1486
- Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 472
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ire-
239] land), Comm. 366, 367, 374, 376, 378; *cl.* 1,
623, 637, 642, 643, 644, 1825, 1834, 1837,
1838, 1840, 1842, 1844, 1850, 1851, 1852
240] *cl.* 4, 444; *cl.* 6, 446, 706, 714, 718; *add.*
*cl.* 870, 871, 904, 915, 918, 920, 922, 923,
924, 1028, 1029, 1031
241] Consid. *cl.* 1, 1309
- †South Africa—Outbreak of the Native Tribes, [237] 255, 625
- Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1549, 1550
  - Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 245
  - Commissioners of Charitable Donations, &c. [241] 1550
  - Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1554, 1558, 1559, 1563
  - Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household, &c. of, [241] 1545
  - Queen's Colleges Ireland, [241] 1540
  - Queen's University, Ireland, [238] 1576
  - Registration of Judgments in Ireland, [242] 1277
  - Report, [241] 1685
  - Royal Irish Academy, [241] 1542, 1543, 1545
  - Superintendence of Prisons, &c. Ireland, [242] 1602

[*cont.*

**Lowther**, Right Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1587; Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 945
- Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1695, 1698
- Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment, Comm. [241] 580
- Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 24

**Lowther**, Hon. W., *Westmoreland*
- Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1511
- Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1271, 1272

**Lubbock**, Sir J., *Maidstone*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1978, 1988
- Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1641
- Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1842
- Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994; Comm. *cl.* 22, [240] 1321, 1322
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 963
- Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res. [241] 777
- Income Tax, Res. [238] 402
- Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1103
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 383
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 182
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 563; [242] 1339

*Lunacy Law*
- Select Committee of last Session to inquire into the operation of the Lunacy Law, so far as it regards the security afforded by it against violations of personal liberty, re-appointed *Feb* 13; Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Birley, Mr. Butt, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr Joseph Cowen, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Herschell, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Kavanagh, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Mr. Leighton, Dr. Lush, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Tremayne, and Mr. Woodd
  - The Report . . . . . . . *P.P.* 113

*Lunacy Laws*
- *Legislation*, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 1, [242] 865
- *Post Mortem Examinations*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 27, [240] 742

**Lush**, Dr. J. A., *Salisbury*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [238] 701
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 170; Comm. *cl.* 30, 2077; *cl.* 55, 2110; Postponed *cl.* 5, [242] 189
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1599
- Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 780
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 27, [238] 322, 325; *cl.* 37, 332
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 4, [241] 466
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2020

[*cont.*

Lush, Dr. J. A.—*cont.*

- Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1477
- Poor Law—Saffron Walden Union, [240] 1070
- Post Office—Mails to the West of England, [238] 872
- Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1525
  - Marlborough House, [238] 1521
  - Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1766
- Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 491

Lusk, Sir A., *Finsbury*

- American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1650
- Bishoprics, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1028; Comm. [242] 849
- Civil Service Estimates, Res. [242] 1453
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [241] 1740; *cl.* 10, 1860; *cl.* 22, 1999; *cl.* B, [242] 430; New Schedule, 828
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1598
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 1297, 1302; *cl.* 12, 1309, 1313, 1316, 1318; *cl.* 15, 1320, 1321; *cl.* 17, 1331; *cl.* 20, 1347
- Epping Forest, Comm. [241] 575; 3R. 775
- Estimates, Discussions on the, [240] 937
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 38, [238] 333; *cl.* 47, 337; *cl.* 69, 471; Amendt. 473, 476; *cl.* 80, 479; New Schedule, 892
- Highways, Comm. *cl.* 20, [241] 1079; *cl.* 22, 1096; *cl.* 25, 1103; *add. cl.* 1357
- Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. [238] 1235
- Parliament—Morning Sittings, [239] 1234
- Parochial Charities of the City of London, Res. [239] 1703
- Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 215
- Public Works Loans, Comm. *cl.* 5, [239] 1355
- South Africa, [238] 1516
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 965
  - Charity Commission, [239] 1612
  - Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1621
  - Civil Service Commission, [238] 1546
  - Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1526, 1532
  - Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1620
  - County Courts, [240] 979
  - Epping Forest Commission, [238] 1616
  - Friendly Societies, [239] 1627
  - "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," [238] 1557
  - Harbours, &c. [238] 1537
  - Home Office, [239] 1484
  - House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1452, 1455, 1460, 1471
  - Land Registry, [240] 987
  - Law Charges, [238] 1558; [240] 941, 942
  - Lighthouses Abroad, [238] 1544
  - Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [240] 1387
  - Mint, Coinage, &c. [239] 1761, 1762, 1763
  - Natural History Museum, Erection of, [240] 1384
  - Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1766
  - Privy Council for Trade, &c. Committee of, [239] 1608, 1609

[*cont.*

Lusk, Sir A.—*cont.*

  - Privy Council Office, [239] 1491, 1492
  - Provisions, Forage, &c. [238] 1624
  - Public Buildings, [240] 1362
  - Royal Palaces, [238] 1518, 1519
  - Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [238] 1522
  - Science and Art Department Buildings, [240] 1381
  - Science and Art Museum, Dublin, [238] 1542, 1543
  - Stationery Office, [239] 1783, 1794; [240] 51, 67
  - Survey of the United Kingdom, [240] 1376
  - Wellington Monument, [238] 1538
- Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1639; *cl.* 8, [241] 50
- Ways and Means, Report, [239] 1244

McArthur, Mr. A., *Leicester*

- Burials, Res. [237] 1785
- Criminal Law—Imprisonment of a Child, [237] 1620
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 14, [238] 119; *cl.* 37, 331; *cl.* 99, 490, 492; Schedule 3, 889
- India—Salt Tax, [241] 447
  - Vernacular Press Act, [241] 321
- Newfoundland—Appointment of a Magistrate, [238] 451
- Railways—Continuous Brakes, [241] 1471
- South Africa, [240] 258
- Tanna—Execution of a Native, [238] 1756

McArthur, Mr. Alderman W., *Lambeth*

- Army Reserve Forces, [240] 29
- Ceylon—Ecclesiastical Votes, [237] 250, 251; [238] 1045
- China—Chefoo Convention, [240] 260
- Madagascar, [240] 261
- Natal—Administration of Native Affairs, Res. [242] 451, 475

Macartney, Mr. J. W. E., *Tyrone*

- Army — Tyrone Fusiliers — Rations, [240] 1611, 1612
- Glebe Loans (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1995
- Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 518
- Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 724
- Idiots, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [241] 201; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 581; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 582; *cl.* 6, Amendt. *ib.*, 583; Consid. Amendt. 945
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 318; Schedule, 331; Consid. 1787; *add. cl.* 1791, 1795
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Landed Estates Court, [238] 1046
  - Law and Justice — Mr. Justice Keogh, Charge of, [238] 1953
  - Law and Police—Procession at Londonderry, [239] 114
  - Poor Law—Union Workhouses, [242] 522
- Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1552
- Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 727
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 496
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 817

[*cont.*

**Macartney, Mr. J. W. E.**—*cont.*
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Morning Sittings, [239] 1238
Privilege—Petitions—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [238] 1485
Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1969
Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 198
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 82
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 470, 471
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 675
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1711; [239] 380; *cl.* 1, 1845, 1847; [240] 119; *cl.* 6, 707; *add. cl.* 864, 867; Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 1318
Supply—Stationery Office, [239] 1804
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1587; Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [240] 1032, 1326; Consid. Amendt. 1490, 1491; *cl.* 2, [241] 948
Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1683
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 265
Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1582
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 14

**MacCarthy, Mr. J. G.,** *Mallow*
Mercantile Marine—Deck Passengers—English and Irish Steamers, [237] 253
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 129
University Education (Ireland), Res. [240] 1110
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1, 28

**Macdonald, Mr. A.,** *Stafford*
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1649
Coal Mines—[see under Mines Regulation Act]
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 16, [241] 1890, 1896; Postponed *cl.* 5, [242] 190
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 2R. [242] 527; 3R. 787
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1042
Explosives Act, 1875 — Mining Cartridges, [239] 1227, 1228
237] Factories and Workshops, 2R. 1474
238] Comm. 75; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 85; *cl.* 10, 95; *cl.* 13, 104; *cl.* 67, 457; *cl.* 69, 471; *cl.* 80, Amendt. 478, 479; *add. cl.* 504, 507, 592, 601, 611
239] 3R. 266
Mercantile Marine — Steamship "Austin Friars," [242] 1639
Message from the Queen—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 394
Mines Regulation Act, 1872—Miscellaneous Questions
[238] 1143
Clause 32, [241] 1970
Colliery Accidents, [238] 1299, 1491, 1492; Motion for Adjournment, 1493, 1494
Eddlewood Colliery Explosion, [240] 159
Explosion in Mines, [241] 325
Haydock Explosion, [240] 1880; [242] 524, 525, 997, 1547, 1555
High Blantyre Colliery Explosion, [237] 250; [238] 447, 1592; [239] 1882; [240] 28, 29

[*cont.*

**Macdonald, Mr. A.**—*cont.*
Mine Inspectors, [238] 535
Mining Accidents—Kilsyth Explosion, [238] 1745
Reports of Inspectors, [238] 1289
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 67, 97
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1991
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [240] 1684
Public Business—Mines, [238] 1487
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 201
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1097, 1098, 1102, 1103
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. [241] 599
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 864
Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1449
Supply—Admiralty Registry of the High Court of Justice, [240] 969, 970
Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 959
Civil Service Commission, [239] 1619
Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1525
Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1622
County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1012
Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 946, 948, 949
Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 682, 686
Friendly Societies, [239] 1628
Law Charges, [240] 942
Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1643, 1647
London Bankruptcy Court, [240] 973
Mint, Coinage, &c. [239] 1762
Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1765, 1767; Amendt. 1770, 1771
Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1777
Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 1000
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, &c. [240] 669, 672, 674, 681
Secret Services, [240] 662
Stationery Office, [239] 1790; [240] 62
Woods and Forests Office, [240] 82, 87, 90
Works and Public Buildings, [240] 91; Amendt. 93
Wages Question—Sheffield Magistrates, [240] 746

**Macduff, Viscount,** *Elgin and Nairn*
Harbours (Scotland), [240] 162

**Mac Iver, Mr. D.,** *Birkenhead*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1597
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1646
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1723
India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. Amendt. [239] 430
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1908
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 310

[*cont.*

Mac Iver, Mr. D.—*cont.*
- Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 808
- Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 1615
- Post Office—West Indian Mail Contract, [242] 1870

McKenna, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
- Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1598, 1600
- Absentee Proprietors (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1589
- Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 3R. [240] 122
- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. [241] 1371; *cl.* 2, 1387, 1425, 1683; *cl.* 4, 1684
- Army—The Roster for Medical Officers, [242] 2086
- Belfast Improvement, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1065
- Bills of Exchange—Acceptance, [239] 962
- Brewers' Licences, Res. [242] 478
- Civil Service—Writers, [242] 42
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 428
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2111, 2114, 2119, 2124, 2127, 2128; Amendt. 2129, 2134, 2135; *cl.* 68, [242] 162, 164; *cl.* 70, 172; *cl.* 71, 180
- Coroners' Inquests—Death of Mr. J. Fulton, [242] 221
- County Government, 2R. [237] 1915
- County Infirmaries, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [240] 859
- Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), 2R. [240] 1672
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 1300
- Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 569, 576
- Dental Practitioners, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1993
- Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 25
- Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 15
- Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 790
- East London Railway (Payment of Debts), 2R. [241] 1232

238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 27, 326;
*cl.* 47, 337; *cl.* 54, 340; *cl.* 59, 341; *cl.* 65,
Motion for reporting Progress, 353; *cl.* 99,
491, 492; *add. cl.* 594, 599, 601

- Foreign Office—Temporary Writers, [241] 494, 495
- Glebe Loans (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1995
- Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 719
- India—Local Service and Staff Corps, [237] 1923
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 289; *cl.* 6, 306; *cl.* 7, 323, 324; Schedule, 332; Consid. *cl.* 5, 1803; *cl.* 6, 1826
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Blackwater Bridge, Youghal, [240] 1250
  - Departmental Commission, [242] 1869
  - Irish Board of Works, [242] 1870
  - Magistracy—Island of Arranmore, [241] 210
  - Peace Preservation Act (1875)—Searches for Arms, [242] 1869
- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1971
- Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1231

McKenna, Sir J. N.—*cont.*
- Irish Estimates, [240] 1665
- Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 726, 734
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2), [241] 101
- Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 17, [241] 1940
- Money Laws (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1705
- Monuments (Metropolis), Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 736, 846
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 818
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2015; *cl.* 23, [239] 59
- Parliament—Business of the House, [241] 328
- Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1741, 1967; [239] 1224
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 180
- Parliamentary Reporting, Nomination of Select Committee, [240] 1678
- Political Prisoners, 2R. [241] 735
- Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 459, 460
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1179

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ire-
237] land), Comm. 1916, 1917
239] 346, 373, 378, 381; Motion for Adjournment, 386, 389, 390, 392; *cl.* 1, 622, 626;
Motion for Adjournment, 1828, 1844, 1847,
1849, 1851
240] 32, 115; *cl.* 2, Motion for reporting Progress, 121; *cl.* 3, 440, 442; *cl.* 6, 445, 708,
711, 714, 715; *add. cl.* 860, 865, 867, 868,
871, 874, 881, 889, 899, 904, 912; Motion
for reporting Progress, 916, 917, 918, 919,
922, 923, 1022, 1025, 1027
241] Consid. 1264, 1266; *cl.* 2, Motion for Adjournment, 1316, 1319

- Sergeant M'Carthy, Case of, Motion for an Address, [241] 1409
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 240
  - Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 685, 993
  - Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 815, 819
  - Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1504
  - Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1778
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 679
  - Secret Services, [240] 665
  - Stationery Office, [239] 1803, 1805, 1808
- Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, Motion for Adjournment, [241] 946
- Truro Chapter, 2R. [241] 845
- Turkey—The War—Ill-treatment of English Doctors, [237] 1922
  - Unsecured Creditors, [242] 993
- Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 495
- Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1942, 1944, 1946
- Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1646; *cl.* 3, [241] 24, 30
- Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1583
- Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 142, 155
- Weights and Measures, Comm. Schedule 6, Amendt. [241] 413

[*cont.*

**Mackintosh, Mr. C. F.,** *Inverness, &c.*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1788; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1793; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1810, 1811; *cl.* 24, [240] 1687; *cl.* 50, Amendt. 1735, 1736; *cl.* 85, Amendt. 1894, 1895, 1899; Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 629
Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Education—Code of 1878 and the Gaelic Language, Withdrawal of Motion, [237] 1925
  Lord Clerk Register for Scotland—24 & 25 Vict. c. 71, [238] 1486
  Poor Law, [238] 1287
  Sheriff Clerks—Salaries, [238] 1747
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 682
  Post Office Packet Service, Amendt. [240] 1670
Under Secretaries of State, 2R. [240] 822

**McLagan, Mr. P.,** *Linlithgowshire*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 355; Comm. *cl.* 10, 1864; *cl.* 16, 1888, 1890; *cl.* 22, 1999; *add. cl.* [242] 438, 444
Merchant Shipping—Dynamite, &c. [240] 623
Railway Passenger Duty, [239] 526
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1787; *cl.* 4, 1803; *cl.* 15, [240] 1204; *cl.* 24, 1688; *cl.* 41, 1718; *cl.* 105, 1914; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1936; *add cl.* 1987, 1989
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 587

**McLaren, Mr. D.,** *Edinburgh*
Church Rates (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [241] 688
Civil Service Estimates, Res. [242] 1453
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 572
Durham Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1046
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 611
Education (Scotland), Consid. [242] 1701; *cl.* A. Amendt. 1704, 1707, 1710; 3R. 1711
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 618; *cl.* 7, 623; *cl.* 11, Amendt. *ib.*, 624; *cl.* 13, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 14, 625; *add cl.* 626
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 10, [238] 96; *cl.* 11, 97, 98, 99; *cl.* 17, 308; *cl.* 20, 313; *cl.* 69, 474; *cl.* 70, Amendt. 477; *cl.* 80, 478; *cl.* 99, 496
Govan Burgh, 2R. [238] 147
Greenwich Hospital — Age Pensions, [242] 1545
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 718
Hospitals, &c. (Scotland), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1072
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 5, [242] 1803
Law and Justice—Scotch Judicial Bench—Lord Craighill, [242] 386
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent—Estimate, [239] 1723
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 26, [239] 127
National School Teachers (Ireland), Res. [239] 1531
Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1396
Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1057
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 401

[*cont.*

**McLaren, Mr. D.**—*cont.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 189
Post Office—Private Letter Bags, Edinburgh, [237] 463
Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties, Res. [240] 636
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [237] 427;
238] Comm. 1765, 1779; *cl.* 3, 1789, 1792;
. Amendt. 1796, 1797, 1798; *cl.* 4, 1801,
. 1808; *cl.* 6, 1813
240] *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1184, 1185, 1189, 1192;
. *cl.* 15, 1203; *cl.* 17, 1213; *cl.* 24, 1216;
. *cl.* 29, 1692; *cl.* 36, 1704, 1708; *cl.* 41,
. 1713, 1717, 1719, 1720; *cl.* 44, 1722; *cl.* 45,
. Amendt. 1723, 1729, 1731; *cl.* 105, 1910,
. 1916, 1917; Amendt. 1918; Postponed *cl.*
. 54, 1934; *add. cl.* 1947, 1956
241] Consid. 604; *add. cl.* 625, 627, 629, 633;
. *cl.* 42, 651, 652; *cl.* 51, 828; *cl.* 88, 834,
. 836, 840
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Consid. [241] 1291; 3R. [242] 1738
Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Defences of the Firth of Forth, [238] 1399
  Education Grants in Scotland, [241] 807, 808
  Lunacy Commission—The Vacancy, [240] 926
  Prisons (Scotland) Act—Prison Board Clerks, [239] 1368
Scotland—Dunkeld Bridge Tolls, Motion for an Address, [237] 632, 637
Supply—Charity Commission, [239] 1614
  Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1619, 1621
  Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1524, 1529
  Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1623
  Courts of Law and Justice, Scotland, [242] 1269, 1270
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1464, 1469, 1471
  International Exhibition at Paris, 1878—Royal Commission, &c. [242] 1266
  Land Registry, [240] 984, 988
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [242] 1263, 1264
  Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 816, 819
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [238] 1523
  Privy Council Office, [239] 1495, 1496
  Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1013
  Royal Palaces, [238] 1519
  Supplementary Estimates, &c. [242] 1180, 1181
  Temporary Commissions, [238] 1613, 1614
Under Secretary of State, 2R. [240] 821, 823
Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1579
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 588

*Madagascar—Importation of Spirits*
Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 20, [240] 261

**Magistrates (Summary Jurisdiction) Bill**
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *August* 13 [Bill 304]
Order for 2R. read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn *August* 16, [242] 2091

**Makins**, Lieut.-Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
Army—Volunteer Artillery Adjutants, [240] 359
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 644
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. [239] 1319, 1320
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1092
Epping Forest, Comm. *cl.* 13, [241] 579
Navy—Admiralty Payments, [238] 1840

*Malta*
Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 20, [240] 263
*Appointment of Governor*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 11, [238] 1047
*Food Taxes*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Jan* 24, [237] 370
*Protest of the Maltese Nobles*, Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, Earl Cadogan; Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon *July* 5, [241] 850
*Revenue and Taxation—The Maltese Nobility*, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Jan* 21, [237] 255
Report of Commission . . [2033] [2131]
*Taxation and Finances—Mr. Rowsell's Report*, Questions, Sir George Bowyer, Mr. James; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 15, [238] 1397
Correspondence . . . . *P.P.* [2032]

*Malta and Ceylon—Food Taxes*
Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 11, [238] 1041

*Manchester Corporation Water Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 12, [237] 1503
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Stafford Howard*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Goldsmid*); Motion withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *Feb* 18, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Rodwell, and Mr. Salt
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Manchester Corporation Water Bill, that they have power to inquire into and report upon the present sufficiency of the water supply of Manchester and its neighbourhood, and of any other sources available for such supply: To consider whether permission should be given to make use of any of the Westmoreland and Cumberland Lakes for the purpose; and, if so, how far, and under what conditions: To consider the prospective requirements of the populations situated between the Lake District and Manchester: To inquire and report whether any, and, if so, what, provisions should be made in limitation of proposals for the exclusive use of the water of any of the said lakes" (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) *Feb* 15, 1723
Amendt. to leave out "between the Lake District and Manchester," and insert "in Lancashire and Yorkshire" (*Mr. Whitwell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Amendt. after "Manchester and" insert "the towns in" (*Mr. Serjeant Spinks*); Question proposed, "That those words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to
Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records
Ordered, That Five be the Quorum of the Committee

**Manners**, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Postmaster General), *Leicestershire, N.*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 892
Eastern Question—Armistice, The—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1332
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 722, 731
Parliament—Privilege—Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1404
Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
  American Mail Service, [237] 318
  Belmullet, Telegraphic Communication with, [237] 319
  Eastern Mail Service, [240] 1887
  Indian Mail Contract, [237] 1732
  Indian Mails, [239] 1283
  Ireland—Case of Mr. John Daly, [240] 1604;—Telegraphic Department—Communication with Granard, [240] 1885
  Letter Carriers, [240] 1165
  Mail Contracts, [238] 973
  Mails to the West of England, [238] 872
  Money Order Office, [237] 1922;—Boy Clerks, [241] 1969;—Salaries, [239] 1882
  Officials, Appointment of, [237] 1050
  Porterage on Telegrams, [241] 1467
  Postal Telegraph Service—The Telephone, [238] 58
  Private Letter Bags, Edinburgh, [237] 463
  Sub-Postmasters, [237] 532
  Surveyor General's Clerks — Edinburgh and Dublin, [242] 1946, 2026
  Telegraphic Department—Charges, [242] 1529;—Lundy Island, [238] 538
  West Indian Mail Contract, [242] 1638
Post Office—American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1654, 1656
Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [239] 1600
Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 216

[cont.

**Manners**, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R.—*cont.*
Supply—Harbours, &c. [238] 1535
Post Office Packet Service, [240] 1671
Post Office Telegraph Disallowances, [238] 1623
Telegraphs, [241] 2057; [242] 1641; 2R. 1695, 1698

*Man, The Isle of—Vaccination*
Questions, Mr. Hick, Mr. John Bright; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 22, [238] 1840

**Manvers**, Earl
Eastern Question—Greek Provinces of Turkey, [238] 265

**March**, Earl of, *Sussex, W.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces, Adjutants of, [241] 324

**Marine Mutiny Bill**
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Sir Massey Lopes*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 18
Read 2° * *Mar* 22
Committee *; Report *Mar* 29
Read 3° * *April* 1
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *April* 2
Read 2ª * *April* 4
Committee *; Report *April* 5
Read 3ª * *April* 8
Royal Assent *April* 16 [41 *Vict.* c. 11]

*Maritime Belligerent Rights—The Declaration of Paris*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 22, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the state of International Law with reference to Maritime Belligerent Rights is unsatisfactory, and calls for the careful attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Sir John Lubbock*) *v.*; [238] 1842; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

**Marlborough**, Duke of (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland)
Ballymena and Larne Railway, 3R. [241] 104

**Marling**, Mr. S. S., *Stroud*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 502; Schedule 3, 888
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 21, [241] 1091
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1530

**Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland) Bill**
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Ernest Noel, Mr. Edward Jenkins*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 24 [Bill 86]
Read 2° * *Feb* 6
Committee *—R.P. *June* 4
Committee *; Report *June* 26
Considered *July* 4, [241] 846
Read 3° * *July* 5
[*cont.*

*Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland) Bill*—cont.
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Camperdown*) *July* 8 (No. 149)
Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 15, 1428
Committee *; Report; Bill re-committed *July* 25 (No. 172)
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 29
Read 3ª * *July* 30
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 288]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 43]

**Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill** (*Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. Morley, Mr. Macdonald, Dr. Cameron*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 52]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 14

*Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Colonial Legislation*
Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Jan* 18, [237] 158

**Marriages (Fiji) Bill** (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 30 [Bill 285]
Read 2° * *August* 1
Committee *; Report *August* 2
Considered * *August* 5
Read 3° * *August* 6
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *August* 8
Read 2ª * *August* 9 (No. 195)
Committee *; Report *August* 12
Read 3ª * *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 61]

**Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Goldney, Sir Charles W. Dilke*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 55]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

**Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill**
(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Playfair*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 32]
2R. [Dropped]

**Marten**, Mr. A. G., *Cambridge*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1980
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 427
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 491; Amendt. 492
Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1902
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1181, 1182
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 192
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Consolidated), Comm. *cl.* 22, [240] 1322
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1176
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 903
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 956, 962

**MARTIN, Mr. P.**, *Kilkenny Co.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2124, 2126
Intermediate Education (Ireland), [238] 1838
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Committee, [239] 474
Poor Law (Scotland)—Case of Agnes Adams, [238] 58
Supply—Queen's University, Ireland, Amendt. [238] 1577
Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1673, 1698
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 266, 273

**MARTIN, Mr. P. W.**, *Rochester*
Public Health—Adulteration of Beer at Maidstone, [240] 927

**MASSEY, Right Hon. W. N.**, *Tiverton*
India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 452

*Masters and Servants—Liability of Employers—Legislation*
Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 11, [241] 1244

**Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Herschell, Sir Henry Holland*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 14 [Bill 117]
Read 2°* *Feb* 20
Committee; Report *Feb* 27, [238] 440
Considered* *Feb* 28
Read 3°* *Mar* 1
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Sudeley*) *Mar* 4 (No. 34)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 12, 1136
Committee *Mar* 29, [239] 186
Report *April* 2, 395 (No. 55)
Read 3ª *May* 17, [240] 126; after short debate, Bill passed (No. 60)
Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. 19]

*Mauritius, The—Coolie Immigration*
Question, Observations, The Earl of Kimberley; Reply, Earl Cadogan; short debate thereon *April* 5, [239] 650

**Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill**
(*Dr. Lush, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Mr. Samuda, Mr. Ritchie*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 30]
2R. [Dropped]

**Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *Mar* 19, [238] 1581 (No. 44)
Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 15, [239] 1267
Committee; Report, after short debate *May* 24, [240] 615
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *June* 3, 1062 (No. 90)
Report* *June* 4 (No. 104)
Read 3ª* *June* 6
*c.* Read 1°* (*Lord George Hamilton*) *June* 13
Bill withdrawn* *August* 5 [Bill 216]

**Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2) Bill**
(*Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Childers, Mr. Goldney*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *May* 29 [Bill 196]
2R., Debate adjourned *June* 13, [240] 1483
Adjourned Debate resumed *June* 21, [241] 98
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

**Medical Officers' Qualifications Bill**
(*Mr. Errington, Mr. John Maitland, Mr. Blennerhassett*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 62]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 5

*Medical Profession, The—Legislation*
Question, Mr. Mills; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Jan* 28, [237] 530

*Medical Reform—Bills before Parliament*
Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 4, [241] 759

**MELDON, Mr. C. H.**, *Kildare*
Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1959; 3R. Amendt. [240] 123
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1681
Army—Medical Officers, Supply of—Report of Committee, [239] 1228; [240] 23
  Surgeon-Major Clarke, Case of, [242] 1402
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1960, 1984
Civil Service Estimates, Res. [242] 1454
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. Amendt. [242] 1844, 1847, 1848, 1850, 1852
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Consid. *cl.* 60, [242] 1279; Motion for Adjournment, 1280
County Government, Comm. [238] 935
County Infirmaries, &c. (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [240] 858, 859
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1671
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1533; Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 307; Schedule, Amendt. 334; Consid. *cl.* 6, 1827
Ireland—Grand Jury, [238] 1297
  National School Teachers (Ireland) Act—Contributory Unions, [238] 1292
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1925
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [239] 1521, 1537, 1539
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1566
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [239] 1604
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 806
Paris Exhibition, 1878—Assistance to English Artizans, [240] 27

[cont.

**Meldon, Mr. C. H.**—*cont.*

Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [241] 450
  Morning Sittings, [239] 1232
  Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1387, 1391
  Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1737; Amendt. 1738; [239] 1221
  Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 153, 159, 164
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1476
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1103
Parliamentary Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [237] 358
Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland), Comm. [242] 1614
Public Health—Death Rate of the City of Dublin, [238] 874, 1745
Public Health (Ireland), 3R. [241] 198
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 462
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 298; Comm. [239] 385, 389; *cl.* 1, 1843, 1849, 1852; *cl.* 8, [240] 719; *add. cl.* 907; [242] 870
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1631
  Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1527
  County Courts, [240] 978
  Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 698, 703
  International Exhibition at Paris, 1878—Royal Commission, Amendt. [242] 1265, 1268, 1269
  Land Judges' Offices, Ireland, [242] 1272
  Land Registry, [240] 988
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [242] 1265
  Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1551, 1555; Motion for reporting Progress, 1561
  Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1779, 1780
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 680
  Queen's Colleges in Ireland, [241] 1539, 1541
  Queen's University, Ireland, Motion for reporting Progress, [238] 1575, 1577
  Registration of Deeds in Ireland, [242] 1274, 1275, 1276; Amendt. 1610
  Registration of Judgments in Ireland, [242] 1277
  Report, [241] 1685
  Royal Irish Academy, [241] 1544
  Stationery Office, [239] 1783, 1794
  Superintendence of Prisons, &c. Ireland, [242] 1604, 1609
  Treasury, [239] 1483
Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1691

**Mellor, Mr. T. W.**, *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 22, [238] 316
Friendly Societies—Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, [237] 923

**Mellor, Mr. T. W.**—*cont.*
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. [238] 2032; Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. [241] 940, 944, 1046, 1047, 2061; [242] 133, 2019
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment —The Twenty-third Clause, [239] 1724
Supply—Admiralty Registry of the High Court of Justice, [240] 969
  Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1622
  County Courts, [240] 976
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1470
  Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1631, 1639
  Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1764; Amendt. 1767
  Stationery Office, [240] 63
  Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 83
  Works and Public Buildings, [240] 93

*Mercantile Amendment Act*, 1856—*Bills of Exchange*
Question, Mr. Stanton; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 19, [238] 1592

*Mercantile Marine*
*Captain Hooper's Life-Saving Apparatus*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 18, [241] 1851
*Coal Laden Ships—Recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Spontaneous Combustion of Coal in Ships*, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 19, [241] 1967; — *The "Annie Richmond,"* Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 1, [241] 490
  Return of Cases . . . . . *P.P.* 366
*Deck Passengers—English and Irish Steamers*, Question, Mr. MacCarthy; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Jan* 21, [237] 253
*Missing Steamers*, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Jan* 24, [237] 370
*The Cefn-y-wrach Shoal, Cardiff*, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 29, [239] 204
*The Eddystone Lighthouse*, Question, Mr. Beckett-Denison; Answer, Sir Charles Ad-
238] derley *Feb* 25, 297; Question, Mr. Waddy; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 11, 1043; —*Establishment of a Signalling Station on the Eddystone Rocks*, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 15, 1398
*The Steamship "Austin Friars"*—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 9, [242] 1639

**Merchant Seamen Bill**
(*Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Edward Stanhope*)
*c.* Considered in Committee *Jan* 21, [237] 304; after short debate, Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° [Bill 79]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Jan* 28, 609

*Merchant Seamen Bill*—cont.

And, on *Feb* 20, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bates, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Thomas Brassey, Mr. Burt, Mr. Corry, Lord Eslington, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Plimsoll, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Torr, and Mr. Charles Wilson

Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Seventeen Members" (*Sir Charles Adderley*) *Feb* 22, [238] 259

Amendt. to leave out "Seventeen," and insert "Nineteen" (*Major Nolan*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That 'Seventeen,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question put, and agreed to

*Insubordination on Shipboard*, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, 1142

Report of Select Comm.* *May* 31 (*P.P.* 205)

Question, Mr. J. Stewart; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 4, [240] 1171; Questions, Captain Pim, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Viscount Sandon *June* 17, 1608

Bill withdrawn* *June* 27 [Bill 200]

*Merchant Shipping Acts*

*Cardiff Pilots*, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 16, [240] 30;—*The Port of Cardiff*, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 28, 834

*Certificates of Masters and Mates*, Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Jan* 21, [237] 252;—*American Officers—Certificates*, Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Jan* 21, 253

*Dynamite, &c.—Detention of the "Enchanter,"* Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 24, [240] 623

*The "Calenick"*—Question, Sir Colman Rashleigh; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 8, [237] 1323

MEREWETHER, Mr. C. G., *Northampton*

Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 69, [238] 476

Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 48, [239] 141

Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. [241] 1042, 1046, 1047

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1718

METROPOLIS

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

*Burglaries and Robberies*, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 7, [238] 876

*Coffee Stalls in the Streets*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 20, [240] 1878

*Demolition of Houses—The Midland Railway Company*, Question, Sir Thomas Chambers; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 5, [239] 664

*Detective Police, The—Report of the Commission*, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 26, [238] 377

[*cont.*

METROPOLIS—*cont.*

*Dirty Condition of Lower Thames Street*, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 14, [242] 1947

*Free Porters of the City of London*, Question, Mr. Cowper-Temple; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 5, [239] 663

*Government of London—Legislation*, Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 11, [241] 1236

*Gray's Inn Road*, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 20, [240] 258

*London Bridge*, Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 14, [239] 1884

*Metropolitan Fire Brigade, The*, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 25, [238] 298

*Newspaper Kiosques*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *Feb* 15, [237] 1729

*Parochial Charities of the City of London*, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 28, [237] 531;—*The Commission*, Questions, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 30, [240] 926; *June* 27, [241] 327; *July* 11, 1244; *July* 18, 1852

Memorials relating to . . . *P.P.* 199

[See title *Parochial Charities of the City of London*]

*Public Health—Deaths from Small Pox in London*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 2, [241] 588;—*Suburban Interments*, Question, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 12, [239] 1226

*South Kensington Museum—The National Portrait Gallery*, Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 16, [240] 24

*Street Traffic—Military Bandsmen*, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Solicitor General *May* 16, [240] 21

*The Albert Terrace (Hyde Park) Improvement Bill*, Question, Sir Henry James; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 5, [237] 1052

*The Gardens of Euston Square*, Question, Sir James Lawrence; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *June* 24, [241] 126

*The Islington and Deptford Cattle Markets*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Alderman Cotton *July* 18, [241] 1851

*The National Gallery*, Observations, Mr. Hermon, Lord Francis Hervey; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 4, [241] 793

*The New Law Courts*, Question, Colonel Walker; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Jan* 22, [237] 322

*The Parks*

*Hyde Park Corner*, Observations, Question, Earl Fortescue; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Jan* 22, [237] 316

*Hyde Park—Erection of New Buildings*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 7, [238] 872

*Hyde Park—Shelters*, Question, Observations, The Duke of Rutland; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *July* 8, [241] 953

[*cont.*

Metropolis—*The Parks—cont.*

*Royal Parks, &c.—Kew Gardens,* Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Jan* 24, [237] 368

Report on Kew Gardens, 1877 *P.P.* 303

*St. James's Park,* Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *August* 2, [242] 994

*The Thames Embankment—The New Opera House,* Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *August* 9, [242] 1638

*The Union of Benefices Act,* Question, Mr. Percy Wyndham; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 16, [239] 1370

*Union of Parishes — Destruction of City Churches,* Question, Observations, Lord Houghton; Reply, The Bishop of London *April* 11, [239] 1087

*Water Companies—Increased Rates,* Question, Colonel North; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 18, [241] 1848; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 14, [242] 1948

*Water Supply,* Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 15, [239] 1285

*Water Supply in South London,* Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 11, [241] 1237

## *Metropolis—The Bethnal Green Museum*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "it is desirable to give greater facilities for admission to the Bethnal Green Museum, by extending the arrangements now existing on the three free days to five in the week" (*Mr. Ritchie*) *v.*, [240] 37; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

## Metropolis Improvement Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bowman's Buildings, Marylebone, &c.) Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord Steward*)

*l.* Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 4 (No. 61)
Read 2ª* *May* 27
Committee*; Report *June* 4
Read 3ª* *June* 6
*c.* Read 1°* *June* 14 [Bill 217]
Read 2°* *June* 21
Committee*; Report *June* 28
Read 3°* *July* 1
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cxii]

## Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Bill

(*Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Rodwell*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 67]
Read 2°*, and referred to a Select Committee *Feb* 6

[cont.

*Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Bill*—cont.

And, on *Feb* 22, Committee nominated as follows:—Viscount Barrington, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Goldney, Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Sir James Lawrence, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Stansfeld, and Mr. Torr

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented on or before the 1st day of March next be referred to the Committee; and all Petitioners be heard by themselves, their Counsel, Agents, and witnesses upon their Petitions, if they think fit, and Counsel be heard in favour of the Bill against the said Petitions

Ordered, That the Reports 1876 and 1877, from the Select Committee on the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, be referred to the Committee (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg*)

Bill reported*; Bill re-committed *Mar* 22 [Bill 132]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *Mar* 28
Committee; Report *April* 5, [239] 755
Considered* *April* 8
Read 3°* *April* 9
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Viscount Midleton*) *April* 11 (No. 72)
Read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *May* 28, [240] 826
And, on *June* 28, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Sherborne, L. De Tabley, L. Oranmore and Browne, L. Winmarleigh (chairman), L. Harlech; *July* 2, L. Blachford *added*, L. Harlech *disch.*
Report of Select Comm* (*P.P.* 78)
Committee* *July* 5 (No. 145)
Report* *July* 8
Read 3ª* *July* 9
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 258]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 32]

## Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase) Bill

(*Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Grantham, Mr. Rodwell*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 58]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 12, [238] 1217
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Samuda*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Charley*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Order for resuming Adjourned Debate read *April* 5, [239] 758; after short debate, Debate further adjourned
Bill withdrawn *May* 23, [240] 493

## *Metropolitan Board of Works*

*Contracts for Watering the Streets,* Question, Mr. Beckett-Denison; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *May* 20, [240] 257

*Metropolitan Building Act, 1855—All Saints' Church, Lambeth,* Question, Mr. Cowper-Temple; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *Mar* 1, [238] 540

[cont.

*Metropolitan Board of Works*—cont.
*Metropolitan Commons Act*, 1866—*Eelbrook Common, Fulham*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *Mar* 4, [238] 635
*The National Opera House*, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *Feb* 7, [237] 1208
*The Water Companies*, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 28, [237] 530

**Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members) Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Camperdown*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª* *Jan* 18 (No. 1)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 11, [238] 1021
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and add ("this day six months") (*The Viscount Midleton*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; Cont. 36, Not-Cont. 54; M. 18
List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1030
Bill to be read 2ª this day six months

**Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) Bill** (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *July* 9 [Bill 251]
Read 2°* *July* 17
Committee; Report *July* 18, [241] 1936
Considered* *July* 19
Read 3°* *July* 22
*l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *July* 23
Read 2ª* *July* 26 (No. 169)
Committee*; Report *July* 29
Read 3ª* *July* 30
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 37]

**Metropolitan Commons Bill**
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Fawcett*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *July* 31 [Bill 287]
Read 2°* *August* 2
Committee*; Report *August* 7
Considered*; read 3° *August* 9
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Monck*) *August* 12 (No. 199)
Read 2ª* *August* 13
Committee*; Report *August* 14
Read 3ª* *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 71]

*Metropolitan Inner Circle Completion Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* Read 2°* *April* 1

*Metropolitan Police Force*
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Report of the Committee appointed in 1868 to investigate the condition of the Metropolitan Police Force, and that specially appointed to inquire into the constitution and condition of the detective department of the Metropolitan Police Force (*The Lord Truro*) *July* 30, [242] 629; after short debate, on Question? resolved in the negative
Question, Observations, Lord Truro, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *August* 9, [242] 1633; Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *August* 12, 1751

*Mexico—Renewal of Diplomatic Relations*
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 14, [238] 1298

MIDLETON, Viscount
Bishoprics, 2R. [239] 19
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 424
Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment, 2R. [240] 826
Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. Amendt. [238] 1023
Monuments (Metropolis), Comm. [240] 1573; [241] 2
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 616, 633

MILBANK, Mr. F. A., *Yorkshire, N.R.*
Criminal Law—G. W. Smith, Case of, [242] 1299

MILLS, Sir C., *Kent, W.*
Turkey—Murder of Mr. Ogle, [239] 666

MILLS, Mr. A., *Exeter*
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1743
Education Code, 1878—Art. 19, [238] 1753
Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 844
India—Financial Statement, [240] 1036
Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 760, 761
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. [240] 1483
Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 99; [242] 523
Medical Profession—Legislation, [237] 530
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1688
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1098
Railway Commissioners — Continuance of Powers, [237] 250
South African Confederation—Kaffir Outbreak, [237] 1325; [242] 643
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1266
Victoria, Colony of—Ministerial Crisis, [238] 1400

*Mines Regulation Act*, 1872
Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [238] 1143
*Accidents in Mines*, Observations, Mr. Macdonald; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 18, [238] 1491; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Macdonald*); Motion withdrawn

[cont.

*Mines Regulation Act*, 1872—cont.
- *Blasting—The Apedale Explosion*, Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 29, [239] 202
- *Clause* 32, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, [241] 1970
- *Colliery Accidents*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 14, [238] 1299
- *Dinas Collieries*, Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 13, [242] 1868
- *Eddlewood Colliery Explosion*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 17, [240] 159
- *Explosions in Coal Mines*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 27, [241] 325; Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 30, [242] 640
- *Life Brigades in Mining Districts*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 18, [238] 1490
- *Mine Inspectors*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 1, [238] 535
- *Reports of Inspectors*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 14, [238] 1289; Question, Mr. Clive; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 22, 1841
- *The Blantyre Colliery Explosion*, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 21, [237] 250; *Feb* 28, [238] 447; Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 18, 1487; Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 19, 1592; *May* 14, [239] 1882; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 16, [240] 28
    - Report of Inspectors . . *P.P.* 116 [1915]
    - Report of Commissioners. . [1916]
- *The Haydock Colliery Accident*, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 20, [240] 1880; *July* 29, [242] 524; *August* 2, 997; Observations, Mr. Macdonald; short debate thereon *August* 8, 1547
- *The Homer Hill Colliery Accident—Case of Thomas Shaw*, Question, Mr. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 15, [242] 2018

    Parl. Papers—

    - Inspection of Mines—Correspondence . . . . . . . . . . 105
    - Reports of Inspectors for 1877 . [2003]
    - Instructions to Inspectors . . . . [1987]
- *The Kilsyth Explosion*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 21, [238] 1745

*Mining Disasters*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 21, To leave out from "That," and add "inasmuch as the history of mining disasters during the last twenty-seven years proves that many of them have resulted from the culpable neglect of well-known provisions in Acts passed for the safety of those employed in Mines, it is expedient that the Government should at once take steps to see that the inspection ordered by the Mines Act of 1872 be rigorously enforced: That, should the powers contained in the above-named Act be insufficient to meet the necessities of all the cases, the Government ought to introduce a measure without delay that will" (*Mr. Macdonald*) *v.*, [241] 67; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

[*cont.*

Minto, Earl of
- Education (Scotland), 2R. [239] 277
- Precognition (Scotland)—Sudden or Suspicious Deaths, Motion for Returns, [239] 647

Monck, Viscount
- Army and Militia Reserve, [242] 1296
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 442

**Money Laws (Ireland) Bill**

(*Mr. Delahunty*, *Mr. Power*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 56]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 20, [238] 1699
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Anderson*); Debate adjourned
- Bill withdrawn * *May* 20

Monk, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*
- Bishoprics, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [242] 1675, 1678
- Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. [239] 1458
- Congé d'élire, 2R. [239] 1545
- Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 298; [242] 1714, 1715
- Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1648
- Conway Bridge (Composition of Debt), 2R. [240] 820
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, Amendt. [239] 1321; *cl.* 20, 1342
- Cyprus, Island of—Health of the Troops, [242] 1946
- Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1993
- Eastern Question—Fleet in the Dardanelles, [238] 1756
- Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), 2R. Amendt. [238] 1915; Comm. [241] 581
- Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1776
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 47, [238] 336
- Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 1036
- Gold and Silver Hall Marking, Motion for a Select Committee, [241] 202
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 18, [238] 2028
- Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-7, Comm. [242] 1615, 1616; Report, 1693, 1694

[*cont.*

MONK, Mr. C. J.—*cont.*
Parliament—Easter Recess, [239] 1381
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 364
Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1739
Post Office—Sub-Postmasters, [237] 532
  Telegraph Department—Lundy Island, [238] 538
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 609, 619
Russia—Colonel Wellesley's Despatches, [237] 1852
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1839, 1850; 3R. [242] 1716
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 985
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1533
  Commutation of Annuities, [238] 1611
  Diplomatic Services, [238] 1610
  Epping Forest Commission, [238] 1616, 1617
  Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, [240] 1385
  Natural History Museum, Erection of, [240] 1384
  Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1774
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 681
Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1), Lords' Amendts. Consid. [242] 1855
Turkey—Crete, [237] 927; [241] 813; [242] 2020;—The Correspondence, [239] 218, 1373
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 586; Amendt. 1148, 1160

MONTAGU, Right Hon. Lord R., *Westmeath*
Baltic Sea, [237] 1324
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1637, 1639, 1640
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1614
  Armistice, The—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople, [237] 1332
  Congress, The, [238] 1346, 1352, 1368; [239] 526;—British Plenipotentiary, Instructions to, [242] 218, 219;—Lord Odo Russell, Instructions to, June 8, 1878, [242] 389, 390;—Terms of Peace, [238] 1045
  Convention between England and Turkey, [241] 1578, 1579
  Despatches of January 4, 8, and 10, [237] 373, 374
  Mediterranean Fleet—Detention of British Seamen, [241] 1852, 1971
  Russia and Turkey, [237] 1324
  Russian Troops in Turkey, [241] 2058
Foreign Office—Abstraction of a State Paper—Anglo-Turkish Memorandum, [241] 2059
German Empire—The Netherlands, [241] 1469
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 304
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 549
Parliament—Breach of Privilege, [239] 670
  Easter Recess, [239] 1382, 1387, 1389, 1397

[*cont.*

MONTAGU, Right Hon. Lord R.—*cont.*
Parliament — Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 393
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] *107
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 246
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1245
Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] *565
Turkey—Asiatic Dominions of the Sultan, [241] 1469
  Firing on a Boat's Crew by the Russians, [241] 2057
University Education (Ireland), Res. [240] 1142

*Monte Video—British Cemetery at*
Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 20, [240] 1886

MONTGOMERIE, Mr. R., *Ayrshire, N.*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. [238] 1783

MONTGOMERY, Sir G. G., *Peeblesshire*
Education (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 1135
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 620
Harbours (Scotland), [240] 168
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 12, [240] 1194; *cl.* 15, 1202; *cl.* 16, 1205; *cl.* 17, 1212; *cl.* 24, 1686; *cl.* 41, 1718; *cl.* 105, 1910; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1931; Consid. [241] 608
Supply—Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1015
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1941, 1945; [242] 334

**Monuments (Metropolis) Bill** (*Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Forsyth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 22 [Bill 133]
Bill withdrawn * *April* 2

**Monuments Metropolis (No. 2) Bill** (*Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Forsyth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *April* 2 [Bill 140]
Read 2° * *May* 6
Committee *; Report *May* 29
Read 3° * *May* 30
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Viscount Midleton*) *May* 31
Read 2ª * *June* 7 (No. 100)
Committee put off, after short debate *June* 17, [240] 1572
Committee, after short debate *June* 21, [241] 2
Report * *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 27
*c.* Consideration of Lords Amendts. deferred *July* 3, 736
Lords Amendts. agreed to *July* 4, 846 [Bill 233]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 29]

MOORE, Mr. A. J., *Clonmel*
- Army—Regimental Debts Act, [241] 132
- Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [240] 480, 481
- Food and Drugs Act, 1875 — Adulterated Liquor, [239] 1518
- Idiots, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [241] 200; Consid. 846
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Convict Disturbance at Haulbowline, [241] 121
  - Drainage Board—The River Mulcair, [241] 1580
  - General Prisons Board—Prison Discipline, [242] 222
  - Poor Law—Pauper Children in Workhouses —Industrial Training, [242] 2051
  - Royal Irish Constabulary, [239] 284
- Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1546
- Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1131
- Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1138
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1182
- Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 360, 932
  - Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1392
- Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 85
- Public Works Loans, Comm. *add. cl.* [239] 1355
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm *cl.* 6, [240] 712, 715
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 241
  - Royal Irish Academy, [241] 1543
  - Superintendence of Prisons, &c. Ireland, [242] 1605
- Treaty of Berlin—Roumania, [242] 2007

MOORE, Mr. S., *Tipperary*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 391

MORAY, Colonel D., *Perthshire*
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 606

MORGAN, Mr. G. Osborne, *Denbighshire*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1984
- Burials, [237] 1056; Res. 1736, 1805
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 418
- Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. [241] 298
- County Courts, 2R. Amendt. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1563
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 726
- Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1885, 1900, 1909
- Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 311
- Ordnance Survey, [238] 1143
- Parliament—Business of the House, [239] 121
  - Easter Recess, [239] 1388
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1191
- Registration of Deeds (Ireland) — Report of Royal Commission, [240] 35
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 859

MORLEY, Earl of
- Eastern Question—Agreement between England and Russia, [242] 366, 367
- Freshwater Fish Protection, 2R. [241] 2036
- National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 403
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 631
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 117; 3R. 300, 305; Commons Amendts. Consid. 1440
- Science and Art—Museum of Casts from the Antique, [238] 1939
- Threshing Machines, 2R. [239] 518
- Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1), Comm. [241] 1446

MORLEY, Mr. S., *Bristol*
- Bills of Sale, Consid. *add. cl.* [239] 1264

MORRIS, Mr. G., *Galway*
- Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1130

MOWBRAY, Right Hon. J. R., *Oxford University*
- Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. [239] 1516
- Parliament—Business of the House, [237] 319
  - Orders of the Day, [237] 378
- Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 408
- Ritualism, Res. [241] 934

MULHOLLAND, Mr. J., *Downpatrick*
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 503, 504, 506, 593, 599
- Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [240] 454
- Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 945, 947
- Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1685

MUNDELLA, Mr. A. J., *Sheffield*
- Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. [241] 1374; *cl.* 2, 1383

241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 540;
. Comm. *cl.* 2, 1616, 1619, 1632, 1635, 1720;
. *cl.* 9, 1744; *cl.* 10, 1859, 1864; *cl.* 16, 1907;
. *cl.* 21, 1915, 1917
242] *cl.* 33, 416; Schedule 5, 809, 816

- Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1590; Amendt. 1591, 1592, 1603, 1697
- Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Treaty Obligations, [241] 1577
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1185
- Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 976
- Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), 2R. [238] 1923
- Estimates, The—Revenue and Expenditure, [242] 1301

237] Factories and Workshops, 2R. 1468
238] Comm. 76, 77, 80; *cl.* 5, 93; *cl.* 11, 102;
. *cl.* 13, 106, 116; *cl.* 16, 123; *cl.* 26,
. 317; *cl.* 27, 319, 320, 323, 326; *cl.* 30,
. Amendt. 327, 329; *cl.* 47, 337; Amendt.
. 338; *cl.* 65, 349; *cl.* 67, 458; *cl.* 68, 461;
. *cl.* 69, 468; *cl.* 80, 479; *add. cl.* 501, 502;

[*cont.*

MUNDELLA, Mr. A. J.—*cont.*

238]Amendt. 503, 596, 603, 609, 611; Schedule 1, 614; Amendt. 884; Amendt. 885; Schedule 3, 888, 889; New Schedule, 891, 892
Freshwater Fish Protection, 2R. [239] 1190; Comm. [241] 1032; *cl.* 11, 1035, 1036
Inland Revenue—Out-Door Licences, [240] 1884
Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1556
Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, [239] 296
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [240] 625
Navy—Indian Troops and Stores—Contracts for Transport, [241] 125; [242] 1532
Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 806, 811
"Nineteenth Century"—The Article on "Liberty in the East and West" (Mr. Gladstone), [240] 1069
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Committee, [239] 473
Patent Laws—Legislation, [237] 1850
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 943
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 902, 1309; [242] 1182
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1482, 1483
  International Exhibition, Paris, 1878—Royal Commission, &c. [242] 1266, 1268, 1269
  Public Education in England and Wales, &c. [242] 1227, 1240, 1255
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 563; Report, 746

**Municipal Corporations Acts Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 3 [Bill 238]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 8, [241] 1030
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Gourley*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
*Legislation*, Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 29, [242] 520
Bill withdrawn * *August* 8

**Municipal Corporations Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)

*l.* Presented; read 1ª * *August* 12 (No. 198)

*Municipal Corporations Commission — Lostwithiel*
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 4, [241] 762

*Municipal Elections—Carlisle*
Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 22, [241] 2051

**Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill**
(*Major O'Gorman, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Richard Power*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 20]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 6, [238] 796
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Kavanagh*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 160, N. 165; M. 5 (D. L. 42)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

MUNTZ, Mr. P. H., *Birmingham*
Army—Poisoning of Soldiers at Malta, [241] 2059
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1436
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 181; Comm. *cl.* 10, 1860; *cl.* 15, 1880; *cl.* 22, 1999; *cl.* 38, 2089
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1589, 1696
County Government, 2R. [237] 1666
District Probate Registry, Lichfield, [238] 538
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 797
Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 776
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. [240] 1325
Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 795
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. [238] 102, 108; *cl.* 69, 471; *cl.* 99, 493; *cl.* 100, 498; Schedule 1, 884
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 870; *add. cl.* 1358
Income Tax, Res. [238] 401
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1909
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 39, [239] 130
Mutiny Act—European and Native Indian Army, [241] 2056
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," [242] 1566
Post Office—Post Office Savings Bank, [240] 1881
Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 214
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 105, [240] 1914
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 954
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1630
  Consular Services, [240] 1283
  "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," [238] 1556
  Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1774
  Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [238] 1554
  Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 88, 89
  Works and Public Buildings, [240] 92
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 3R. [242] 2036
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 507
Valuation of Property, 2R. [240] 1318; Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 21; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 36; *cl.* 16, 65

[*cont.*

Muntz, Mr. P. H.—*cont.*
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 154
Ways and Means, Report, [239] 746; Comm. 1146; [242] 1375
Weights and Measures, 2R. [238] 719

Mure, Colonel W., *Renfrew*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 640
Army Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 649
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [238] 680
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2098, 2099, 2121; *cl.* 62, 2139; *add. cl.* [242] 768; Schedule 5, 814
Eastern Question—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 534
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 618
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 10, [238] 96; *cl.* 11, 98
Mutiny, Comm. [238] 1979; *cl.* 1, 1984; *cl.* 16, 2016
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. 422, 433
238] Comm. 1772, 1778, 1779; *cl.* 4, 1804, 1808; *cl.* 8, 1820
240] *cl.* 12, 1196; *cl.* 15, 1199, 1201; *cl.* 17, 1211; *cl.* 85, 1896; *cl.* 105, 1913; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1922, 1930, 1932, 1937; *add. cl.* 1957, 1964, 1974
241] Consid. 602, 826; *cl.* 88, 832
South Africa—Outbreak of Native Tribes—Military Operations, [239] 1229
The Cape—Telegraphic Communication, [240] 928
Supplementary Estimate, Personal Explanation, [237] 1059, 1060
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 506

Murphy, Mr. N. D., *Cork City*
Contagious (Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 16, [241] 1906; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1921; *cl.* 22, 1934; *cl.* 29, 2015; *cl.* 55, 2127; *cl.* 64, 2143; *cl.* 71, [242] 182; *add. cl.* 767, 768
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1536; Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 288
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)—The Governor of Limerick Asylum, [240] 643
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1476
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 474
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1918; Motion for Adjournment, [239] 299, 317, 322, 338, 361, 374, 385, 390, 393; *cl.* 1, 639, 1829, 1835, 1841, 1850, 1851, 1853; *cl.* 3, [240] 442; *cl.* 6, 705, 710, 713, 714; *cl.* 8, 717, 718; *add. cl.* 915, 919; Consid. [241] 1253; Preamble, Amendt. 1302; *cl.* 1, Amendt. *ib.*, 1303, 1309; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1315, 1317, 1318; 3R. [242] 1720, 1743
Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1549
County Courts, [240] 979

*Mutiny and Marine Mutiny Acts*
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to examine into the Acts commonly called the Mutiny Act and the Marine Mutiny Act, and into the Law relating to the subject-matters of those Acts, or made in pursuance of such Acts, and to report on any amendments it may be desirable to make therein, and on the form in which legislation on the matters aforesaid should be promoted;" That the Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members:—Lord Charles Beresford, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Admiral Egerton, Lord Elcho, Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. Russell Gurney, Sir William Harcourt, Sir Henry Havelock, Captain Hayter, Mr. Herschell, Mr. Staveley Hill, Viscount Hinchingbrook, Mr. John Holms, The Judge Advocate General, Colonel Loyd Lindsay, Mr. Merewether, Colonel Mure, Major O'Beirne, Mr. Parnell, General Shute, and Sir Henry Wilmot
Moved, "That Instructions be given to the Committee to consider the propriety of granting an appeal from the decision of a regimental district, or general court martial to the Court of Queen's Bench, except in the case of courts martial held during war time" (*Mr. Stacpoole*) *April* 11, [239] 1191; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Select Committee appointed and nominated
The Report . . . . . . *P.P.* 316

*Mutiny Act—The European and Native Indian Army*
Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 22, [241] 2056

**Mutiny Bill** (*Mr. Secretary Hardy, The Judge Advocate, Colonel Loyd Lindsay*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7
Read 2° * *Mar* 22
238] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 25, 1976; after short debate, Question put; A. 128, N. 12; M. 116 (D. L. 65); Committee—R.P.
239] Committee—R.P. *Mar* 26, 39
Committee; Report *Mar* 28, 122
Read 3°, after short debate *Mar* 29, 207
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord Ashford*) *Mar* 29
Read 2ª *April* 1, 280
Committee; Report *April* 2, 396
Read 3ª * *April* 4
Royal Assent *April* 16 [41 *Vict.* c. 10]

Naghten, Colonel A. R., *Winchester*
Army—Commissions in the Line, [239] 1719
Retirement from the, [240] 258
Army—Auxiliary Forces, [238] 448;—Army Reserve, [239] 962;—Militia, [240] 1421
Public Health Act—Public Officers of Health, [237] 923
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 1024

Napier and Ettrick, Lord
Army (India)—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1459
Eastern Question — Congress, The — Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1839;—Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 490

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

NAPIER AND ETTRICK, Lord.—*cont.*
India, Famines in, [241] 2021, 2036
India—Jaghire of Bungana Pally, Motion for an Address, [241] 1221
Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [240] 241

NAPIER OF MAGDALA, Lord
Army and Militia Reserves, [242] 1289
Army (India)—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1457
India—Taxation and Expenditure — Petition, Motion for Correspondence, [242] 1162
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne, [242] 205

*Natal, Colony of—Administration of Native Affairs*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "this House strongly condemns the policy of the Local Government of Natal in employing the machinery of British Courts in that Colony for the purpose of legalising polygamy and validating and enforcing Native usages which recognise rights of property in women and children; and this House is of opinion that measures should at once be taken to promote the civilization of the native tribes, and to facilitate their withdrawal from the savage state, and recommends the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the subject" (*Mr. Alderman M'Arthur*) *v.*, [242] 451; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

*National Debt, The — The New Sinking Fund*
Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 8, [239] 856

*National Portrait Gallery, South Kensington*
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the time has come for the Treasury to carry out the promise made by it in March 1876, of appropriating certain specified portions of the Exhibition Buildings at South Kensington for the accommodation of the National Portrait Gallery, in addition to the apartments already occupied by that Gallery" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*) *Mar* 5, [238] 759; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 21, 1749

**Naval Discipline Amendment Bill** [H.L.]
*Afterwards*—
**Naval Discipline Act (1866) Amendment Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Elphinstone*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª* *July* 26 (No. 175)
Read 2ª* *July* 30
Committee*; Report *August* 1
Read 3ª* *August* 2
*c.* Read 1°* (*Mr. W. H. Smith*) *August* 2
Bill withdrawn* *August* 12 [Bill 290]

NAVY
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
*Admiralty Payments*, Question, Colonel Makins; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 22, [238] 1840
*Case of Mr. John Clare*, Observations, Mr.
Biggar; Reply, Mr. A. F. Egerton *Mar* 14,
238] 1335; Observations, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr.
. Parnell; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross, 1370;
Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr.
. W. H. Smith *Mar* 21, 1757
*Case of Thomas Maguire*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 12, [238] 1142
*Charges for Pilotage*, Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 1, [238] 535
*Chief Engineers*, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 2, [242] 992
*Coal Contracts*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 22, [238] 158
*Commanders on the Active List*, Question, Mr. Vans Agnew; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 5, [242] 1176
*Dockyards, H.M.—Mechanic Writers*, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Jan* 28, [237] 529
*Engine-room Artificers*, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 8, [242] 1523
*Greenwich Hospital—Age Pensions*, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 15, [241] 1470; Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 18, 1844; Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 26, [242] 391; Observations, Mr. P. A. Taylor; short debate thereon *August* 8, 1538
Order in Council . . . . . *P.P.* 302
*H.M.S. "Beagle"*—See title *Navy—"Beagle," H.M.S.*
*H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of*, Question,
Lord Sudeley; Answer, Lord Elphinstone
238] *Mar* 25, 1925; Question, Mr. Goschen;
. Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith, 1959; Obser-
. vations, Mr. W. H. Smith, 2032; Ques-
tion, Earl De La Warr; Answer, Lord
239] Elphinstone *Mar* 26, 1; Question, Mr.
O'Clery; Answer, The Chancellor of the
. Exchequer *Mar* 28, 119; Question, Captain
Price; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 1,
. 286; Question, Observations, Lord Dun-
sany; Reply, Lord Elphinstone *April* 4,
. 513; Question, The Earl of Wharncliffe;
. Answer, Lord Elphinstone *April* 5, 646;
Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer, Lord
240] Elphinstone *May* 21, 349; Question, Obser-
vations, Lord Dorchester; Reply, Lord
. Elphinstone *June* 3, 1063; Question,
Earl De La Warr; Answer, Lord Elphin-
. stone *June* 4, 1155; Question, Mr.
Bates; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 6,
. 1251; Questions, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Cap-
tain Pim, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answers, Mr.
241] W. H. Smith *June* 24, 120; Observations,
. Viscount Cranbrook *July* 16, 1575; Obser-
vations, Mr. D. Jenkins; short debate
242] thereon *August* 8, 1564; Question, Obser-
vations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, Lord
. Elphinstone *August* 9, 1627; Observations,
Lord Charles Beresford; short debate thereon
. *August* 15, 2041 (*P.P.* No. 105)

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

*H.M.S.* "*Nelson,*" Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 18, [237] 1847

*H.M.S.* "*Undaunted,*" Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 18, [237] 1849

*H.M.S.* "*Vanguard,*" Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 8, [239] 858; Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 29, [242] 523; Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 16, 2092

*Indian Troops and Stores—Contracts for Transport,* Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 24, [241] 125

*Mr. Henwood,* Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Childers *August* 1, [242] 866

*Naval Courts Martial,* Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 6, [240] 1251

*Naval Engineers,* Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 7, [237] 1206

*Naval Forces in the Pacific,* Question, Mr. Bates; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 5, [239] 666

*Naval Stations in the Pacific—Esquimalt Harbour,* Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 15, [239] 1283

*Navigating Officers,* Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 31, [240] 1035

*Re-organization of the Admiralty—Report of Committee,* Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 5, [242] 1177

*Re-organization of the Dockyards—The Clerks,* Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 17, [240] 1608

*Reserved or Retired Officers,* Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 22, [238] 152

*Roman Catholics—Religious Instruction,* Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 15, [237] 1732

*Roman Catholic Chaplains,* Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 26, [238] 376; Questions, Mr. Newdegate; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 21, 1756

Minute of Admiralty . . . . . [2068]

*Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers,* Question, Mr. T. Brassey; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 28, [238] 446; Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 18, [241] 1849

Report on Efficiency . . . . *P.P.* 115

*Sailing Regulations of the Fleet,* Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 20, [240] 1879

*Sale of Worn-out Boilers,* Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 26, [239] 34

*The Admiralty—The Accountant General of the Navy,* Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 5, [241] 855; Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 18, 1849

*The Boiler Committee,* Question, Mr. T. Brassey; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 28, [238] 446; Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 2, [241] 588

[*cont.*

Navy—cont.

*The Census,* Question, Mr. E. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 5, [242] 1178

*The Channel and Particular Service Squadrons,* Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 12, [242] 1768

*The* "*Ganges*" *Training Ship,* Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 15, [242] 2021

*The* "*Independencia,*" Question, Admiral Egerton; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 21, [238] 1743

*The Mediterranean Squadron,* Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *Jan* 25, [237] 461

*The Naval Review at Portsmouth,* Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *August* 8, [242] 1527

*The Naval Strength of the Country—Arming the Mercantile Marine,* Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 8, [239] 853

*The Rams of Iron-clads,* Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 4, [240] 1168

*Torpedo Boats,* Question, Mr. James Stewart; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 8, [238] 977

*Training Ships (Ireland),* Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 28, [241] 450

*Transports in the Mediterranean,* Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 8, [242] 1532

*War Material at Tenedos,* Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 11, [239] 1095

*Widows' Pension Fund,* Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 7, [240] 1342

*Writers in the Dockyards,* Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 24, [240] 620

*Navy and Army Expenditure,* 1876-7

Resolved, That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon the Grants for Navy and Army Services in the year ending on the 31st day of March 1877, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments which were presented upon the 18th day of February and the 12th day of March last, be referred to the Committee (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *August* 7

Considered in Committee *August* 8, [242] 1615

Moved, (1.) "That it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1877, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Navy Services for the said year amounted to the sum of £166,546 6*s.* 10*d.*

(2.) "That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of £129,508 12*s.* 3*d.*, out of the said total sum of £166,546 6*s.* 10*d.*, to

[*cont.*

*Navy and Army Expenditure,* 1876-7—cont.

provide for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Navy Services for the said year

(3.) "That the said application be sanctioned

(4.) "That it appears by the Army Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1877, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Army Services for the said year amounted to the sum of £370,434 10*s.* 7*d.*, and that the sum of £247,548 17*s.* 1*d.* has been realised in excess of the estimated Appropriations in aid, amounting together to the total sum of £617,983 7*s.* 8*d.* (That the sum of £2,714 10*s.* having been disallowed by a Committee of this House from the expenditure recorded in the said account, the gross surplus thereon is increased from the said sum of £617,983 7*s.* 8*d.* to £620,697 17*s.* 8*d.*)

(5.) "That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of £476,728 1*s.* 10*d.* out of the said surplus to provide for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Army Services for the said year

(6.) "That the said application be sanctioned;" after short debate, Resolutions to be reported

Resolutions reported *August* 9, 1693; after short debate, Resolutions agreed to

*Navy — "Beagle," H.M.S. — Execution of a Native of Tanna — Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders*

237] Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer,
Mr. W. H. Smith *Jan* 24, 371; Question,
Mr. Gorst; Answer, The Attorney General
*Jan* 28, 532; Question, Sir Charles W.
Dilke; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 14,
1617; Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr.
238] W. H. Smith *Mar* 18, 1494; Questions,
Lord Francis Hervey, Mr. Childers; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 21, 1744;
Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir
Michael Hicks-Beach, 1756; Questions, Dr.
239] Kenealy; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith
*April* 4, 527; Questions, Mr. Gorst, Mr.
Childers; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith
240] *May* 16, 35; Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 24, 621;
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *May* 27, 740; Question, Mr.
Gorst; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 6,
1254

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that instructions may be issued to the Officers commanding Her Majesty's ships to define and regulate their authority to put persons to death not subjects of Her Majesty" (*Mr. Gorst*) *v.* [242] 1183; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put, and agreed to

*Parl. P.* . . . . . . 65, 223

*Navy—Designs of Ships of War*

Notice of Motion on Committee of Supply *Mar* 11, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system followed by the Admiralty in obtaining and settling designs for ships of war, and carrying such designs into execution when adopted; and to report whether any and what improvement may be effected in that system" (*Mr. Seely*), [238] 1057; Observations, Mr. Seely; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Gorst*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 14, 1300

*Navy—Projectiles—Shells and Armour-plates*

Moved that there be laid before this House, Return of the trials of shells against iron plates, stating the general result, and also the weight and shape of the various shells, and the thickness of the iron targets" (*The Duke of Somerset*) *April* 15, [239] 1271; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Navy — Seamen and Marines' Widows' Pension Fund*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 18, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the establishment of a Fund to provide Pensions for the Widows of Seamen of the Royal Navy and Royal Marines, such Fund to be supported by contributions from the men themselves and partly by Government aid, would tend to bind the men more closely to the service, check desertion, and prove a salutary and economical measure; and that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the best means of establishing such a Fund" (*Captain Price*) *v.*, [238] 1495; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 7, [240] 1342

*Navy—The Royal Naval Reserves*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the Royal Naval Reserve is not adapted for the present requirements of the Nation, and should at once be superseded or at least supplemented by a large increase of Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers; and that, in order to secure efficiency, such men should be trained on board sea-going gunboats stationed round the Coast and available for service on the shortest notice" (*Captain Pim*) *v.*, [242] 1533; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

NELSON, Earl

Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 3R. [241] 302

St. Katherine's Hospital—Royal Commission, 1871, [238] 1383

[*cont.*

**Newdegate**, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1591, 1602
Burials, Res. [237] 1809
Civil Service Estimates, Res. [242] 1451
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 370, 372; Comm. 1005; *cl.* 2, 1674; *cl.* 9, 1739; *cl.* 10, 1859, 1861, 1862; *cl.* 15, 1874; *cl.* 16, 1907; *cl.* 22, 1928, 1985, 2070; *cl.* 30, 2077; *cl.* 55, 2109, 2111, 2131
242] *cl.* 68, 162; *cl.* 71, 177; Postponed *cl.* 5, 188, 189, 190, 192; *cl.* 33, 193, 414; *add. cl.* 767; Schedule 5, 814, 818
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1588, 1605, 1691
County Government, 2R. [237] 1894; Comm. [238] 939
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1309, 1316; 3R. 1676, 1680, 1757
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 786
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions'
  Congress — Ministerial Statement, [240] 1082
  Negotiations, [239] 1441
  Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 780
  Treaty of San Stefano—The Maps, [239] 206
Endowed Schools (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1232
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [242] 1956
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 65, [238] 351, 354; *cl.* 68, 462; *cl.* 69, 474; *cl.* 99, 486, 488, 489, 490; *add. cl.* 598; Schedule 2, 887; Schedule 3, *ib.*
German Emperor, [240] 1169
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1506; Comm. [242] 274; *cl.* 2, 278, 280; *cl.* 5, 294; *cl.* 6, 316; *cl.* 7, 323, 1302; Consid. 1782; *add. cl.* 1799; *cl.* 5, 1803, 1805, 1806
Irish Estimates, [240] 1666, 1667
Libel Law Amendment, 2R. [237] 655
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 727
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1531
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 415, 512, 514
Military Forces—Expenses of Indian Contingent, [239] 1597, 1723
Navy—Roman Catholic Chaplains, [238] 1756
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1462, 1464, 1465, 1467, 1468
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [242] 1640
  Morning Sittings, [239] 1238
  Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1388, 1392
  Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1740
Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1051
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 237
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1401
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 387
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 178, 180

[*cont.*

**Newdegate**, Mr. C. N.—*cont.*
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1796
Removal of Paupers, [241] Res. 684
Ritualism, Res. [241] 932
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1273, 1279
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1374
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1866

*Newfoundland — Appointment of Magistrate*
Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 28, [238] 451

*New South Wales—Colonial Finance*
Question, Address for Papers, The Earl of Belmore *May* 14, [239] 1867; after short debate, Motion agreed to *P.P.* [2029]

*New Zealand—Crown Redress (No. 2) Act*
Question, Mr. Courtney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 15, [238] 1395

**Noel**, Right Hon. G. J. (First Commissioner of Works), *Rutland*
Egyptian Obelisk (Cleopatra's Needle), [237] 724
Epping Forest, [237] 724
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 601
India—Bengal—Enhancement of Rent, [237] 463
  The Moar Succession, [239] 1228
India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 448
Malay Peninsula—Expenses of the Expedition, [238] 448
Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  Albert Terrace (Hyde Park) Improvement, [237] 1053
  Hyde Park, [238] 873
  New Law Courts, [237] 322
  Royal Parks, &c.—Kew Gardens, [237] 368
  St. James' Park, [242] 994
National Portrait Gallery, South Kensington, [238] 1749
Ordnance Survey, [238] 1143; [240] 256
Public Health—Ventilation of the Law and Police Courts, [238] 1044
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [238] 1791; Amendt. 1793
Scotland—The Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh, [240] 930
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 780
Supply—Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1531
  County Court Buildings, [240] 1373
  Houses of Parliament Buildings, [240] 1361
  Marlborough House, [238] 1520, 1521; [240] 1360
  Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, [240] 1374
  Natural History Museum, [238] 1539; [240] 1383
  New Courts of Justice and Offices, [240] 1375
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [238] 1522; [242] 1688, 1689

[*cont.*

**Noel, Right Hon. G. J.**—*cont.*
Public Buildings, [240] 1365, 1368, 1371, 1373
Public Offices Site, [238] 1540, 1541
Royal Palaces, [238] 1517, 1518, 1519, 1520; [240] 1359; [242] 1690
Science and Art Department Buildings, [240] 1379
Survey of the United Kingdom, [240] 1376
Wellington Monument, [238] 1538
Works and Public Buildings, [240] 91, 93, 94
Ventilation of Public Buildings—Police Courts, [238] 972

**Noel, Mr. E.**, *Dumfries, &c.*
Borneo, [240] 358
India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 448
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [241] 641, 642; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 646

**Nolan, Major J. P.**, *Galway Co.*
Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1959
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1683; 3R. [242] 450
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1649
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
First Class Army Reserve, [239] 1692
India—Artillery Pensions, [238] 1044
Indo-European Troops in Malta, [240] 746
Paymasters, [239] 1092
Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 652
Siege Guns, [240] 496
Army—Army and Militia Reserves, [241] 1846; — Families of Reserve Men, [239] 1518, 1721; Res. [242] 1378
Army Estimates—Army Reserve, [240] 1476
Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1407, 1409
Commissariat, Transport, &c. [242] 1407
Land Forces, [238] 672, 717
Medical Establishments and Services, [240] 1440, 1442
Regular Forces in India, Home Charges, [242] 1421
Volunteer Corps, [240] 1466
Warlike Stores, [242] 1411
Breech-Loading Ordnance, Res. [238] 1146
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 250; Comm. *cl.* 22, 1924, 1928, 1933, 1986; *cl.* 30, 2070; *cl.* 55, 2097, 2100, 2101, 2103, 2104, 2106, 2110, 2112, 2117, 2126, 2135; *cl.* 64, 2141, 2145
242] *add. cl.* 766, 767, 768, 769; Consid. *cl.* 60, Amendt. 1279, 1281
Corrib (Galway) River, 2R. [241] 843
County Government, Leave, [237] 607; 2R. 1909
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences)—Burglars with Housebreaking Implements—Definition of "Night," [241] 1971
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1188; 3R. 1677
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 759, 917

[*cont.*

**Nolan, Major J. P.**—*cont.*
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Armistice, The, [237] 926
Dardanelles—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1534
Russia and England, [239] 260
Exchequer Bonds (£1,000,000), Comm. [238] 723
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 485, 487, 488, 491, 494, 497; *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, 611, 613
Glebe Loans (Ireland), Comm., [237] 1995; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1996
Gold and Silver Hall Marking, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [241] 201, 202
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 514
Idiots, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [241] 582; Consid. 846
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [242] 282; *cl.* 5, 286; *cl.* 6, 310, 312; *cl.* 7, 321; Schedule, 328, 333; Consid. *add. cl.* 1790; *cl.* 5, 1814
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
County Government, [237] 1619
Moycullen Dispensary, [239] 116
Peace Preservation Act—House Searches, [241] 448, 497, 959; [242] 41
Public Health, [240] 496
Queen's Colleges—The Estimates, [240] 1612
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1957
Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1231
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [239] 1534
Ireland — University Education, Res. [240] 1126
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1566
Irish Estimates, [240] 1667
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1135, 1144, 1145
Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1936
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 729
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1184
Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, Amendt. [238] 259
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1691
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 599
Mutiny, Comm. [238] 1979; *cl.* 6, 2002; *cl.* 9, 2004; *cl.* 16, 2020; *cl.* 26, Amendt. [239] 62, 65
Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-7, Comm. [242] 1616
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1466
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, [238] 1470
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House, [239] 121
Morning Sittings, [239] 1238
Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1388; Amendt. 1389
Saturday Sitting, [242] 392
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for Adjournment, [240] 836
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 255
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 407

[*cont.*

NOLAN, Major J. P.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary Reporting, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 854; Nomination of Select Committee, 1678
  Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 86, 94
  Poor Law (Scotland)—Deportation of Irish Paupers, [237] 1539
  Public Works Loans (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment, Comm. [241] 66, 200
  Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1797
  Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1007
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [240] 444
  Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1493
    Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1547
    Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1626; Amendt. 1627, 1628, 1632; [239] 178, 243
    Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1531
    Commissioners of Charitable Donations, &c. for Ireland, [241] 1550
    Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1621
    House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1464, 1471, 1477
    Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1555, 1563
    Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1771, 1773, 1776
    Prisons, Ireland, Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1603, 1607, 1609
    Provisions, Forage, &c. [238] 1625
    Public Works Office, Ireland, [242] 1586
    Queen's Colleges in Ireland, Amendt. [241] 1537, 1541
    Queen's University, Ireland, [238] 1568; Amendt. 1575
    Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1014
    Registration of Deeds in Ireland, [242] 1275
    Science and Art Museum, Dublin, [238] 1542
    Stationery Office, [239] 1791, 1804, 1809, 1811; [240] 44, 75, 76, 81
    Temporary Commissions, [238] 1612, 1613, 1614
  Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 946, 948
  Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1680
  Turkey—Cyprus, Occupation of, [241] 1242
  Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 264, 270
  Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1645; *cl.* 3, [241] 26, 30, 32
  Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1573
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 590, 606; Report, 745; Comm. 1154
  Weights and Measures, 2R. [238] 721

NORTH, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
  Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, [240] 1423
  Army — New Line Ex-Indian Regiments — Report of Committee, [239] 1594

[*cont.*

NORTH, Colonel J. S.—cont.
  Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 789
  Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 506
  Water Companies (Metropolis) — Increased Rates, [241] 1848

NORTHBROOK, Earl of
  Army—Artillery—Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns, Motion for Returns, [241] 1328
  Army (India)—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1460
  Eastern Question—Congress—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] *1816, 1828
  India—Taxation and Expenditure—Petition, Motion for Correspondence, [242] 1139
  Mauritius—Coolie Immigration, [239] 653

NORTHCOTE, Right Hon. Sir S. H. (*see* Chancellor of the Exchequer)

*North-Eastern Railway Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* Read 2° * *April* 4

NORTHUMBERLAND, Duke of (Lord Privy Seal)
  Army — Auxiliary Forces — Hampshire Rifle Volunteers, [242] 862

NORTON, Lord
  Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. [240] 1156
  Railways—Sir Francis Goldsmid, Accident to, [241] 316
  Tramways Orders Confirmation, Comm. [242] 1282

NORWOOD, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
  Army—Defences of the Humber, [238] 636
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. Postponed *cl.* 33, [242] 420, 426
  Merchant Seamen, Leave, [237] 307
  Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 809
  Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1094
  Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 957
    Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, [240] 1385

*Noxious Vapours Commission—The Report*
  Questions, Colonel Blackburne; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 5, [238] 756; *May* 13, [239] 1720; Question, Lord Winmarleigh; Answer, Lord Aberdare *May* 17, [240] 124
    The Report . . . . . . *P.P.* [2159]

O'BEIRNE, Major F., *Leitrim*
  Army—Miscellaneous Questions
    Adjutants, Nationality of, [241] 758
    Army Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 652
    Arrears of Pay (Paymasters), [241] 1239
    Brigade Depôts—Cavalry Officers, [237] 251

[*cont.*

**O'Beirne**, Major F.—*cont.*
    Cavalry Colonels—Royal Warrant, 1878, [239] 1093
    Commander-in-Chief—Leave of Absence, [241] 1335
    Half-Pay—Royal Warrant, [241] 2061
    Married Soldiers, [239] 1717, 1883
    Promotion of General Officers, [242] 865
    Rifled Ordnance, [240] 626, 1075
  Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers and Yeomanry, [241] 326;—Militia—Fines for Drunkenness, [240] 1605
  Army — Auxiliary Forces — Yeomanry Adjutants, Res. [242] 1395
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [238] 712
    Militia, &c. [240] 1444
    Works, Buildings, &c. [242] 1418
    Yeomanry Cavalry, [240] 1447; Amendt. 1448
  Collection of Rates (Dublin)—Report of Commission, [241] 449
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 20, [239] 1347
  Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 804
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. [242] 273
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Irish Board of Works—Report of Select Committee, [242] 221
    Poor Law—Pauper Children in Workhouses—Industrial Training, [242] 2059
    Taxation—Volunteer Force, [241] 131
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1990; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 2003; *cl.* 26, [239] 65; *cl.* 39, Amendt. 128, 129, 131
  Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, Comm. [242] 260
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 289; Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 623; *add. cl.* [240] 880; Consid. [241] 1264; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1311
  Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1268
    Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household, &c. of, Amendt. [241] 1545, 1546
    Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, Amendt. [240] 678, 679
  Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1162

**O'Brien**, Sir P., *King's Co.*
  Cattle Disease—Inoculation, [241] 1465
  Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. [242] 1436
  Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1042
  Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 79, [238] 476
  Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 296; Schedule, 333; Consid. *cl.* 6, 1818, 1820, 1822
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2013; *cl.* 48, [239] 141; *cl.* 56, 144
  Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1382, 1384, 1389
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 175
  Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 677
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 638; *add. cl.* [240] 883, 913, 920, 921, 922; Consid. *cl.* 1, [241] 1310; 3R. [242] 1741
  Supply—Stationery Office, [239] 1799

[*cont.*

**O'Brien**, Sir P.—*cont.*
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 568
  Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1377

**O'Byrne**, Mr. W. R., *Wicklow Co.*
  Post Office, Dublin—Pay of Telegraph Officials, [242] 2025

**O'Clery**, Mr. K., *Wexford Co.*
  Army Estimates — Volunteer Corps, Amendt. [240] 1449, 1455, 1456, 1457, 1461, 1473
  Civil Service — Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), [241] 2059
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [242] 1849
  Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1094
  Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 525
  Indian Press Law, Res. [238] 1605
  Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1555
  Ireland—Taxation—Volunteer Force, 128, 130; Motion for Adjournment, [241] 131
  Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1570
  Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 505
  Land Taxation, Res. [240] 1357
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2020; *cl.* 22, [239] 48
  Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [239] 119
  Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    Business of the House, [240] 930
    House of Commons—Salaries of Officials, [242] 1396
    Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1389
    Privilege—Petitions—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [238] 1485
    Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1973
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 131, 171
  Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 91
  Pope Pius IX., Death of—Sittings of the Conclave, [237] 1325
  Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 214
  Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 471
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1701, 1702, 1708; [238] 723, 874; [239] 384; *cl.* 1, 637, 1814, 1836; *cl.* 6, [240] 709
  Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1629
    House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1466
    Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1507
    Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 681
    Queen's University (Ireland), [238] 1574; Amendt. 1578
  Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1694
  Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 268, 272
  Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 29

O'Conor, Mr. D. M., *Sligo Co.*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1592, 1593 ; Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 764
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 366, 372
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1771
Parliament — Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1740
Parliamentary Election Petitions, [237] 373
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [239] 1277, 1282

O'Conor Don, The, *Roscommon Co.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 22, [241] 1926, 2007 ; *cl.* 68, [242] 160, 161 ; *cl.* 70, 168, 169 ; *add. cl.* 436, 438, 449, 769
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland), Leave, [241] 201
Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1475 ; Comm. *cl.* 10, [238] 95 ; *cl.* 11, 98, 101, *cl.* 13, 108, 111, 113 ; Amendt. 114 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 119, 121 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. *ib.*, 124
Idiots, &c. (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [241] 582
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1513 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 287 ; Schedule, Amendt. 327, 330, 331, 332 ; Consid. *cl.* 6, 1820, 1825, 1827
Ireland—Suck Drainage District, [237] 1848
Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1236
Ireland — University Education, Res. [240] 1038, 1082, 1144
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1565
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 732
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1187
Martin, Mr. Wykeham, Death of, [240] 1053
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 39, [239] 130, 132
Parliament—Business of the House, [237] 319 ; [240] 836, 932 ; [241] 327, 328
Saturday Sitting, [242] 392
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1474
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [237] 383
Parliament — Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1973
Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland), Comm. [242] 1614 ; Amendt. 1615
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ire-
237] land), 2R. 277 ; Comm. Motion for reporting
. Progress, 364, 1693, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1705,
. 1709, 1714, 1716, 1717, 1719, 1721, 1917, 1919
239] 337, 338, 362, 368, 373, 377, 381, 386, 393,
. 394 ; *cl.* 1, 623, 633, 643, 645, 1812, 1813,
. 1818, 1823, 1827, 1831, 1839, 1840, 1849,
. 1852, 1853
240] Comm. *cl.* 1, 32, 33, 104 ; *cl.* 2, 121 ; *cl.* 3,
. 438, 439, 440, 442, 443 ; *cl.* 4, 444 ; *cl.* 6,
. Motion for reporting Progress, 445, 446, 704,
. 705, 706, 710, 714 ; *cl.* 8, 718, 719, 720 ;
. *add. cl.* 868, 896, 910, 912, 918 ; Amendt.
. 921, 923, 924, 1021, 1028
241] Consid. 413, 414, 964 ; *add. cl.* 1299, 1302 ;
. *cl.* 1, 1308, 1312 ; *cl.* 2, 1315, 1319
242] 3R. 1716, 1723, 1725
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 181, 182
Prisons (Ireland), Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1601, 1607
Stationery Office, [239] 1807 ; [240] 81

O'Conor Don, The—*cont.*
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1696, 1697
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 268
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 17
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 137, 148, 154

O'Donnell, Mr. F. H., *Dungarvan*
Army—Tyrone Fusiliers, [240] 1342, 1610, 1611 ; Motion for Adjournment, *ib.*
Army (India)—31st Native Infantry, [240] 744
County Government, Comm. [238] 934, 941
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences)—Burglars with Housebreaking Implements—Definition of "Night," [241] 1970
Dunkeld Bridge Tolls, Motion for an Address, [237] 626, 636
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, Res. [239] 1259, 1261
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 976, 1036
Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 801
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 65, [238] 354
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 523
India—Miscellaneous Questions
Bengal Medical Regulations, [239] 414
Bengal, Native Police of, [237] 1053
Bombay Town Hall, [239] 415, 416
Licence Tax Act, [238] 1758
Maharajah of Kuch Bahar, [240] 1073
Maharajah Scindiah, [238] 1757
Taxation, [238] 156, 157
Troops of Native States, [240] 1073
India—East India (Appointment of Mr. M. Macpherson), Res. [237] 1974, 1977
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 490
Indian Press Law, Res. [238] 1596, 1603, 1606
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, Amendt. [242] 66, 132
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 299 ; Schedule, 331 ; Consid. *cl.* 6, 1825
Ireland—Royal College of Science, Dublin, [238] 378
Irish Estimates, Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1663
Land Taxation, Res, [240] 1355, 1359
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 608
238] Mutiny, Comm. 1982 ; *cl.* 1, 1984, 1986,
. 1987, 1992, 1995, 2000 ; *cl.* 2, 2002 ; *cl.* 4,
. *ib.* ; *cl.* 16, 2021, 2023 ; *cl.* 17, 2024 ; *cl.* 18,
. Amendt. *ib.*, 2030 ; *cl.* 19, *ib.*
239] *cl.* 22, 51, 53 ; *cl.* 23, 55, 59, 60, 61 ; *cl.* 41,
. 132, 134 ; *cl.* 44, 135 ; *cl.* 48, Amendt. *ib.*,
. 138 ; Amendt. *ib.*, 140, 141 ; *cl.* 56, Amendt.
. 142, 143, 145, 147 ; *cl.* 57, Amendt. *ib.* ;
. *cl.* 97, 150 ; *add. cl.* Motion for Adjourn-
. ment, 169
Navy—Clare, Mr. John, Case of, [238] 1370, 1757
"Nineteenth Century"—The Article on "Liberty in the East and West" (Mr. Gladstone)—Mr. Hanbury's Motion, [240] 1164
Parliament—Business of the House, [240] 361
Morning Sittings, [239] 1239
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1399, 1402, 1404, 1411

O'DONNELL, Mr. F. H.—*cont.*

- Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [237] 405, 407, 408; Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 364
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 200, 206
- Queen's Colleges and University (Ireland), 2R. [238] 29, 378; [239] 1990
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 1960
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1718; *cl.* 1, [239] 645
- South Africa—Kaffir Outbreak, [237] 1734; [238] 1511
- Supplementary Estimate, Personal Explanation, [237] 1063, 1064; Comm. 1332
- Supply—Admiralty Registry of the High Court of Justice, [240] 972
  - Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. Amendt. [240] 962, 963
  - Chief Secretary for Ireland Offices, [238] 1557
  - Civil Contingencies Fund, Re-payments to, [238] 1622
  - Civil Service Commission, [238] 1546
  - Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1630; Amendt. [239] 229
  - Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1531
  - Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [240] 1290, 1291; Amendt. 1298, 1305, 1307
  - Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1626
  - Consular Services, [240] 1289
  - Convict Establishments, [240] 1005
  - Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 952
  - Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1278; Amendt. 1281
  - Law Charges, [238] 1559; [240] 942
  - Lighthouses Abroad, [238] 1543
  - Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1630, 1643, 1649
  - Mint, Coinage, &c. [239] 1762; Amendt. 1763
  - Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances in Great Britain, Amendt. [240] 1312
  - Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1768, 1769, 1770; Amendt. 1772
  - Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1776
  - Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 990, 992, 993, 994
  - Post Office Telegraph Disallowances, [238] 1623
  - Public Offices Site, [238] 1541
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, &c. Amendt. [240] 668, 669, 672, 674
  - Queen's University in Ireland, [238] 1560, 1570, 1572, 1576
  - Report, [238] 1632
  - Royal Palaces, [238] 1520
  - Secret Services, [240] 659, 662
  - Slave Trade, Suppression of, [240] 1308
  - Stationery Office, [239] 1784, 1785, 1786; Amendt. 1788, 1794, 1796, 1799; Motion for reporting Progress, 1801; [240] 41, 42; Amendt. 49, 57, 61, 67, 68, 71

[*cont.*

O'DONNELL, Mr. F. H.—*cont.*

  - Superannuations and Retired Allowances [240] 1310
  - Temporary Commissions, [238] 1614, 1615
  - Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 89
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 26
- Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1161, 1162; Report, 1249

O'DONOGHUE, The, *Tralee*

- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 68, [242] 164; *add. cl.* 447
- Parliament—Business of the House—Saturday Sitting, [242] 391
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Consid. [241] 1283, 1295; *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, 1299; *cl.* 2, 1319; 3R. [242] 1717
- Supply—Royal Irish Academy, Motion for reporting Progress, [241] 1543
- Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1695, 1697, 1698

O'GORMAN, Major P., *Waterford*

- Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 3R. [240] 123
- Cotton Manufactories—Riots in Lancashire, [240] 34
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1685
- Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 16
- Expiring Laws Continuance, Leave, Amendt. [242] 1610
- Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 1037
- Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1161
- Irish Church Temporalities Commission—Perpetuity Rents, [242] 1300
- Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 796, 799
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 2000
- Navy—Training Ships (Ireland), [241] 450
- Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1380, 1381, 1382, 1383, 1384
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, [237] 134, 213
- Railways—Train Management, [241] 20
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. 301
  - 237] land), 2R. 301
  - 238] 1293
  - 239] Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 373; Motion for reporting Progress, 393, 394; *cl.* 1, 633, 640; Motion for reporting Progress, 641; Motion for Adjournment, 1815, 1839, 1844; Motion for reporting Progress, 1847; Motion for Adjournment, 1848
  - 240] *cl.* 1, 121; *cl.* 3, 443; Amendt. 444; *cl.* 4, Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*; *cl.* 6, 704, 705, 711; Motion for reporting Progress, 715; *cl.* 8, Motion for Adjournment, 717; *add. cl.* 920; Motion for Adjournment, 924, 925, 1024
- Supply—Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1563
- Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 149
- Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1375

**O'HAGAN, Lord**
Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1216, 1218
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 417
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1861
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1170

**O'LEARY, Dr. W. H.,** *Drogheda*
Fiji—Status of the Natives, [242] 1532
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1191, 1193
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1385
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 3R. [242] 1619, 1717, 1718, 1719
Supply—Prisons in Ireland, Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1609

**O'NEILL, Hon. E.,** *Antrim*
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1586

**ONSLOW, Earl of**
Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 968

**ONSLOW, Mr. D. R.,** *Guildford*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1989
Army—Auxiliary Hospital, Woolwich, [237] 1209
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 571
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1044
Eastern Question—The Congress—Advance of the Russian Army, [238] 1287
    Treaty of Berlin—Roumania, [242] 2008
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), Comm. [242] 1714
Factories and Workshops, Comm. [238] 75; *cl.* 3, 87
India—Jowakis, [238] 301
    Maharajah Scindia, The, [237] 249
India — East India (Appointment of Mr. M. Macpherson), Res. [237] 1978
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 484
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 85
Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. [241] 1030
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1988
Parliament — Business of the House, [240] 1615; [241] 328; [242] 1639, 1640
    Saturday Sitting, [242] 230
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 363
Post Office—Mail Contracts, Res. [239] 1599
Racecourses (Licensing), Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [240] 1489
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 283; Comm. 1699; Motion for reporting Progress, 1704, 1707, 1716, 1918; Comm. [238] 723; [239] 323, 324, 325, 337; Motion for reporting Progress, 378, 393; *cl.* 1, 627, 1813, 1839; [240] 32; *cl.* 6, 704; *add. cl.* 908, 1021; Motion for reporting Progress, 1025, 1028, 1031; Consid. Amendt. 1675; [241] 414; Amendt. 1248; 3R. Amendt. [242] 1617, 1720, 1747

[*cont.*

**ONSLOW, Mr. D. R.**—*cont.*
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1469
    Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 182
    Report, [242] 1691
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1698; Amendt. 1699, 1700
Turkey—Mohammedan Population of Bulgaria, [241] 488
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1156

*Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sundays*
Question, Observations, Lord Thurlow; Reply, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *April* 2, [239] 396

**ORANMORE AND BROWNE, Lord**
Bishoprics, 3R. [239] 1865
Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1195, 1218;—Returns, [240] 618; [241] 848
Cyprus, Island of—Sanitary Condition, [241] 1433, 1434, 1436
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 433; Comm. Schedule, 585, 586
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1959

*Ordnance Survey, The*
Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 12, [238] 1143; Question, Mr. Williams Wynn; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *May* 20, [240] 256
    Report of Progress, 1877 . *P.P.* [1986]

**O'REILLY, Mr. M. W.,** *Longford Co.*
Army—Enlistment for India, [238] 663
    Promotion and Retirement — Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 646
Army Estimates—Divine Service, [238] 718
Elementary Education Act, 1870—School Inspection, [239] 525
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 489
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 517
India—Khelat—Occupation of Quetta, [237] 320
    Private Corbett, Case of, [237] 254
Industrial Schools, [239] 855
Industrial Schools Act (Ireland), [239] 287, 671
Ireland—Criminal Law—Edmond M'Grath, Case of, [237] 246, 247
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 496
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1175
National Gallery—Purchase of Pictures (Civil Service Estimates), [239] 119
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 414
Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 197, 199
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 383
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 12

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. R., *Limerick*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1378 ; *cl.* 2, 1381, 1389 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 1424, 1426 ; Amendt. 1682, 1683
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 134
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1256
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [242] 1849
Convict Prison Discipline—The Commission, [237] 157 ; [238] 1399
County Government, 2R. [237] 1915
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 65, [238] 349, 355 ; *cl.* 69, 472 ; *add. cl.* 505, 590, 611
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 516
Intermediate Education (Ireland), [239] 1593 ; 2R. [241] 1509 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [242] 277, 278 ; *cl.* 6, 308, 312 ; Schedule, 327 ; Consid. 1782 ; *cl.* 5, 1813
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Lunatic Asylums—The Governor of Limerick Asylum, [240] 643
  Magistracy, [242] 1762 ;—The Officer Commanding at the Curragh, [241] 122
  Stipendiary Magistrates, [242] 1853
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1945
Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1230
Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1132
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1567
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [239] 1606
Irish Estimates, [240] 1663, 1668
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1140
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 493
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2013 ; *add. cl.* [239] 164
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [240] 839
  Order of Business, [241] 764
  Public Business, [238] 157
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1403
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 407
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 217
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 81
Poor Law—Roman Catholic Nurses in Workhouses, [240] 493
Public Health (Ireland), Comm. [238] 722 ; *add. cl.* [240] 1991, 1993
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 448, 459, 473
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 686
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 301 ; Comm. 1693, 1698 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1703, 1711, 1917 ; [239] 384 ; 3R. [242] 1740
Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1546
  Civil Service Commission, Amendt. [239] 1614, 1618
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 181, 237
  House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1481

[*cont.*

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. R.—*cont.*
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1473
  Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1559
  Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 814
  Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1779
  Queen's Colleges in Ireland, [241] 1538
  Report, [238] 946
  Secret Services, [240] 664
  Stationery Office, [239] 1791, 1808 ; [240] 51, 52, 79
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 28
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 153

O'Sullivan, Mr. W. H., *Limerick Co.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 525 ; Comm. *cl.* 16, 1885 ; *cl.* 22, 1991 ; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 2010 ; *add. cl.* [242] 449
County Infirmaries, &c. (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [240] 858, 859
Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1993
Glebe Loans (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1995
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 716
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 132
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1570
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 728
Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, [238] 260
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2018, 2022
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [241] 328
  Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1438
  Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1964, 1976
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 193
237] Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ire-
. land), 2R. 295 ; Comm. Motion for reporting
. Progress, 1692, 1693, 1695, 1702, 1706,
. 1719, 1919
239] 327, 330, 331, 368, 378, 388 ; Motion for
. Adjournment, 390, 392, 393 ; *cl.* 1, 624,
. 625, 626 ; Motion for reporting Progress,
. 627, 639, 1813, 1820, 1839, 1843 ; Motion
. for Adjournment, 1846 ; Motion for report-
. ing Progress, 1848, 1851, 1852
240] *cl.* 3, Motion for reporting Progress, 439,
. 440, 441, 444 ; *cl.* 4, *ib.* ; *cl.* 5, Amendt.
. *ib.* ; Amendt. 445 ; *cl.* 6, *ib.* ; Motion for
. reporting Progress, 704, 706 ; Amendt. 707,
. 709, 713 ; *cl.* 8, 720 ; *add. cl.* 886, 888, 889,
. 908, 910, 914, 924 ; Motion for reporting
. Progress, 925, 1020, 1024, 1025
241] Consid. 1266, 1267, 1269 ; *add. cl.* 1298 ;
. *cl.* 1, 1309 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1311,
. 1312 ; *cl.* 2, 1316, 1320
242] 3R. Amendt. 1715, 1716, 1727
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 182
  Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 690
  Local Government Board in Ireland, Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1562, 1563
Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1683

[*cont.*

O'SULLIVAN, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*
Tobacco Duties Acts, 1830—Cultivation of Tobacco in Ireland, [241] 1968
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 263, 265, 268, 277
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 23

**OTWAY, Mr. A. J.**, *Rochester*
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Bulgaria, [242] 526
San Stefano Treaty, [241] 2056
Treaty of Berlin, [241] 1581
Russia and Turkey—War Indemnity, [241] 1845, 1846

**Outlawries Bill**
*c.* Read 1°* *Jan* 17

**PAGET, Mr. R. H.**, *Somersetshire, Mid*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 22, [241] 1926; *cl.* 30, 2073, 2078, 2079
County Government, 2R. [237] 1860
Criminal Law — Reformatory Schools, [241] 2052
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 670, 672
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1681
Eastern Question — Russia and Turkey — Treaty of San Stefano, [239] 117
241] Highways, Comm. *cl.* 4, 467, 468; *cl.* 7, 469; Amendt. 470, 471; *cl.* 11, 474, 478; Amendt. 857; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 882; *cl.* 18, 885, 888, 890; *cl.* 19, 897; *cl.* 23, 1098; *cl.* 24, 1100; *add. cl.* 1343, 1348, 1358, 1360
242] Consid. Amendt. 194
Northern Circuit—Assizes, [240] 39
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1254
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1696
Valuation, 2R. [237] 1594
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 46; *cl.* 16, 64

**PALK, Sir L.**, *Devon, E.*
Eastern Question — Constantinople — Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1623

**PALMER, Mr. G.**, *Reading*
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1825

*Paris Exhibition, The,* 1878
*Assistance to English Artizans,* Questions, Mr. Meldon; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lyon Playfair *May* 16, [240] 27
*Government Workmen,* Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 13, [239] 1716

*Paris, The Declaration of — Maritime Belligerent Rights*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 22, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the state of International Law with reference to Maritime Belligerent Rights is unsatisfactory, and calls for the careful attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Sir John Lubbock*) *v.*, [238] 1842; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

**PARKER, Colonel W.**, *Suffolk, W.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1680

**PARKER, Mr. C. S.**, *Perth*
Army Supplementary Estimate for Native Indian Troops, [240] 805
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [240] 480, 488
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 20, [239] 1342
Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [242] 1127; Consid. 1709
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 14, [242] 625
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 22, [238] 316
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 278
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [240] 1756
Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1017
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [238] 1794, 1795; *cl.* 15, [240] 1203; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1722; *cl.* 85, Amendt. 1894; *cl.* 98, 1903; *add. cl.* 1972; Consid. *cl.* 33, [241] 648
Scotland—Endowed Schools, [238] 1947; [241] 132
Harbours, [240] 168
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1268; Report, 1424
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 590

## Parliament

LORDS—

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Jan* 17

The Session of Parliament was opened by Commission

**Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech**
237] delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR *Jan* 17, 3

An ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY thereon moved by The Earl of WHARNCLIFFE (the Motion being seconded by The Earl of LOUDOUN), and, after long debate, agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente Jan* 17, 7

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Jan* 22, 316

*Chairman of Committees*—The Earl of Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente,* to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Jan* 17

*Committee for Privileges*—appointed *Jan* 17

*Sub-Committee for the Journals*—appointed *Jan* 17

*Appeal Committee*—appointed *Jan* 17

[*cont.*

**O'Shaughnessy, Mr. R.**, *Limerick*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1378 ; *cl.* 2, 1381, 1389 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 1424, 1426 ; Amendt. 1682, 1683
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 134
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1256
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [242] 1849
Convict Prison Discipline—The Commission, [237] 157 ; [238] 1399
County Government, 2R. [237] 1915
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 65, [238] 349, 355 ; *cl.* 69, 472 ; *add. cl.* 505, 590, 611
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 516
Intermediate Education (Ireland), [239] 1593 ; 2R. [241] 1509 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [242] 277, 278 ; *cl.* 6, 308, 312 ; Schedule, 327 ; Consid. 1782 ; *cl.* 5, 1813
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Lunatic Asylums—The Governor of Limerick Asylum, [240] 643
  Magistracy, [242] 1762 ;—The Officer Commanding at the Curragh, [241] 122
  Stipendiary Magistrates, [242] 1853
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1945
Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1230
Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1132
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1567
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [239] 1606
Irish Estimates, [240] 1663, 1668
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1140
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 493
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2013 ; *add. cl.* [239] 164
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [240] 839
  Order of Business, [241] 764
  Public Business, [238] 157
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1403
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 407
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 217
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 81
Poor Law—Roman Catholic Nurses in Workhouses, [240] 493
Public Health (Ireland), Comm. [238] 722 ; *add. cl.* [240] 1991, 1993
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 448, 459, 473
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 686
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 301 ; Comm. 1693, 1698 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1703, 1711, 1917 ; [239] 384 ; 3R. [242] 1740
Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1546
  Civil Service Commission, Amendt. [239] 1614, 1618
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 181, 237
  House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1481

[*cont.*

**O'Shaughnessy, Mr. R.**—*cont.*
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1473
  Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1559
  Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 814
  Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1779
  Queen's Colleges in Ireland, [241] 1538
  Report, [238] 946
  Secret Services, [240] 664
  Stationery Office, [239] 1791, 1808 ; [240] 51, 52, 79
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 28
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 153

**O'Sullivan, Mr. W. H.**, *Limerick Co.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 525 ; Comm. *cl.* 16, 1885 ; *cl.* 22, 1991 ; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 2010 ; *add. cl.* [242] 449
County Infirmaries, &c. (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [240] 858, 859
Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1993
Glebe Loans (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1995
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 716
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 132
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1570
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 728
Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, [238] 260
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2018, 2022
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [241] 328
  Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1438
  Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1964, 1976
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 193
237] Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. 295 ; Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, 1692, 1693, 1695, 1702, 1706, 1719, 1919
239] 327, 330, 331, 368, 378, 388 ; Motion for Adjournment, 390, 392, 393 ; *cl.* 1, 624, 625, 626 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 627, 639, 1813, 1820, 1839, 1843 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1846 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 1848, 1851, 1852
240] *cl.* 3, Motion for reporting Progress, 439, 440, 441, 444 ; *cl.* 4, *ib.* ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.* ; Amendt. 445 ; *cl.* 6, *ib.* ; Motion for reporting Progress, 704, 706 ; Amendt. 707, 709, 713 ; *cl.* 8, 720 ; *add. cl.* 886, 888, 889, 908, 910, 914, 924 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 925, 1020, 1024, 1025
241] Consid. 1266, 1267, 1269 ; *add. cl.* 1298 ; *cl.* 1, 1309 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1311, 1312 ; *cl.* 2, 1316, 1320
242] 3R. Amendt. 1715, 1716, 1727
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 182
  Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 690
  Local Government Board in Ireland, Motion for Adjournment, [241] 1562, 1563
Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1683

[*cont.*

O'SULLIVAN, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*
Tobacco Duties Acts, 1830—Cultivation of Tobacco in Ireland, [241] 1968
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 263, 265, 268, 277
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 23

OTWAY, Mr. A. J., *Rochester*
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Bulgaria, [242] 526
San Stefano Treaty, [241] 2056
Treaty of Berlin, [241] 1581
Russia and Turkey—War Indemnity, [241] 1845, 1846

**Outlawries Bill**
*c.* Read 1°* *Jan* 17

PAGET, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 22, [241] 1926; *cl.* 30, 2073, 2078, 2079
County Government, 2R. [237] 1860
Criminal Law — Reformatory Schools, [241] 2052
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 670, 672
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1681
Eastern Question — Russia and Turkey — Treaty of San Stefano, [239] 117
241] Highways, Comm. *cl.* 4, 467, 468; *cl.* 7,
469; Amendt. 470, 471; *cl.* 11, 474, 478;
Amendt. 857; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 882; *cl.* 18,
885, 888, 890; *cl.* 19, 897; *cl.* 23, 1098;
*cl.* 24, 1100; *add. cl.* 1343, 1348, 1358, 1360
242] Consid. Amendt. 194
Northern Circuit—Assizes, [240] 39
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1254
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1696
Valuation, 2R. [237] 1594
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, [241] 46; *cl.* 16, 64

PALK, Sir L., *Devon, E.*
Eastern Question — Constantinople — Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1623

PALMER, Mr. G., *Reading*
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1825

*Paris Exhibition, The,* 1878
*Assistance to English Artizans*, Questions, Mr. Meldon; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lyon Playfair *May* 16, [240] 27
*Government Workmen,* Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 13, [239] 1716

*Paris, The Declaration of — Maritime Belligerent Rights*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 22, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the state of International Law with reference to Maritime Belligerent Rights is unsatisfactory, and [*cont.*

*Paris, The Declaration of—Maritime Belligerent Rights*—cont.
calls for the careful attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Sir John Lubbock*) *v.*, [238] 1842; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

PARKER, Colonel W., *Suffolk, W.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1680

PARKER, Mr. C. S., *Perth*
Army Supplementary Estimate for Native Indian Troops, [240] 805
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [240] 480, 488
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 20, [239] 1342
Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [242] 1127; Consid. 1709
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 14, [242] 625
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 22, [238] 316
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 278
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [240] 1756
Representation of Minorities, Res. [238] 1017
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [238] 1794, 1795; *cl.* 15, [240] 1203; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1722; *cl.* 85, Amendt. 1894; *cl.* 98, 1903; *add. cl.* 1972; Consid. *cl.* 33, [241] 648
Scotland—Endowed Schools, [238] 1947; [241] 132
Harbours, [240] 168
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1268; Report, 1424
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 590

**Parliament**
LORDS—
MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Jan* 17
The Session of Parliament was opened by Commission

**Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech**
237] delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR *Jan* 17, 3
AN ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY thereon moved by The Earl of WHARNCLIFFE (the Motion being seconded by The Earl of LOUDOUN), and, after long debate, agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente Jan* 17, 7
HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Jan* 22, 316
*Chairman of Committees*—The Earl of Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Jan* 17
*Committee for Privileges*—appointed *Jan* 17
*Sub-Committee for the Journals*—appointed *Jan* 17
*Appeal Committee*—appointed *Jan* 17
[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Fifth Session of the Twenty-first Parliament of the United Kingdom *Jan* 17

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table (No. 5) *Jan* 21

*Chairman of Committees*, Moved, That the Lord Steward be appointed to take the Chair in the Committees of the Whole House in the absence of the Lord Redesdale; agreed to *April* 16

*Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod*—Select Committee appointed *Feb* 4: The Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Saint Albans, Ld. Chamberlain, M. Lansdowne, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, Ld. Steward, E. Devon, E. Doncaster, E. Tankerville, E. Carnarvon, E. Bradford, E. Granville, E. Kimberley, E. Sydney, E. Redesdale, V. Hawarden, V. Hardinge, V. Eversley, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Colchester, L. Skelmersdale, and L. Aveland

*Private Bill Legislation*

Orders in relation to Petitions *Feb* 5, [237] 1025

*Private Bills*—Standing Orders Committee appointed *Feb* 4; The Lords following, with the Chairman of Committees, were named of the Committee:—D. Somerset, Ld. Chamberlain, M. Winchester, M. Lansdowne, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Airlie, E. Carnarvon, E. Cadogan, E. Belmore, E. Chichester, E. Powis, E. Verulam, E. Morley, E. Stradbroke, E. Amherst, E. Sydney, V. Hawarden, V. Hutchinson, V. Hardinge, V. Eversley, V. Halifax, L. Camoys, L. Saye and Sele, L. Balfour of Burley, L. Colville of Culross, L. Boyle, L. Monson, L. Ponsonby, L. Digby, L. Colchester, L. Silchester, L. De Tabley, L. Skelmersdale, L. Belper, L. Ebury, L. Egerton, L. Hartismere, L. Penrhyn, and L. Wolverton

*Opposed Private Bills*—The Lords following, viz.:—M. Lansdowne, L. Colville of Culross, L. Boyle, and L. Skelmersdale, were appointed, with the Chairman of Committees, a Committee to select and propose to the House the names of the five Lords to form a Select Committee for the consideration of each opposed Private Bill *Feb* 4

On the Motion of the Chairman of Committees, it was—

Ordered, That this House will not receive any petition for a Private Bill after Friday the 15th day of March next, unless such Private Bill shall have been approved by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice; nor any petition for a Private Bill approved by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice after Friday the 3rd day of May next:

That this House will not receive any report from the Judges upon petitions presented to this House for Private Bills after Friday the 3rd day of May next *Feb* 25

*The Easter Recess*

Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Mar* 15, [238] 1381

Ordered that Standing Orders Nos. 92. and 93. be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Easter, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess *April* 12

*The Whitsuntide Recess*

Ordered, That the time for the Second Reading of any Private Bill brought from the House of Commons, limited by the Order of the 4th day of February last to the 11th day of June next, be extended to the 18th day of June next *May* 31

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 72. and 82. be suspended for the remainder of the Session *June* 3

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92. and 93. be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess

*Business of the House*

Observation, Earl Granville *Feb* 1, [237] 818; Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Feb* 4, 910

*Parliamentary Papers*, Observations, The Marquess of Ripon; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Feb* 1, [237] 817

*Strangers*, Question, Observations, The Earl of Camperdown; Reply, The Earl of Redesdale; short debate thereon *July* 25, [242] 198

*The Easter Recess—Adjournment of the House*, *April* 16; on the Motion of The Earl of Beaconsfield, House adjourned to Monday the 13th of May next

*The Whitsuntide Recess*, Observation, The Earl of Beaconsfield *May* 24, [240] 615

House adjourned on Friday 7th June, to Monday 17th June

*The Ministry—Resignation of the Earl of Derby*, Statement, The Earl of Derby; Observations, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Mar* 28, [239] 100

*The Ministry—The Ministerial Resignations*, Personal Explanations, The Earl of Carnarvon, The Earl of Beaconsfield *August* 1, [242] 850

*The Ventilation of the House*, Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *July* 22, [241] 2018

[*cont.*

*Parliament—Business of the House*

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, the sittings for Public Business should commence at 4 P.M. instead of 5 P.M." (*The Viscount Midleton*) *Mar* 4, [238] 616; after debate, Motion withdrawn

COMMONS

237] The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been reported; An humble Address thereon moved by Mr. WILBRAHAM EGERTON (the Motion being seconded by Mr. TENNANT) *Jan* 17, 59: after debate, Amendt. proposed, at end of Question, to add the following paragraph:—

"We humbly represent to your Majesty that, while we are glad to observe that the questions of the Grand Jury Laws and Intermediate Education in Ireland are to be brought before Parliament, and while we await information on the nature and scope of the proposals which may be submitted, we humbly assure your Majesty that we shall regard it as the duty of Parliament, on the earliest opportunity in the present condition of public affairs, to consider, in a wise and conciliatory spirit, the national demands which the Irish people have repeatedly raised" (*Mr. Henry*), 126; Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Jan* 18, 159; after long debate, Question put; A. 48, N. 301; M. 253

Div. List, A. and N. 220

Main Question put, and agreed to; Committee appointed to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution:—Mr. Wilbraham Egerton (Chairman), Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Secretary Hardy, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Stanley, Mr. Tennant, and Mr. Winn, or any Three of them

Report of Address brought up, and read, and, after short debate, agreed to *Jan* 21, 257

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Jan* 25, 488

*Printing*—Select Committee appointed *Feb* 4, and nominated as follows:—Mr. Dodson, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Massey, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. William Henry Smith, Colonel Stanley, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Spencer Walpole, and Mr. Whitbread

*Privileges*—Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed *Jan* 17

*Public Accounts*—Committee nominated *Feb* 18, as follows:—Sir Walter Barttelot, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Cubitt, Lord Eslington, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Thomson Hankey, Sir John Lubbock, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Seely, and Colonel Stanley

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—cont.

*Public Petitions*—Select Committee appointed and nominated *Jan* 22, as follows:—Sir Charles Forster (Chairman), Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. H. Corry, Earl de Grey, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Viscount Macduff, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. O'Conor, The O'Donoghue, Lord Arthur Russell, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Sandford, Mr. Simonds, and Mr. Reginald Yorke

*Selection*—Committee nominated *Jan* 21, as follows:—Mr. Mowbray (Chairman), Mr. Floyer, Mr. Thomson Hankey, Sir Graham Montgomery, The O'Conor Don, and Mr. Whitbread

*Standing Orders*—Select Committee nominated *Jan* 21, as follows:—Mr. Mowbray (Chairman), Mr. Bruen, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Thomson Hankey, Mr. Howard, Sir Graham Montgomery, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Rodwell, and Mr. Whitbread

*Order*

*Public Petition—Petition for the Impeachment of the Earl of Beaconsfield—Rules respecting Petitions*, Petition presented, Mr. J. Cowen; Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 25, [242] 215

*Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member*, Moved, "That Major O'Gorman for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair be directed to withdraw" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *August* 6, [242] 1384; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sheil*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn

Question again proposed

Amendt. to leave out "for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair," and add "for disregarding the authority of the Chair" (*Major Nolan*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Main Question put; Ordered, That Major O'Gorman, for his disorderly conduct and disrespectful behaviour towards the Chair, be directed to withdraw" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

Moved, "That the conduct of Major O'Gorman towards the Chair be taken into consideration to-morrow, and that he be ordered to attend in his place to-morrow" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Motion agreed to

Order for consideration of Major O'Gorman's conduct read *August* 7, 1438

The honourable Member for Limerick County rose, and said that he had been requested by Major O'Gorman to ask leave of the House that he might be allowed to submit a statement and apology for his conduct to the House

Leave being given, the Serjeant was directed by Mr. Speaker to acquaint Major O'Gorman, That he had permission to return to his place; Then Major O'Gorman returned to his place, and offered to the House and to the Chair the expression of his deepest regret for what took place last night, and submitted himself to the favourable judgment of the House

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Whereupon Mr. Speaker addressed the House as follows :—"The House has now heard the statement and apology of Major O'Gorman. If it should be the wish of the House to proceed no further in the matter, it would be an agreeable duty on my part to declare the will of the House in favour of indulgence. The House may be assured that, while jealous for the character of this House, and determined so far as lies in my power to maintain order in debate, it is with great reluctance that I have put in force the authority of the Chair as I felt bound to do upon this occasion"

Then the House after considering the apology of Major O'Gorman, and, in consequence of what Mr. Speaker had said, consented that the said Order of the Day should be discharged

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

Ordered, That the Order for the attendance of Major O'Gorman in his place be read and discharged (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

*Privilege*

*Breach of Privilege,* Question, Dr. Kenealy; short debate thereon *April* 5, [239] 669

*Privileges of the House,* Observations, Dr. Kenealy *May* 10, [239] 1712

*Privileges of Members,* Observations, Dr. Kenealy; Mr. Speaker's Answer; short debate thereon *May* 24, [240] 643

*The London Journals,* Observations, Mr. Parnell; short debate thereon *April* 4, [239] 532

*Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe,"* Moved, "That the said article of 'The Globe' is a breach of the Privileges of this House" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *April* 16, [239] 1399

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived

Words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

*Petitions—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill,* Questions, Mr. Macartney, Mr. O'Clery; Answers, Sir Charles Forster *Mar* 18, [238] 1485

[See titles *Parliament—Public Petitions, &c.*]

*Public Business*

*Arrangement of Public Business*

*Business of the House*

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day subsequent to the Factories and Workshops Bill be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Amendment of the Grand Jury Law in Ireland" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Feb* 28, [238] 453; after short debate, Motion agreed to

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Ordered, That the Orders of the Day subsequent to the Order of the Day for receiving the Report from the Committee of Ways and Means be postponed until after the Notice of Motion for leave to bring in a Bill for establishing a Code of Indictable Offences (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *April* 5

*Postponement of Motions,* Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Sir Henry Jackson; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 9,
239] 963

Question, Mr. Bates; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, 963

Ordered, That the Government Order of the Day appointed for To-morrow be taken at Two of the clock (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *April* 11

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day subsequent to the Public Works Loans Bill be postponed until after the Notice of Motion for leave to bring in a Bill for establishing a Code of Indictable Offences" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *April* 11, 1096; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Postponement of Motions (Military Forces of the Crown), Mr. W. Holms, Mr. A. Moore, Mr. Parnell, Mr. O'Donnell *May* 21, [240] 360

*Treaty of Berlin,* Questions, The Marquess of Hartington; Observations, Mr. Butt; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, [241] 2063

*University Education (Ireland),* Observations, Major Nolan *May* 28, [240] 836

*Vernacular Press (India) Act,* Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 11, [241] 1241

Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 21,
237] 256; Questions, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Mowbray; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 22, 319; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the
238] Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1048; Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Mark Stewart *Mar* 15, 1401; Questions, Major Nolan, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Rylands; Answers, Colonel Stanley, The Chancellor of
239] the Exchequer *Mar* 28, 121; Question, Mr. O'Clery; Observations, Mr. Butt; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Questions, Mr. A. Moore, Mr. Eyton; Answers, The O'Conor Don, The Attorney
240] General *May* 30, 930; Questions, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Parnell; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, 1074; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 6, 1256; Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 7, 1343; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 14, 1567; Questions, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. W. Holms, Mr. Onslow; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 17, 1615; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 20, 1888; Questions, Mr. J. Cowen, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

241] the Exchequer *June* 24, 132; Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Hibbert; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 27, 330; Questions, Mr. E. Jenkins, Mr. Dillwyn; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 1, 499; Questions, Mr. Goschen, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Dr. Cameron; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 4, 763; Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 9, 1071; Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir George Campbell; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 11, 1246; Question, Mr. Dillwyn, Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
242] *August* 8, 1533; Questions, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Newgegate, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answers, Mr. Speaker, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, 1639

[See titles *Parliament—Arrangement of Public Business; Parliament — The Half-past Twelve Rule*]

*Parliamentary Representation*

*Perth County Election* — Return amended *Feb* 5, [237] 1068

*Controverted Elections*, Election for the Southern Division of the County of Northumberland; Report of Mr. Justice Field *June* 19, [240] 1799; *July* 5, [241] 853

*Franchise of the Reserve Men*, Question, Mr. Elliot; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 24, [240] 622

*Members for the Scottish Universities—Expenses of Election*, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 27, [240] 739

*The Franchise—Manufacture of Faggot Votes—Exeter*, Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 20, [240] 1879

*Public Bills, &c.—Legislation*

*Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers) Bill*, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 25, [242] 225

*Bankruptcy Act* (1869) *Amendment Bill*, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 9, [242] 1635

*Bar Education and Discipline Bill*, Questions, Dr. Kenealy; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, [238] 157; *Mar* 11, 1046

*Breach of Promise of Marriage Bill*, Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Herschell *July* 2, [241] 588

*Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill*, Questions, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 15, [239] 1288; Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 6, 1450; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 28, [240] 835

*Corrupt Practices Bill*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Solicitor General *May* 16, [240] 22; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 7, 1340

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

*County Courts Bill—Valuation Bill*, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 24, [240] 625

*County Government Bill*, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 15, [239] 1285; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 28, [240] 835

*Education (Scotland) Bill*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 1, [242] 870

*Intermediate Education (Ireland)*, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 22, [238] 157; Question, Mr. P. Martin; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 22, 1838

*Liabilities of Employers and Workmen*, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Solicitor General *May* 16, [240] 22

*Local Courts of Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *June* 28, [241] 450

*Medical Act Amendment Bill*, Questions, Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. A. Mills; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *July* 29, [242] 523

*Mines*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, [238] 1487

*Mutiny and Marine Mutiny Bills*, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 28, [238] 446; Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 28, 447

Report of Select Comm. . . *P.P.* 316

*Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—The Ballot Act*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 27, [241] 322

*Parliamentary Election Petitions*, Question, Mr. O'Conor; Answer, The Attorney General *Jan* 24, [237] 373

*Patent Laws*, Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 18, [237] 1850; Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *Mar* 19, [238] 1579

*Police Superannuation Funds*, Question, Sir Frederick Perkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 1, [241] 491

*Poor Law Amendment Act* (1876) *Amendment Bill*, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *August* 12, [242] 1768

*Public Health (Ireland) Bill*, Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 14, [239] 1883

*Registration of Land, &c.*, Question, Dr. Brady; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 24, [237] 369

*Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill*, Questions, The O'Conor Don, Mr. O'Sullivan, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Onslow; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The O'Conor Don *June* 27, [241] 327

*Simony*, Question, Mr. Leatham; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 18, [237] 157

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

*Sunday Closing in Ireland,* Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Jan* 18, [237] 156

*Valuation Bill,* Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 15, [239] 1287

*Private Bill Legislation*

Orders in relation thereto *Feb* 4, [237] 912

*The Easter Recess,* Ordered, That Standing Order 129 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order, or Provisional Certificate, be extended to Monday the 6th day of May next (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *April* 16

*The Whitsuntide Recess,* Ordered, That Standing Order 129 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order, or Provisional Certificate, be extended to Thursday next (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *June* 7

*Private Bills—Bradford Tramway Company,* Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 25, [238] 1956

*Private Bill Business,* Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 25, [238] 1958

*Standing Orders—Hybrid Bills,* Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Raikes *Mar* 22, [238] 1837

*Business of the House—Public Business*

*Amendments on Supply,* Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 15, [238] 1400

*Conduct of Business in this House,* Observations, Mr. Rylands *April* 12, [239] 1229; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Kew Gardens,* Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Sir Trevor Lawrence *July* 15, [241] 1464

*Reports of Debates,* Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 7, [237] 1207; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, [238] 1487

*Salaries of Officials,* Observations, Mr. O'Clery; Reply, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 6, [242] 1396

*Select Committee on Public Business — The Committee Stage of Bills,* Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 11, [241] 1238

*Scotch Business,* Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 16, [240] 25; Questions, Mr. Baxter; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 12, [241] 1336

*The Supplementary Estimates,* Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 29, [242] 526

[See title *Parliament—Public Business of the House*]

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

*Sittings of the House*

Resolved, That this House do meet To-morrow at Two of the clock (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Mar* 5

Resolved, That the sitting of this House at Two of the clock To-morrow be held subject to the Resolution of the House of the 30th day of April, 1869 *Mar* 18; *Mar* 25

*The Easter Recess—Arrangement of Business,* Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, [238] 1291

*Morning Sittings,* Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 1, [239] 288; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 18, [240] 1684

*The Easter Recess,* Moved, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday the 6th day of May next" (*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *April* 16, [239] 1375; after short debate, Amendt. to leave out "6th day of May next," and add "29th day of this instant April" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That '6th day of May next,' &c.;" after further short debate, Question put; A. 168, N. 10; M. 158 (D.L. 108)

Main Question put, and agreed to

*Committees—Ascension Day,* Ordered, That Committees shall not sit To-morrow, being Ascension Day, until Two of the clock, and have leave to sit until Six of the clock, notwithstanding the sitting of the House (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *May* 29

*The Derby Day—Adjournment of the House,* Questions, Mr. Chaplin; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Speaker *June* 3, [240] 1075; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Chaplin *June* 4, 1171

Moved, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Thursday next" (*Mr. Chaplin*); after short debate, Question put; A. 225, N. 95; M. 130 (D. L. 163)

*The Whitsuntide Recess,* Notice of Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 23, [240] 498; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 24, 620

*The Whitsuntide Recess,* House, at its rising, to adjourn till Thursday next *June* 7

*Saturday Sitting,* Questions, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Onslow; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, [242] 230; Questions, Mr. Charles Lewis, The O'Donoghue; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *July* 26, 391

*Saturday Sitting,* Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill—The Third Reading *August* 9, [242] 1716

*Parliament—Arrangement of Public Business*

Moved, "That after To-morrow, for the remainder of the Session, Orders of the Day have precedence of Notices of Motion upon

[*cont.*

*Parliament—Arrangement of Public Business*—cont.

Tuesdays, Government Orders having priority, and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *July* 15, [241] 1472 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Resolved, That, for the remainder of the Session, Orders of the Day have precedence of Notices of Motion upon Tuesdays, Government Orders having priority, and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesdays (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

*Parliament—Borough Franchise* (*Ireland*)

Moved, "That the restricted nature of the Borough Franchise of Ireland, as compared with that existing in England and Scotland, is a subject deserving the immediate attention of Parliament, with a view of establishing a fair and just equality of the Franchise in the three countries" (*Mr. Meldon*) *Feb* 19, [237] 1925 ; after long debate, Question put ; A. 126, N. 134 ; M. 8 (D. L. 18)

*Parliament—Business of the House—The Half-past Twelve Rule*

Moved, "That, except for a Money Bill, no Order of the Day or Notice of Motion be taken after half-past Twelve of the clock at night, with respect to which Order or Notice of Motion a notice of opposition or amendment shall have been printed in the Notice Paper, or if such Notice of Motion shall only have been given the next previous day of sitting, and objection shall be taken when such Notice is called" (*Mr. Mowbray*) *Jan* 24, [237] 408

Amendt. to leave out after "That," and insert "it is inexpedient to deal with the proposed rule in reference to Opposed Business after half-past Twelve until the Committee on the Despatch of Public Business has reported to the House" (*Mr. Hibbert*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; Resolution put, and agreed to

Question, Mr. Parnell ; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 12, [237] 1538 ; Question, Mr. Dillwyn ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, 1736

*Parliament—Cost of Returns*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 11, To leave out from "That," and add "Members asking for Returns should previously ascertain from the Department the approximate expense and time required for their production, and give this information to the House when moving for the same" (*Mr. Hermon*) *v.*, [238] 1049 ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

*Parliament—Household Franchise*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 22, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to establish, throughout the whole of the United Kingdom, a Household Franchise similar to that now established in the English Boroughs" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *v.*, [238] 159 ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Question put ; A. 271, N. 219 ; M. 52

Div. List, A. and N., 255

*Parliament — Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms* (*House of Commons*)

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms, in the Department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House:"—Mr. Adam (Chairman), Mr. Dick, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Goldney, Captain Hayter, Lord Kensington, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Richard Power, Mr. Stacpoole, and Sir Henry Wolff *Jan* 22

Moved, "That Three be the quorum of the Committee"

Amendt. to leave out "Three," and insert "Five" (*Mr. Hardcastle*) *v.* ; Question, "That 'Three,' &c.," put, and negatived

Question, "That 'Five' be inserted, *v.*," put

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Ordered, That Five be the quorum of the Committee

And, on *Jan* 24, Lord Henry Thynne and Mr. Monk *added*

*Parliament—New Writ for Clare County*

*Representation of Clare—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen*, Question, Mr. Sullivan ; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 15, [241] 1462; Question Mr. Sullivan ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 22, 2060

*The Legislature of Victoria — Sir Bryan O'Loghlen*, Question, Mr. Sullivan ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 23, [242] 42

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Clare, in the room of Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Baronet, who, since his Election for the said County, hath accepted the office of Attorney General of Victoria" (*Mr. Sullivan*) *July* 23, 44

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Member for the County of Clare, has since his Election accepted an office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report their opinion whether he has vacated his seat by the acceptance of the said office" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived

Words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

And, on *July* 30, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Secretary Cross (Chairman), Mr. Adam, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Butt, Sir William Dyke, Mr. William Edward Forster,

[*cont.*

*Parliament — New Writ for Clare County*—cont.
Sir William Harcourt, Lord Francis Hervey, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Spencer Walpole, and Mr. Whitbread
Mr. Assheton Cross reported from the Select Committee that they had agreed to a Resolution, which they had directed him to report to the House *August* 8, 1522; Report to lie upon the table; Minutes of Proceedings to be printed [No. 343]
Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to give directions to Her Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to communicate the Report to Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Her Majesty's Attorney General for Victoria
*Privilege*, Observations, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 24, [242] 135

*Parliament—Parliamentary Reporting*
Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 7, [237] 1207; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, [238] 1487
*Civil Service Estimates—Class II.*, Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1878, as a grant in aid of the preparation and publication of 'Hansard's Parliamentary Debates' *Mar* 18, [238] 1555; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Moved "That a Select Committee be appointed, 'to consider the question of Parliamentary Reporting'" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 28, [240] 853; Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed, 854
And, on *June* 17, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. William Henry Smith (Chairman), Mr. Barclay, Viscount Crichton, Mr. Dunbar, Mr. William Edward Forster, Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. Hall, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Lord Francis Hervey, Mr. Mills, Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Walter, and Sir Henry Wolff; short debate thereon, 1677; *June* 20, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Cowen, and Major Arbuthnot *added*
The Report, with Plan . . . *P.P.* 327

*Parliament—Public Business of the House*
Orders of the day postponed *Jan* 24, [237] 377
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the best means of promoting the Despatch of Public Business in this House" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), 379
Amendt. at end of Question, to add "and especially to inquire into the desirability of committing Bills, unless when otherwise ordered, to Grand Committees, instead of to a Committee of the Whole House" (*The O'Conor Don*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Question put, and negatived
Main Question again proposed; Amendt. at end of Question, to add "and whether the endeavour of the Imperial Parliament to deal with the legislative requirements of the three Kingdoms as to local affairs has not been a serious obstacle to the due and expeditious discharge of the general Business of the House" (*Mr. O'Donnell*), 405; Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Select Committee appointed; Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Mowbray, and Mr. Dodson nominated Members of the Select Committee *Feb* 25, [238] 361
Moved, "That Mr. Whitbread be one other Member of the Committee;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Dr. Cameron*); after further short debate, Question put; A. 17, N. 72; M. 55; (D. L. 309)
Original Question put, and agreed to; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. J. W. Barclay*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Plunket, Sir Charles Dilke, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Goldney nominated other Members of the Committee
The Report . . . . . . . *P.P.* 268

*Parliament—Public Petitions*
House moved, That so much of the Order appointing the Select Committee on Public Petitions as directs that the Reports of the Committee do in all cases set forth the number of signatures to each Petition might be read; and the same being read,
Ordered, That, in accordance with the recommendation of the Special Report of the Committee on Public Petitions (11th of April), so much of the Order appointing the Select Committee on Public Petitions as directs that the Reports of the Committee do in all cases set forth the number of signatures to each Petition be discharged
Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee that the Reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed (*Sir C. Forster*)
*The Indian Press Law—Point of Order*, Petition presented (*Mr. Gladstone*) *June* 18, [240] 1681; Petition brought up, and ordered to lie upon the Table

*Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions*
Special Report brought up, and read *Mar* 21, [238] 1737
Moved, "That the Special Report do lie upon the Table"
Amendt. to leave out from "Report," and add "be referred back to the Public Petitions Committee, and that they inquire into the circumstances connected with the Petitions mentioned in the said Report, and make a Report thereupon to the House" (*Mr. Meldon*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir W. Lawson*); after further short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

*Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions*—cont.

Ordered, That the Special Report be printed (No. 97)

Debate resumed *Mar* 25, 1961; Question put, and negatived

Question proposed, "That the words 'be referred back to the Public Petitions Committee, and that they inquire into the circumstances connected with the Petitions mentioned in the said Report, and make a Report thereupon to the House,' be there added," 1972

Amendt. proposed to the proposed Amendt. to insert, after "the said Report," "and all other Petitions presented to the House during this Session for and against the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill" (*Mr. Maurice Brooks*); Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after short debate, Amendt. to Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Leave to make a Special Report—Special Report brought up, and read *April* 11, [239] 1089

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 145]

Special Report read *April* 12, 1220; Moved, "That the said Order be discharged" (*Sir Charles Forster*); after short debate, Motion agreed to

Special Report brought up, and read *May* 20, [240] 254; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 188]

*Petition for the Impeachment of the Earl of Beaconsfield — Rules respecting Petitions*, Petition presented, Mr. J. Cowen; Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 25, [242] 215

*Parliament—Representation of Minorities*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the whole electoral body should be enabled to enjoy that direct representation which is at present confined to majorities:

"That no effectual security exists for the due representation of minorities:

"And that, as far as possible, all opinions should have an opportunity of being represented in direct proportion to the number of electors by whom they are held" (*Mr. Blennerhassett*) *v.*, [238] 979; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate,

[House counted out]

*Parliament—The "Nineteenth Century"—The Article on "Liberty in the East and West"—(Mr. Gladstone)*

240] Notice, Mr. Hanbury *June* 3, 1069;—Mr. Hanbury's Motion, Notice of Amendment, Mr. O'Donnell *June* 4, 1164; Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Hanbury, 1170; Question, Observations, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Reply, Mr. Hanbury; Observations, Mr. Gladstone *June* 17, 1616

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS

*New Peers*

*May* 14—The Right Honourable Gathorne Hardy, created Viscount Cranbrook of Hemsted in the county of Kent

- The Right Honourable Sir Charles Bowyer Adderley, created Baron Norton of Norton-on-the-Moors in the county of Stafford

*Sat First*

*Jan* 17—The Lord Mowbray (Barony called out of abeyance)

The Earl of Saint Germans, after the death of his Father

*Jan* 24—The Lord Ranfurly, after the death of his Brother

*Jan* 25—The Lord Kinnaird, after the death of his Brother (special limitation)

*Jan* 31—The Marquess of Ailesbury, after the death of his Brother

*Feb* 8—The Viscount Canterbury, after the death of his Father

*Feb* 19—The Lord de Clifford, after the death of his Father

*Mar* 5—The Earl Bathurst, after the death of his Uncle

*April* 4—The Lord Rodney, after the death of his Father

*April* 8—The Earl of Ravensworth, after the death of his Father

*May* 14—The Lord Bishop of Saint David's

*May* 16—The Lord Somerhill, after the death of his Father

*May* 21—The Lord Middleton, after the death of his Father

*May* 23—The Lord Clements, after the death of his Uncle

*May* 24—The Viscount Melville, after the death of his Brother

The Lord Grantley, after the death of his Great-Uncle

*June* 3—The Lord Hastings, after the death of his Father

*Representative Peer for Ireland (Certificate)*

*Jan* 17—The Earl of Caledon, *v.* Lord Headley, deceased

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS

*New Writs Issued*

1878

*Jan* 18—*For* Greenock, *v.* James Johnstone Grieve, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds

*For* Leith District of Burghs, *v.* Donald Robert Macgregor, esquire Manor of Northstead

*Jan* 21—*For* Perth, *v.* Honble. Arthur Fitzgerald Kinnaird, now Baron Kinnaird

*Jan* 23—*For* Perth County, *v.* Sir William Stirling Maxwell, baronet, deceased

*Jan* 25—*For* Marlborough, *v.* Lord Ernest Bruce, now Marquess of Ailesbury

*Jan* 29—*For* Oxford County, *v.* Right honble. Joseph Warner Henley, Chiltern Hundreds

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT — COMMONS—*New Writs Issued*—cont.

*Feb* 14—*For* York, *v.* James Lowther, esquire, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
*Feb* 25—*For* Canterbury, *v.* Henry Alexander Munro Butler-Johnstone, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
*Mar* 4—*For* Cirencester, *v.* Allen Alexander Bathurst, esquire, called up to the House of Peers
*Mar* 8—*For* Mid-Somerset, *v.* Ralph Neville-Grenville, esquire, Manor of Northstead
*For* Hereford City, *v.* Evan Pateshall, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
*Mar* 11—*For* East Somerset, *v.* Richard Bright, esquire, deceased
*Mar* 22—*For* the City of Worcester, *v.* Alexander Clunes Sherriff, esquire, deceased
*Mar* 25—*For* Belfast, *v.* William Johnston, esquire, Inspector of Fisheries (Ireland)
*April* 1—*For* North Lancashire, *v.* Lieutenant Colonel the Hon. Frederick Arthur Stanley, one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State
*April* 3—*For* Northumberland County (Southern Division), *v.* Lord Eslington, now Earl of Ravensworth
*April* 4—*For* Middlesex, *v.* Lord George Hamilton, Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education
*April* 16—*For* North Staffordshire, *v.* the Right Hon. Sir Charles Bowyer Adderley, K.C.M.G., now Baron Norton
*For* Tamworth, *v.* Robert William Hanbury, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
*May* 6—*For* Oxford University, *v.* the Right Hon. Gathorne Hardy, now Viscount Cranbrook, called up to the House of Peers
*For* West Kent, *v.* John Gilbert Talbot, esquire, Manor of Northstead
*For* County Down, *v*, James Sharman Crawford, esquire, deceased
*For* Carmarthen, *v.* Sir Emile Algernon Arthur Keppel Cowell-Stepney, Chiltern Hundreds
*May* 9—*For* Reading, *v.* Sir Francis Henry Goldsmid, baronet, deceased
*June* 6—*For* Southampton, *v.* The Right Hon. Russell Gurney, deceased
*June* 7—*For* Rochester, *v.* Philip Wykeham Martin, esquire, deceased
*June* 24—*For* Middlesborough, *v.* Henry William Ferdinand Bolckow, esquire, deceased
*June* 25—*For* the Borough of Flint, *v.* Peter Ellis Eyton, esquire, deceased
*July* 22—*For* Haddington District of Burghs, *v.* Sir Henry Robert Ferguson Davie, baronet, Manor of Northstead
*Aug* 5—*For* Boston, *v.* John Wingfield Malcolm, esquire, Manor of Northstead

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT — COMMONS — *New Writs Issued*—cont.

*Aug* 8—*For* the County of Argyll, *v.* the Right hon. John Douglas Campbell, commonly called Marquess of Lorne, Chiltern Hundreds
*Aug* 15—*For* Newcastle-under-Lyme, *v.* Sir Edmund Buckley, baronet, Chiltern Hundreds

*New Members Sworn*

*Jan* 17—Lord Burghley, *Northampton County* (Northern Division)
*Jan* 28—James Stewart, esquire, *Greenock*
*Jan* 31—Lord Charles Bruce, *Marlborough*
Andrew Grant, esquire, *Leith District of Burghs*
*Feb* 4—Charles Stuart Parker, esquire, *Perth*
Lieutenant Colonel Henry Edward Stirling Home Drummond Moray, *Perth County*
*Feb* 7—Edward William Harcourt, esquire, *Oxford County*
*Feb* 20—James Lowther, esquire, *York City*
*Mar* 4—Alfred Erskine Hardy, esquire, *Canterbury*
*Mar* 14—Thomas William Chester Master, esquire, the younger, *Cirencester*
*Mar* 18—Lieutenant Colonel George Arbuthnot, *Hereford City*
*Mar* 20—William Stephen Gore Langton, esquire, *Mid Division of the County of Somerset*
*Mar* 22—Philip John William Miles, esquire, *Eastern Division of the County of Somerset*
*April* 1—John Derby Allcroft, esquire, *City of Worcester*
*April* 8—William Ewart, esquire, *Belfast*
*April* 9—Right Hon. Frederick Arthur Stanley, *Lancaster County (Northern Division)*
*April* 12—Lord George Hamilton, *Middlesex*
*May* 6—Robert William Hanbury, esquire, *Northern Division of the County of Stafford*
*May* 9—Albert Henry George Grey, esquire, and Edward Ridley, esquire, *Southern Division of the County of Northumberland* (double Return)
*May* 13—Hamar Alfred Bass, esquire, *Tamworth*
*May* 16—Viscount Lewisham, *Western Division of the County of Kent*
Benjamin Thomas Williams, esquire, *Borough of Carmarthen*
*May* 20—John Gilbert Talbot, esquire, *University of Oxford*
George Palmer, esquire, *Reading* (*Affirmation*)
*May* 21—Viscount Castlereagh, *County of Down*
*June* 17—Arthur John Otway, esquire, *Rochester*
Alfred Giles, esquire, *Southampton*
*July* 5—Isaac Wilson, esquire, *Middlesborough*
*July* 8—John Roberts, esquire, *Borough of Flint*
*Aug* 5—Lord William Montagu Hay, *Haddington Burghs*
*Aug* 12—Thomas Garfit, esquire, *Boston*

**Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Ballot Papers) Bill**

(*Sir Charles W. Dilke, Sir Henry James, Mr. Mark Stewart, Major Nolan*)

*c.* Motion for Leave (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *May* 9, [239] 1687; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 172]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 29

***Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling***

Select Committee appointed, "to consider the question whether any and what alteration can, without inconvenience, be made in the Hours of Polling at Parliamentary and Municipal Elections in Boroughs other than the Metropolitan Boroughs, so as to afford greater facilities to Electors desiring to record their Votes" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *Jan* 18

And, on *April* 2, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Barran, Mr. Burt, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Cotes, Sir William Cuninghame, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Halsey, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Marten, Mr. Mills, Mr. Moore, Mr. Henry Samuelson, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, and Mr. Tennant; *April* 8, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Charley *added*; *April* 15, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *disch.*, Sir Matthew White Ridley *added*; *May* 28, Mr. Charley *disch.*, Mr. Alfred Gathorne-Hardy *added.*

The Report . . . . . . (*P.P.* 325)

**Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill**—*Afterwards*
**Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Consolidated) Bill**

(*Mr. Alfred Marten, Mr. Torr, Mr. Dodds*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 73]
Read 2° *, and referred to a Select Committee *Jan* 24
And, on *Jan* 25, Committee nominated as follows:—The Lord Advocate, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Birley, Mr. Boord, Mr. Cotes, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Hamond, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Alfred Marten, Mr. Meldon, The O'Donoghue, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Serjeant Simon, and Mr. Torr
Ordered, That the Select Committee have power to consolidate the three Bills referred to that Committee, namely, the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill, the Parliamentary Electors Registration Bill, and the Borough Voters Bill (*Mr. Marten*) *Feb* 28
Report of Select Comm. * (*P.P.* 212)
Report *; Re-comm. *June* 3 [Bill 202]
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 6, [240] 1322
Read 3° * *June* 7
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl Stanhope*) *June* 17 (No. 125)
Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 1, [241] 484
Committee *; Report *July* 8
Read 3ª * *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 26]

**Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill**

(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 29 [Bill 281]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 14

**Parliamentary Elections (Boroughs) Bill**

(*Mr. Yeaman, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Muntz, Dr. Ward, Mr. Goulding*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 98]

**Parliamentary Elections (Metropolis) Bill**

(*Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Gordon, Colonel Beresford, Mr. William Edward Forster*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 14]
Read 2° *Jan* 22, [237] 357
Committee; Report *Jan* 23, 364
Read 3° * *Jan* 30
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl Cadogan*) *Feb* 1 (No. 12)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Feb* 18, 1844
Committee *; Report *Feb* 19
Read 3ª * *Feb* 21
Royal Assent *Feb* 25 [41 *Vict.* c. 4]

**Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland) Bill**

(*Mr. James Stewart, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Montgomerie, Mr. Ramsay*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 2 [Bill 237]
Read 2° * *July* 10
Committee *—R.P. *July* 19
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Considered * *July* 24
Read 3° * *July* 25
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Henniker*) *July* 26 (No. 174)
Read 2ª * *July* 30
Committee *; Report *August* 1
Read 3ª * *August* 2
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 41]

**Parliamentary Electors Registration Bill**

(*Mr. Boord, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Grantham*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 33]
Read 2° *, and referred to the Select Committee on Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill *Feb* 11
Report *; Re-comm. *June* 3
Reported from Select Committee

**Parliamentary Franchise (Ireland) Bill**

(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Henry*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 77]
Read 2° *Jan* 22, [237] 358
Committee [Dropped]

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Meath*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1600
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1315; Comm. Amendt. [241] 1367, 1375; *cl.* 2, 1388; Amendt. 1425, 1679, 1681; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1683, 1684

[*cont.*

Parnell, Mr. C. S.—*cont*
Arklow Harbour (Ireland), [241] 1848
Army—Royal Artillery, [239] 520, 521
Army Estimates — Army Reserve, Amendt. [240] 1474, 1482
Divine Service, [238] 718
Medical Establishments, &c. [240] 1433, 1434, 1435, 1436, 1439
Militia, &c. [240] 1445, 1446
Volunteer Corps, [240] 1456, 1470
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1647
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2102, 2103, 2118, 2119; Amendt. 2123, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2135
County Government, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1910; Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 937, 943
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Leave, [239] 1958
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [239] 1291; *cl.* 17, 1331; Amendt. 1335, 1337; Consid. Amendt. 1413
Dublin Tramways, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [239] 29
Eastern Question—Reserve Forces, [239] 174, 207
East India (Appointment of Mr. M. Macpherson), Res. [237] 1978
Estimates, Discussions on the, [240] 933, 934, 935
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 3, 86;
. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 93; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 94, 96;
. *cl.* 11, 97, 102; *cl.* 13, 113; *cl.* 16, 127;
. Amendt. 128; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 303, 308;
. Amendt. 312; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 313; Amendt.
. 315; Amendt. 316; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 317;
. *cl.* 29, 327; *cl.* 31, 329; *cl.* 37, Amendt.
. 331; *cl.* 38, 333; *cl.* 39, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 47,
. 338; *cl.* 54, 340; *cl.* 60, Amendt. 341, 342;
. *cl.* 65, 345, 350; Amendt. 357; *cl.* 66,
. Amendt. 456; *cl.* 80, 478, 479; *cl.* 88;
. Amendt. 480, 482; *cl.* 99, 484, 491; Amendt.
. 495, 496; *cl.* 100, 499; *add. cl.* 503, 590,
. 598; Amendt. 600, 603, 613; Schedule 1,
. 614; Amendt. 877; Amendt. 879, 883, 885;
. New Schedule, 892, 893
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 520
Highways, 2R. [239] 1257
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 1659
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 6, [242] 1825, 1826
Ireland—Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, Res. [239] 1261
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment, [238] 1298; 2R. [239] 474
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1567, 1571
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [239] 1601
Irish Estimates, [240] 1659, 1661, 1662, 1665
Land Taxation, Res. [240] 1358
Militia Volunteers for Service, [239] 414
238] Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, 1989, 1990, 1998, 1999,
. 2000; *cl.* 2, 2001; *cl.* 9, 2004; *cl.* 16, 2005,
. 2008, 2012, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2021, 2023;
. *cl.* 18, 2026, 2029, 2031

[*cont.*

Parnell, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
239] *cl.* 22, 41, 45, 47; *cl.* 23, 54; Motion for
. reporting Progress, 58, 60, 61; *cl.* 24, 62;
. *cl.* 26, 65, 122, 123, 124; Motion for re-
. porting Progress, 125; *cl.* 39, 130, 131;
. *cl.* 41, 134; *cl.* 44, 135; *cl.* 48, 138, 139;
. *cl.* 56, 142, 144, 146; *cl.* 57, 148; *cl.* 66,
. 149; *cl.* 97, Amendt. *ib.* 151; *add. cl.* 152,
. 159, 161, 163, 164; Motion for reporting
. Progress, 165, 166, 168, 169; 3R. 211
Navy—Clare, Mr. John, Case of, [238] 1379
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1463
Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 805
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House, [240] 360, 361, 839, 1074, 1343
Marine Mutiny, [238] 447
Morning Sittings, [239] 1236
Mutiny, [238] 446
Order of Business, [238] 455
Privilege, [239] 532, 535, 536
Public Petitions Committee, Report, [239] 1225
Parliament—Business of the House (Half-past Twelve Rule), [237] 1538, 1539
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1405, 1406, 1407, 1408
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1097, 1103, 1398
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 363
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 194
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 87, 94
Prisoners, Treatment of, [240] 1683
Public Health (Ireland), Comm. [238] 722
Public Works Loans (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment, Comm. [241] 66
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [237] 1695; Comm. [239] 384; *cl.* 1, 1817, 1842
Statute Law Revision (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1258
Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1437
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 965
Charity Commission, [239] 1613
Chief Secretary for Ireland, [241] 1549
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 181, 182, 240
Colonial Local Revenue, [240] 1301, 1302
Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1619, 1621, 1623, 1626
Convict Establishments, [240] 1001; Amendt. 1004, 1007, 1008
County Courts, [240] 978, 979
County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1012
Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1282
Fishery Board, Scotland, Amendt. [240] 691, 694, 700, 702
Foreign Office, [239] 1488
Friendly Societies, [239] 1627
Home Office, [239] 1484, 1485
House of Commons, Offices of the, Motion for reporting Progress, [239] 1479, 1480, 1481
House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1453, 1460, 1469, 1475, 1477

[*cont.*

**Parnell**, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
Local Government Board, &c. Amendt. [239] 1633, 1637, 1648
Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1555, 1558
Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 816
London Bankruptcy Court, [240] 973
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household, &c. of, [241] 1546
Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1505, 1508
Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 991, 994, 996
Post Office Telegraphs, [240] 1313
Privy Council for Trade, &c., Committee of, [239] 1611
Privy Council Office, [239] 1490, 1492, 1496
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 676, 677
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, [241] 1538
Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1014, 1016, 1017
Report, Amendt. [238] 943, 948; [239] 394; [240] 348
Royal Irish Academy, [241] 1542, 1544
Secret Services, Amendt. [240] 657
Stationery Office, [239] 1798, 1801, 1804, 1805, 1806; Motion for Adjournment, 1810, 1811; [240] 42, 47, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 63, 66, 69; Motion for reporting Progress, 70, 73, 75, 78, 80, 81; Amendt. 82
Treasury, Amendt. [239] 1481
Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 84, 90
Works, Buildings, &c. [240] 94
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 275
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1504; *cl.* 3, [241] 27; *cl.* 16, 63
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 153, 154
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 597, 606; Report, 748; Comm. 1159, 1162
Weights and Measures, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 719, 721; Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, [241] 409, 410

*Parochial Charities of the City of London*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "it is desirable that Her Majesty's Government should, at the earliest possible date, introduce some legislative measure carrying into effect the recommendations of the Twenty-fourth Report of the Charity Commissioners with respect to the Parochial Charities of the City of London" (*Mr. James*) *v.*, [239] 1694; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
*The Commission*, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 27, [241] 327
*Legislation*, Questions, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 27, [241] 327; *July* 11, 1244; *July* 18, 1852

**Patent Law Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Dalrymple, Mr. Alexander Brown*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 13 [Bill 127]
2R. [Dropped]

*Patent Laws, The—Legislation*
Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 18, [237] 1850; Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *Mar* 19, [238] 1579

**Pease**, Mr. J. W., *Durham, S.*
Blake *v.* The Albion Life Assurance Society, [238] 1590
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1237, 1254, 1273
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 534;
. Comm. *cl.* 2, 1699; *cl.* 10, 1859, 1864; *cl.* 15,
. 1872; *cl.* 16, 1898; *cl.* 22, 1989, 1996;
. Amendt. 2000; *cl.* 31, 2080, 2082; *cl.* 34,
. 2085; *cl.* 53, 2091, 2092; *cl.* 54, 2095;
. *cl.* 55, 2097, 2100, 2126
242] *cl.* 68, Amendt. 136, 154, 163
Cruelty to Animals Act, 1877—Licences, [238] 1042
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1753
Dublin Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1042
Education Department — Education Minute, 1878—"Unnecessary Schools," [241] 1576
Education—Inspectors of Elementary Schools, [241] 826
Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 842, 853
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 708
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 20, [241] 1081, 1083; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1340, 1341, 1357
Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870—Account of Insurance Companies, [239] 519
Police Superannuation, [239] 203
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 384; *cl.* 1, 637
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors—Licensing Law, Res. [239] 1540, 1541, 1543
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 981, 1234
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 480, 508
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 562; Report, 745

**Peek**, Sir H. W., *Surrey, Mid*
Law and Justice—Bankrupt Solicitors, [237] 619
Metropolis—London Bridge, [239] 1884
Royal Parks, &c.—Kew Gardens, [237] 368

**Peel**, Right Hon. Sir R., *Tamworth*
Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000), 2R. [237] 1634, 1645
Eastern Question—Congress, The, [238] 1336, 1352, 1593, 1594
Negotiations, [239] 1445
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Mr. Justice Keogh, Charge of, [238] 1954
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 837, 841, 1120, 1121, 1122, 1239; Comm. 1401
Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 571
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 21

**Peel**, Mr. A. W., *Warwick Bo.*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1576, 1596, 1597
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 175, 397; Comm. *cl.* 22, 1995; *cl.* 68, [242] 144; *cl.* 71, 184; Postponed *cl.* 33, 406

[*cont.*

PEEL, Mr. A. W.—*cont.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1606
County Government, Leave, [237] 603; 2R. 1874
County Government Bill — Management of Rivers, [240] 30
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 20, [239] 1344
Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1363
Select Committee on Cattle Plague, 1877—Cattle from Ireland, [241] 123
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills, Res. [239] 1275, 1282

PELL, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Army—Pay of Reserve Soldiers, [239] 1693
Army Reserves, [240] 261
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. [238] 1579
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 236; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1698, 1706, 1718; *cl.* 21, 1914; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 2096, 2097, 2099; *cl.* 70, [242] 171, 172; Postponed *cl.* 5, 187; *cl.* 33, 408; *add. cl.* 439, 443; Schedule 5, Amendt. 815, 817, 819, 821
County Government, 2R. [237] 1676
Education Department—Miscellaneous Questions
Grants in Elementary Schools, [239] 531
School Board Schools and Savings Banks, [241] 820
School Fees, [241] 761
Highways, Comm. [241] 464; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 884, 889; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 898; *cl.* 21, 1092; *add. cl.* 1110, 1158, 1160
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 504
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1406
Parochial Charities of the City of London, Res. [239] 1703
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. [238] 2032; Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 941, 1037, 1045
Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 547
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 681
Town Councils, Local Boards, and other Local Governing Bodies, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [238] 825
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 504
Valuation, 2R. [237] 1593
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1514; *cl.* 5, [241] 34; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 37, 40, 45, 51, 56; *cl.* 16, 61

PEMBROKE and MONTGOMERY, Earl of
Eastern Question—British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 691, 697

*Penal Servitude Commission — Fenian Convicts*
Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 21, [238] 1758

PENZANCE, Lord
Forces of the Crown in Ireland, Motion for a Return, [240] 1333, 1338
Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [239] 187; *add. cl.* 191, 192; 3R. Amendt. [240] 126

PERCY, Right Hon. Earl, *Northumberland, N.*
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 420
Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), Comm. [241] 581
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 709
Militia Reserve Act—Non-commissioned Officers, [241] 496
Parliament — Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1051
Public Health—Small-Pox, [238] 754
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 631
Vaccination Acts, [238] 974
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. Amendt. [239] 489, 490
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1153

PERKINS, Sir F., *Southampton*
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1653
Cattle Disease—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [241] 962
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1605
Police Superannuation Funds, [241] 491
Russia and Turkey — Alleged Execution of Polish Doctors, [238] 758
Sale of Food and Drugs Act—Sale of Spirits under Proof, [240] 743

**Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill**
(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Richard, Mr. Dalway, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Downing*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 24]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 26, [241] 251
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Wheelhouse*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Question put; A. 115, N. 278; M. 194 (D. L. 187)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

*Persia*
*The Late Persian Legation,* Question, Sir Thomas Chambers; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 5, [239] 663
*Visit of the Shah,* Question, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 30, [240] 928

**Petty Sessions Clerks and Fines (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. James Lowther*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 10 [Bill 253]
Read 2° * *August* 2
Committee; Report, after short debate *August* 8, [242] 1614
Considered *; read 3° *August* 9
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *August* 12 (No. 200)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *August* 13
Read 3ª * *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 69]

PHIPPS, Mr. P., *Northampton*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 544; Comm. *cl.* 33, [242] 399

**Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill**
(*Viscount Sandon, Mr. J. G. Talbot*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 8 [Bill 148]
Read 2° * *April* 16
Committee *; Report *May* 6
Order for 3R. discharged *May* 8
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 3
Considered *; read 3° *June* 4 [Bill 187]
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Hartismere*) *June* 6 (No. 109)
Read 2ª * *June* 17
Committee *; Report *June* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 1
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cxiv]

**Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill**
(*Viscount Sandon, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *May* 6 [Bill 159]
Read 2° * *May* 14
Committee *; Report *June* 3
Considered *; read 3° *June* 4
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Hartismere*) *June* 6 (No. 110)
Read 2ª * *June* 17
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Read 3ª * *June* 25
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cxv]

PIM, Captain B., *Gravesend*
Admiralty—Accountant General of the Navy, [241] 855, 1849
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. [241] 1370; *cl.* 1, 1375; Motion for reporting Progress, 1376, 1377; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1379, 1381, 1386, 1387; [242] 225
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Circular Remonstrance of Prince Gortchakoff (1856), [238] 1754
  Notice of Motion, [239] 1517
  Russia and Turkey—Terms of Peace, [238] 449
  Treaty of San Stefano—Seaport of Batoum, [239] 1366

PIM, Captain B.—*cont.*
German Navy—"Der Grosser Kürfurst," Destruction of, [240] 1037
Mercantile Marine—Training Schools and Ships, [241] 963
Merchant Seamen Bill — Select Committee, [240] 1608
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent—The Estimate, [239] 1722
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  Henwood, Mr., [242] 866
  H.M.S. "Eurydice," [241] 120; [242] 2041
  Naval Artillery Volunteers, [241] 1849
  Naval Review at Portsmouth, [242] 1527
Navy — Royal Naval Reserves, Res. [242] 1533
Navy Estimates — Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [238] 1469, 1470
  Committee, [242] 1572
  Departmental Statement, [238] 1446, 1459
Privateering, [239] 1369
Russia, Evangelical Dissenters in, [240] 259
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 3R. Amendt. [242] 1720
Spain—Case of George White, [242] 2019, 2090
Vote of Credit, [237] 657
Watermen and Lightermen of the Thames—Petition, [238] 875

PLAYFAIR, Right Hon. Mr. Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 335, 346, 382; Comm. *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1908; *cl.* 30, 2073; *cl.* 32, 2084
Courts of Session (Scotland), [238] 1295
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 611
Education Grants in Scotland, [241] 810
Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* A, Amendt. [242] 1128
Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res. [241] 792
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 617; *cl.* 7, 622, 623; *add. cl.* 627
Endowed Schools (Birmingham Scheme, &c.), Motion for an Address, [238] 794
238] Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 27, 323, 324; *cl.* 31, Amendt. 329; *cl.* 32, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 47, 337; *cl.* 68, Amendt. 460; *cl.* 69, 467, 469, 473
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 720
India — East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 455
India—Salt Tax, Res. [237] 481
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. [242] 267; *cl.* 2, 271, 279; *cl.* 6, 312; Schedule, 328, 332; Amendt. 334
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 78
Paris Exhibition, 1878—Assistance to English Artizans, [240] 28
Parliament—Members for the Scottish Universities—Expenses of Election, [240] 739
  Public Business—Medical Act Amendment, [242] 523
Post Office—United States Telegraph System, [240] 740
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [238] 1804

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Playfair, Right Hon. Mr. Lyon—*cont.*
Scotch University Commission, [238] 873
Scotland—The Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh, [240] 930
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 242
Royal Irish Academy, [241] 1544
Stationery Office, [239] 1803, 1806; [240] 71, 81
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 505

Plimsoll, Mr. S., *Derby Bo.*
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. Amendt. [242] 982; 1508, 1510
Coal Mines—Haydock Colliery Explosion, [242] 1551
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. Amendt. [242] 779, 789
Mercantile Marine—Cefn-y-wrach Shoal, Cardiff, [239] 204
Missing Steamers, [237] 370
Merchant Seamen's Act—Insubordination on Shipboard, [238 1142
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 87
Navy—Worn-out Boilers, Sale of, [239] 34

Plunket, Hon. D. R., *Dublin University*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [237] 1960, 1966
Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 29
Eastern Affairs, Res. Amendt. [242] 549
Eastern Question—Congress, The, [238] 1363
The Marquess of Hartington's Resolutions, [241] 2049
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1518
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 813
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 138
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. Previous Question moved, [239] 77
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 461
Sergeant M'Carthy, Case of, Motion for an Address, [241] 1409
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 243
Queen's University, Ireland, [238] 1562
University Education (Ireland), Res. [240] 1119
Voters (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1575, 1580

Plunkett, Hon. R. E., *Gloucester, W.*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. Amendt. [237] 1980
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1981
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 581
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 505
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [237] 1186
Parliament — Household Franchise, Res. Amendt. [238] 188
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1103

**Police Expenses Act Continuance Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 11 [Bill 256]
Read 2° * *July* 12

[*cont.*

*Police Expenses Act Continuance Bill*—cont.
Committee *—R.P. *July* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3° * *July* 18
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 19 (No. 165)
Read 2ª * *July* 23
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 36]

*Police Superannuation—Legislation*
Question, Mr. Cotes; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 7, [238] 872; Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 29, [239] 203; Question, Sir Frederick Perkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 1, [241] 491

**Political Prisoners Bill**
(*Mr. O'Connor Power, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. O'Donnell*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 21 [Bill 84]
2R., after short debate, Debate adjourned *July* 3, [241] 735
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

*Pollution of Rivers Act*, 1876 — *Legal Proceedings*
Question, Mr. Tennant; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 9, [239] 1596; Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 12, [241] 1333

Poor Law
Miscellaneous Questions
*Case of Eliza Littlehales*, Question, Mr. A. H. Brown; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 20, [240] 1885
*Compensation Allowances to Union Officers*, Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 7, [240] 1341
*North Surrey District School—Detention of a Child*, Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 4, [238] 634
*Removal of Irish Paupers*, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 2, [242] 996;—*Thomas Johnson*, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 24, [240] 626
*Roman Catholic Nurses in Workhouses*, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 23, [240] 493
*Saffron Walden Union*, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 3, [240] 1070
*Scotland—Case of Agnes Adams*, Question, Mr. P. Martin; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Feb* 21, [238] 58
*The Basingstoke Union Casuals*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Spinks; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 4, [241] 759
*The Boarding-Out System*, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Viscount Cranbrook *July* 29, [242] 514
*The Dolgelly Guardians—Care of Children*, Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 14, [240] 1493

*Poor Law and Highway Boards* (*Union of Parishes*)

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for—

Return of all complaints made to any public offices of inconvenience arising from the union of parishes belonging to different counties in Poor Law or Highway Boards" (*The Earl of Redesdale*) *Mar* 8, [238] 953; Address agreed to

*Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 1, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system under which Guardians of the Poor in England and Ireland, and Members of Parochial Boards in Scotland, and Members of Local Boards, are at present elected; and to report whether it is desirable to make any change in the manner of conducting such elections, either by the adoption of the ballot or otherwise; and also, whether it is desirable to extend the term of office for which Guardians and Members of Parochial Boards are now elected" (*Mr. Hibbert*) *v.*, [238] 541; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

*Poor Law Guardians, &c.*

Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the system under which Guardians of the Poor and Members of Local Boards in England and Ireland, and Members of Parochial Boards in Scotland, are at present elected; and to report whether it is desirable to make any, and, if so, what change in such system; and also, whether it is desirable to extend the term of office for which Guardians of the Poor and Members of Parochial Boards are now elected" (*Mr. Hibbert*) *Mar* 12

And, on *Mar* 20, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Thomas Acland, Viscount Emlyn, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Gray, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Hutchinson, Sir Arthur Middleton, Colonel Naghten, Mr. O'Connor Power, Mr. Pell, Mr. Phipps, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Salt, Mr. Sanderson, Mr. Abel Smith, and Mr. Mark Stewart; *Mar* 27, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Briggs *added; May* 13, Mr. Hanbury re-appointed

The Report . . . . . . . . *P.P.* 297

*Poor Law—Removal of Paupers*

Question, Mr. French; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 27, [241] 324

Moved, "That the Laws under which the destitute poor receiving relief from the poor's rate are subject to removal in England and Scotland in their operation inflict many wrongs and cause great sufferings; that they are unjust and impolitic; therefore, That, in the opinion of this House, the said Laws ought to be so amended as that every poor person who shall have maintained himself or herself for twelve months by some industrial occupation in any parish, combination of

[*cont.*

*Poor Law—Removal of Paupers*—cont.

parishes, or union in England, Wales, or Scotland, previously to receiving such relief, shall not be subject to removal therefrom" (*Mr. M'Carthy Downing*) *July* 2, 653

Amendt. to leave out from "inflict," and add "hardships, and requires consideration with a view to their amendment" (*Mr. Verner*) *v.*; Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Resolved, That the Laws under which the destitute poor receiving relief from the poor's rate are subject to removal in England and Scotland in their operation inflict hardships, and require consideration with a view to their amendment (*Mr. M'Carthy Downing*)

**Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Mellor, Mr. Merewether, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Phipps, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Hibbert*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 7 [Bill 103]
Read 2° * *Mar* 11
Committee; Report, after short debate *Mar* 25,
238] 2032
239] *The 23rd Clause*, Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, 1724
Considered * *May* 24 [Bill 134]
Read 3° * *May* 29
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *May* 31
240] Read 2ª, after debate *June* 6, 1240 (No. 99)
Committee; Report, after short debate *June* 24,
241] 107
Read 3ª, after short debate *June* 27, 300
*c.* Lords Amendts. to be printed [Bill 232]
Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 5, 855
Moved, "That the Lords Amendts. be now taken into Consideration" *July* 5, 939; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Lords Amendts. to be considered upon Monday next
Order for Consideration of Lords Amendts. read *July* 8, 1037; Lords Amendts. considered; one agreed to; several disagreed to
Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to certain of their Amendts. to the Bill—Mr. Cowan, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Hibbert, Sir Henry James, Mr. Mellor, Mr. Merewether, Mr. Phipps, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens
*l.* Commons Reasons for disagreeing to some of the Amendts. made by the Lords, considered *July* 15, 1436
Moved, "Not to insist on the Amendt. to which the Commons have disagreed" (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*); after short debate, on Question, Whether to insist? Cont. 41, Not-Cont. 27; M. 14; resolved in the affirmative

List of Cont. and Not-Cont., 1440

And a Committee appointed to prepare reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on their amendments; The Committee to meet forthwith; Report from Committee of reasons prepared by them; read, and agreed to; and a message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill with the reasons

[*cont.*

*Poor Law Amendment Act* (1876) *Amendment Bill*—cont.

c. Lords Reasons for insisting on their Amendts. to be printed [Bill 266]

241] Questions, Mr. Mellor, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, 2061

Lords' Reasons for insisting on certain of their

242] amendts. to the Bill considered *July* 23, 133

Moved, "That this House doth insist on its disagreement to the amendts. made by the Lords to the Bill, to which this House hath disagreed" (*Mr. Mellor*); Motion agreed to

*The Lords' Amendts.*, Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 15, 2019

**Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election Bill** (*Mr. Gray, Mr. Downing, Mr. Redmond*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 17]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 27, [239] 67

Previous Question moved (*Mr. Plunket*); after debate, Question put, "That the Original Question be now put;" A. 164, N. 208; M. 44 (D. L. 75)

*Poor Laws* (*Scotland*)

Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 14, [238] 1287

*Pope Pius IX., Death of—Sittings of the Conclave*

Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 8, [237] 1325

*Population Statistics—The Registrar General's Returns*

Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 8, [242] 1531

Portman, Viscount

Conway Bridge (Composition of Debt), 2R. [241] 486

Portman, Hon. W. H. B., *Dorsetshire*

Belfast Improvement, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1064

*Post Office*

Miscellaneous Questions

*Appointment of Officials*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 5, [237] 1050

*Letter Carriers*, Question, Mr. H. Brassey; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 4, [240] 1165

*Mail Contracts*

*Eastern Mail Service—The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Shipping Company*, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 8, [238] 973; Question, Mr. Hopwood; [*cont.*

Post Office—*Mail Contracts—cont.*

Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 16, [240] 25; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 6, 1255; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 20, 1887

*Mails to the West of England*, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 7, [238] 872

*The American Mail Service*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord John Manners *Jan* 22, [237] 318

Returns, 1868 to 1877 . . (*P.P.* 92)

*The Contracts and Correspondence*, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 2, [242] 998

*The Indian Mail Contract*, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 15, [237] 1732

*The Indian Mails*, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 15, [239] 1283

*West Indian Mail Contracts*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 9, [242] 1637; Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 13, 1870

*Money Order Department*

*Boy Clerks*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 19, [241] 1969

*Promotions*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 19, [237] 1922

*Salaries*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 14, [239] 1881

*Newspaper Registration*, Question, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 7, [240] 1339

*Post Office Savings Banks*, Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 20, [240] 1881

*Private Letter Bags, Edinburgh*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Lord John Manners *Jan* 25, [237] 463

*Sub-Postmasters*, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord John Manners *Jan* 28, [237] 532

*Surveyor General's Clerks, Edinburgh and Dublin*, Question, Sir Arthur Guinness; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 14, [242] 1945

*Telegraph Department*

*Charges*, Questions, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Whitwell; Answers, Lord John Manners *August* 8, [242] 1529

*Lundy Island*, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 1, [238] 538

*Porterage on Telegrams*, Question, Mr. A. H. Brown; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 15, [241] 1467

*Post Office Dublin—Pay of Telegraph Officials*, Question, Mr. O'Byrne; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 15, [242] 2025

*Telegraphic Communication with Belmullet*, Question, Mr. Browne; Answer, Lord John Manners *Jan* 22, [237] 319 [*cont.*

**Post Office**—*Telegraph Department—cont.*

- *The Telephone*, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 21, [238] 58
- *United States Telegraph System*, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 27, [240] 740

### *Post Office—American Mail Service*

- Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the time for monopoly in the American Mail Service has passed, and the recent change made by the Government, after a period of freedom, in re-establishing monopoly and subsidizing favoured Companies by paying them nearly double the rates paid by the American Government, and lately paid by ourselves, is wrong in principle and prejudicial to the public service" (*Mr. Anderson*) *Mar* 19, [238] 1633; after debate, Question put; A. 92, N. 117; M. 25 (D. L. 59)

### *Post Office—Dover and Calais Mail Contracts*

- Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 23, [240] 494
- Moved, "That the Contract entered into between the South Eastern Railway Company and the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company and the Postmaster General for the conveyance of the Mails between Dover and Calais be approved" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *June* 4, 1236
- Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House declines to approve the said Contract until an undertaking be given by the South Eastern Company and the London, Chatham, and Dover Company to provide more adequate service in their steam vessels" (*Sir William Fraser*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to

  The Contracts . . . (*P.P.* 157, 203)

### *Post Office—Mail Contracts*

- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the enforcing of a Contract which makes no allowance for fogs or bad weather leads to great and unjustifiable risks, by inducing, and even compelling, the masters of mail packets to neglect the necessary precautions in such weather, and thereby to endanger life and property; and that in such Contracts the give and take system ought to be adhered to" (*Mr. Bentinck*) *v.* [239] 1598; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

### *Post Office—Postmasterships*

- Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the responsibility of appointing to Postmasterships, whatever the salary attached to the appointment, should rest solely with the Postal authorities, and that the present system of making such appointments in certain cases conditional upon a nomination by Members of Parliament endorsed by the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury is anomalous, and calculated to interfere with the efficiency of the Postal and Telegraph Service" (*Dr. Cameron*) *v.* [239] 211; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 174, N. 78; M. 96 (D. L. 81)

### POTTER, Mr. T. B., *Rochdale*

- Eastern Question, [237] 821
- India—Famine in Bombay, [239] 959; [240] 744;—Mortality, [241] 321;—The Census, [238] 1742
  - Salt Laws, [238] 1484
- Malta and Ceylon—Food Taxes, [237] 369, 370; [238] 1041
- Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1163, 1200

### POWER, Mr. J. O'Connor, *Mayo*

- Acknowledgment of Deeds by Married Women (Ireland), 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [240] 122, 123
- Army — Auxiliary Forces—Yeomanry Adjutants, Res. [242] 1395
- Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1271
- Coal Mines—Haydock Colliery Explosion, [242] 1554
- County Government, 2R. [237] 1912
- Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 31
- Dunkeld Bridge Tolls, Motion for an Address, [237] 630, 636
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 22, [238] 317; *cl.* 65, 345, 346, 349, 352; *cl.* 99, 490
- India—Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 69
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1524; Comm. *cl.* 7, [242] 325; Schedule, 327; Consid. *cl.* 5, 1814; *cl.* 6, 1822, 1826
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Criminal Law—Convicts at Spike Island, [237] 618;—Fenian Convict Patrick Melody, [238] 1141
  - Education—Irish Language, [241] 763
  - Law and Justice — Mr. Justice Keogh, Charge of, [238] 1951, 1953
  - Prisons Act—Rules and Regulations, [237] 1019
  - Queen's Colleges—Irish Language, [239] 672
- Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1553
- Ireland—University Education, Res. [240] 1134

238] Mutiny, Comm. 1979; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1983,<br>
. 1989, 1998; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 2001; *cl.* 9,<br>
. 2003; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 2004, 2006, 2009,<br>
. 2011, 2014, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2022; *cl.* 18,<br>
. Motion for reporting Progress, 2026, 2029<br>
239] *cl.* 22, Amendt. 39, 44; Amendt. 46, 50;<br>
. Amendt. 53; *cl.* 23, Amendt. *ib.*, 55, 58;<br>
. Amendt. 61; *cl.* 24, 62; *cl.* 26, 65, 127;<br>
. *cl.* 48, 137, 139; *cl.* 56, 142, 144, 146;<br>
. *add. cl.* 159, 164, 166, 167

- Navy—Case of Thomas Maguire, [238] 1142
- Parliament — Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1384
- Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1406, 1411

[*cont.*

POWER, Mr. J. O'Connor—*cont.*
Parliament—Public Business, Motion for a Select Committee, [237] 403
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 126, 210, 211
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 95
Prisons Act, 1877—Rules and Regulations, [237] 1049
Racecourses (Licensing), 2R. Amendt. [237] 640
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 354, 383, 394; *cl.* 1, 1814, 1819, 1845; [240] 117; Consid. [241] 1294, 1296
Sergeant M'Carthy, The late, Case of, [237] 622, 726, 1051; [238] 1294; [239] 119; Motion for an Address, [241] 1416
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 182
Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 701
House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1455, 1457; Amendt. 1462, 1468, 1476, 1478
Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1631, 1635, 1648
Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1497; Motion for reporting Progress, 1506, 1507
Mint, Coinage, &c. [239] 1764
Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1772, 1774
Paymaster General in London and Dublin, [239] 1777, 1778, 1780
Police Courts of London and Sheerness, Motion for reporting Progress, [240] 992, 994, 995
Prisons, Ireland, Superintendence, &c. of, Amendt. [242] 1587, 1592, 1599, 1606, 1607
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, &c. [240] 677
Secret Services, [240] 666, 667
Stationery Office, [239] 1781, 1787, 1790, 1797, 1801, 1803, 1809, 1810; [240] 69, 71, 77, 79
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 604

POWER, Mr. R., *Waterford*
Commissioners of National Education (Ireland)—Agricultural Model Schools, [240] 1036
Parliament—Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, [240] 1174, 1181
Poor Law—Removal of Irish Paupers—Thomas Johnson, [240] 626
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [240] 441; *cl.* 8, Motion for reporting Progress, 715; *add. cl.* 1022; [241] 963; Consid. 1299

POWERSCOURT, Viscount
Medical Act, 1858, Amendment, Comm. [240] 617
Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [240] 216
Public Health (Ireland), 2R. [241] 852; Comm. *cl.* 38, Amendt. 1051, 1052
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Powers), Res. [242] 342
Treaty of Berlin—Port of Batoum, [242] 34

POWIS, Earl of
Bishoprics, 2R. [239] 20; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 515
London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. [241] 740
Truro Chapter, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [241] 118

PRICE, Captain G. E., *Devonport*
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
Dockyards — Re-organization of — The Clerks, [240] 1608
Greenwich Hospital Pensioners, [241] 1470; —Age Pensions, [242] 391, 1539
H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [239] 286
Widows' Pension Fund, [240] 1342
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1305
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1439
Dockyards, &c. [242] 1576, 1585
Seamen and Marines—Victuals and Clothing, [238] 1469
Seamen and Marines' Widows' Pension Fund, Res. [238] 1495, 1505

PRICE, Mr. W. E., *Tewkesbury*
Army—Brigade Depôt Quartermasters, [239] 35
Royal Warrant of 1877—Article 88, [237] 722

**Prison (Officers' Superannuation) Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
*c.* Considered in Committee * *July* 19
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 22 [Bill 269]
Read 2° * *July* 25
Committee *; Report *July* 31
Read 3° * *August* 1
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *Aug* 2 (No. 184)
Read 2ª * *August* 9
Committee *; Report *August* 12
Read 3ª * *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 63]

*Prisons Act*, 1877
*Governors of Gaols*, Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 13, [239] 1720
*Letters to Prisoners' Friends*, Question, Mr. Whitbread; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 9, [239] 959
*Plank Beds*, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 5, [242] 1174

*Prison Discipline*
Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 25, [242] 216
*Flogging*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 26, [239] 34
*Personal Search*, Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 18, [241] 1846

[*cont.*

*Prisons Act*, 1877—cont.
*Prisoners under the Vaccination Act*, Questions, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 18, [240] 1682
*Rules as to Debtors*, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 24, [240] 626
*The Rules and Regulations*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 5, [237] 1049; Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 13, [239] 1716; Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 7, [242] 1437
(*Parl. P.* 59, 93, 95, 128, 156, 242, 257, 265, 270, 355, 363, 391)
*Visiting Committees*, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 1, [237] 820

**Prisons Authorities Act, 1874, Amendment Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Viscount Gordon*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª *June* 25, [241] 209 (No. 134)
Read 2ª * *June* 27
Committee *; Report *July* 1
Read 3ª * *July* 4
*c.* Read 1° * (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *July* 8
Read 2° * *July* 16 [Bill 246]
Committee *; Report *July* 29
Considered * *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 31
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 40]

*Prisons (Ireland) Act — The Rules and Regulations*
Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 5, [237] 1049
(*Parl. P.* 119, 314)

*Prisons (Scotland) Act*, 1877
*Cell Accommodation*, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 28, [238] 448
*Prison Board Clerks*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *April* 16, [239] 1368
(*Parl. P.* 60, 90, 99, 138, 201, 226)

*Privateering*
Question, Captain Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 16, [239] 1369

*Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "the present system of taxing the succession to property is partial and unjust, and, in the opinion of this House, ought to be re-adjusted" (*Mr. James Barclay*) *v.*, [240] 627; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 150, N. 107; M. 43 (D. L. 146)

**Provisional Orders (Ireland) Confirmation (Dungarvan, &c.) Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *April* 5 (No. 65)
Read 2ª * *May* 14
Committee *; Report *May* 23
Read 3ª * *May* 24
*c.* Read 1° * (*Mr. J. Lowther*) *May* 29 [Bill 193]
Read 2° * *June* 4
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 14
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cxvi]

**Public Baths and Washhouses Bill**
(*Mr. Forsyth, Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. Ritchie, Colonel Beresford*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 37]
Read 2° * *Jan* 30
Committee *; Report *Mar* 4
Read 3° * *Mar* 7
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Houghton*) *Mar* 8 (No. 39)
Read 2ª *Mar* 21, [238] 1707
Committee * *April* 1
Report * *April* 2
Read 3ª * *April* 9
Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. 14]

*Public Buildings and Offices—Report of the Committee*
Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 6, [239] 1450

*Public Health*
*Adulteration of Beer at Maidstone*, Question, Mr. Wykeham Martin; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 30, [240] 927
*Ascot, Sanitary Condition of*, Question, Mr. Walsh; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 4, [241] 757
*Dublin, Death-Rate of the City of*, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 7, [238] 874
*Medical Officers of Health*, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 4, [237] 923
*Scarborough—Fatal Bathing Accidents*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 15, [241] 1466
*Small Pox*, Question, Earl Percy; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 5, [238] 754; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 25, [242] 223
*Ventilation of the Law and Police Courts*, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 8, [238] 972; Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 11, 1044
Public Health Act — Report of Select Commiteee . . . . . . *P.P.* 134

**Public Health Act Amendment (Interments) Bill**
(*Mr. Marten, Mr. Greene, Mr. Cole*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *June* 17 [Bill 221]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 13

**Public Health Act (1875) Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Playfair, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Joseph Cowen*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 66]
Read 2° *, and referred to a Select Committee *Jan* 31
And, on *Feb* 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Thomas Acland, Colonel Brise, Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Cowen, Mr. Fremantle, Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, Mr. Paget, Mr. Peel, Mr. Pell, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Salt, Mr. Whitwell, and Mr. Reginald Yorke
Report of Select Comm. *April* 5 (*P.P.* 134)
Report *; Re-comm. *April* 5 [Bill 144]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *April* 8
Committee; Report *May* 9, [239] 1686
Read 3° * *May* 15
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Earl of Kimberley*) *May* 16 (No. 85)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 28, [240] 825
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee" *June* 4, 1156
Amendt. to leave out all after ("That") and insert ("the Bill be referred to a Select Committee") (*The Earl De La Warr*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion agreed to; Committee (No. 106)
Report *June* 21, [241] 1 (No. 131)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *June* 25, 205
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day six months") (*The Earl De La Warr*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 3ª
*c.* Lords Amendts. considered *July* 1, 580; after short debate, Lords Amendts. agreed to [Bill 230]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 25]

**Public Health (Ireland) Bill** (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 1]
Read 2° * *Jan* 24
Committee deferred, after short debate *Mar* 4, [238] 722
Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 14, [239] 1883; Question, Major Nolan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 23, [240] 496
Committee *; Report *May* 30 [Bill 199]
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 20, 1990
Considered * *June* 21
Read 3°, after short debate *June* 24, [241] 198
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 25 (No. 133)
Read 2ª *July* 5, 851
Committee *July* 9, 1051
Report * *July* 11
Read 3ª * *July* 15
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 272]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 52]

**Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Lochgelly) Bill**
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 171]
Read 2° * *May* 16

*Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Lochgelly) Bill*—cont.
Committee *; Report *May* 24
Considered * *May* 27
Read 3° * *May* 29
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 31
Read 2ª * *June* 7 (No. 102)
Committee *; Report *June* 17
Read 3ª * *June* 18
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. cvi]

*Public Offices—Purchase of Land*
Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 11, [238] 1043

**Public Parks (Scotland) Bill**
(*Mr. Fortescue Harrison, Dr. Cameron, Mr. William Holms, Sir George Balfour, Sir Windham Anstruther*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 34]
Read 2°, after short debate *Jan* 23, [237] 359
Committee *; Report *Jan* 31
Considered * *Feb* 1
Read 3° * *Feb* 4
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Kinnaird*) *Feb* 5 (No. 18)
Read 2ª *Feb* 19, 1920
Committee *Feb* 26, [238] 369
Report * *Mar* 1
Read 3ª * *Mar* 7
Royal Assent *Mar* 18 [41 *Vict.* c. 8]

**Public Prosecutor Bill**
(*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Watkin Williams, Mr. Serjeant Simon*)

*c.* Ordered * *Feb* 6
Read 1° * *Feb* 7 [Bill 105]
Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 14

**Public Works Loans Bill** (*Mr. Raikes, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

*c.* Considered in Committee * *Mar* 29
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 1 [Bill 138]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 4, [239] 608; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *April* 12, 1251; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee; Report *April* 15, 1351
Read 3° * *April* 16
*l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *May* 13
Read 2ª * *May* 20 (No. 81)
Committee *; Report *May* 21
Read 3ª * *May* 23
Royal Assent *May* 27 [41 *Vict.* c. 18]

*Public Works Loans, Epping Forest Rural Sanitary Authority, and Wigan Parish Church [Composition and Cancellation of Debts]*
*c.* Resolutions considered in Committee *April* 9, [239] 1041
Resolutions reported *April* 10

[cont.

**Public Works Loans (Ireland) Act (1877) Amendment Bill**

(*Mr. James Lowther, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 14 [Bill 219]
Read 2° * *June* 20
Committee—R.P. *June* 21, [241] 66
Committee; Report *June* 24, 200
Read 3° * *June* 25
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 27 (No. 137)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *July* 1
Read 3ª * *July* 2
Royal Assent *July* 4 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 24]

***Public Worship Regulation Act—Petition and Presentment***

Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 14, [242] 1945

**PULESTON, Mr. J. H.**, *Devonport*

Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1598
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1649
Eastern Question—Anglo-Turkish Convention—Tribute of Cyprus, [241] 2051
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1062
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. Schedule, [242] 331
Masters and Servants—Liability of Employers, [241] 1244
Merchant Shipping—Cardiff Pilots, [240] 30
Merchant Shipping Act, 1854—Port of Cardiff, [240] 834
Parliament—Liabilities of Employers and Workmen, [240] 22
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 700

**Queen Anne's Bounty Bill**

(*Mr. Bass, Mr. Monk, Mr. Arthur Bass*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 15]
Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 13

**Queen's Colleges and University (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gray, Mr. Biggar, Mr. O'Connor Power*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 26]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 20, [238] 29; Debate adjourned
Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 26, 378
Order read, for resuming Further Proceeding on Question [20th February], "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Debate resumed *May* 15, [239] 1990
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon "this day six months" (*Mr. James Corry*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 26, N. 232; M. 206 (D. L. 133)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

**Racecourses (Licensing) Bill**

(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Thomas Chambers, Sir James Lawrence*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 76]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 29, [237] 638
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. R. Power*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 84, N. 82; M. 2 (D. L. 6)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *June* 4, [240] 1239
Committee; Report *June* 13, 1483
As amended to be considered [Dropped]

**RAIKES, Mr. H. C.** (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means), *Chester*

Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1598
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1379
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1984
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [240] 14, 55, 1456
Army Supplementary Estimate for Native Indian Troops, [240] 804
Belfast Improvement, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1066
Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. [239] 1514
Bishoprics, Comm. *cl.* 3, [242] 1651; *cl.* 8, 1685
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 989; Re-comm. 1429, 1433; Consid. 1513, 1516
Contagious Disease (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1635, 1724; *cl.* 21, 1912; *cl.* 22, 1987; *cl.* 30, 2068; *cl.* 55, 2112, 2113, 2119, 2120, 2121; *cl.* 70, [242] 169, 170, 172, 184; Postponed *cl.* 5, 186; *add. cl.* 769
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 1292
Dublin Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1038
Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 27
Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 18
East London Railway (Payment of Debts), 2R. [241] 1227
Education (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 1131, 1132
Epping Forest, Comm. Schedule, [241] 579
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 3, [238] 86, 87; *cl.* 20, 312, 313; *cl.* 37, 331; *cl.* 99, 487, 488, 489, 490; *add. cl.* 602; Schedule 1, 614; New Schedule, 892
Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 7, [241] 1035
Govan Burgh, 2R. [238] 149
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 475, 477, 478; *cl.* 18, 895; *cl.* 19, 896, 898; *cl.* 20, 900, 1079; *cl.* 21, 1091; *cl.* 24, 1100; *add. cl.* 1162, 1344
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1350
Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. *cl.* 1, [242] 1837
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 304, 311
London and North-Western Railway (Reddish to Leeds), [238] 971

[*cont.*

RAIKES, Mr. H. C.—*cont.*
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1521 ; Instruction, 1724, 1728
Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2), [241] 100
238] Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, 1986, 1987, 1996,
. 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 ; *cl.* 16, 2016,
. 2017, 2019 ; *cl.* 18, 2029
239] *cl.* 22, 52 ; *cl.* 23, 55, 57, 60, 61 ; *cl.* 26,
. 123, 124, 125 ; *cl.* 48, 136, 137 ; *add. cl.*
. 169
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1463, 1465, 1466, 1467
Parliament—Standing Orders—Hybrid Bills, [238] 1837
Parliament — Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 415
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Committee, [239] 474
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, Comm. [242] 259, 260
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3,
238] 1793
240] *cl.* 15, 1203 ; *cl.* 17, 1210, 1211 ; *cl.* 36,
. 1701 ; *cl.* 44, 1722 ; *cl.* 49, 1734 ; *cl.* 83,
. 1893 ; *cl.* 105, 1910 ; Postponed *cl.* 54,
. 1939 ; *add. cl.* 1972, 1983, 1989, 1990
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ire-
237] land), Comm. 1702, 1712, 1717, 1916
239] 322, 331, 353, 354 ; *cl.* 1, 625, 626, 633,
. 641, 1814, 1817
240] *cl.* 3, 438, 440, 443 ; *cl.* 6, 710, 711 ; *add.*
. *cl.* 871, 881, 888, 910, 920, 921, 922, 923,
. 1025
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1482, 1483, 1484
  Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 962, 964
  Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [240] 1298, 1302
  Convict Establishments, [240] 104
  Education Vote, [242] 1227
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1272
  Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 691, 700, 702
  Harbours, &c. [238] 1535
  House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1480
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1456
  Land Registry, [240] 980
  Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1769, 1771
  Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 990, 991, 992, 993
  Prisons, Ireland, Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1592, 1601, 1606, 1607
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer' Remembrancer, [240] 668, 677
  Queen's Colleges, Ireland, [241] 1542
  Regular Forces in India, Home Charges, [242] 1422
  Stationery Office, [239] 1785, 1786, 1787, 1789, 1790, 1797, 1806 ; [240] 41, 42, 43, 49, 53, 54, 56, 67, 69, 70, 75, 76, 77, 78
Tenant Right (Ireland), [240] 1327 ; Consid. 1490
Tramways Bills, Amendt. [237] 1047
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), [238] 297 ; Res. [239] 1275, 1280, 1282

[*cont.*

RAIKES, Mr. H. C.—*cont.*
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1942
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 10, [241] 59 ; *cl.* 16, 61
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 146, 148
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1358, 1362, 1363, 1364, 1372
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 606

*Railways*
*Brake Power*, Question, Mr. Baxter ; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Jan* 21, [237] 248 ; Question, Mr. M. Brooks ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 16, [239] 1366
*Continuous Brakes*, Question, Mr. Heygate ; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 28, [238] 451 ; Question, Mr. M. Brooks ; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 5, 758 ; Observations, Earl De La Warr ; Reply, Lord Henniker ; short debate thereon *Mar* 14, 1276 ; Question, Mr. M'Arthur ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 15, [241] 1471
Circular of Board of Trade *P.P.* [1921] [1963]
*Level Crossing at Radstock*, Question, Major Allen ; Answer, The Attorney General *Jan* 31, [237] 725
*Locomotive Accident near Leeds;* Question, Mr. Barran ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 20, [240] 257
*Management of Railways*, Question, The Duke of St. Albans ; Answer, Lord Henniker ; short debate thereon *Jan* 25, [237] 456

*Railway Accidents*
*Death of Sir Francis Goldsmid, Member for Reading*, Question, Mr. Isaac ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 10, [239] 1689 ; Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey ; Answers, Viscount Sandon *June* 4, [240] 1166 ; Question, Mr. Isaac ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 25, [241] 210 ; Question, Observations, The Duke of St. Albans, Lord Cottesloe, Lord Norton, Lord Truro ; Reply, Lord Henniker *June* 27, 310 *P.P.* [2046] [2074]
*Platforms, Footboards, &c.*, Question, Observations, Lord Cottesloe ; Reply, Lord Henniker *July* 12, [241] 1330 ;—*Continuous Footboards*, Question, Mr. Gregory ; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot *August* 8, [242] 1525

*Railway Passenger Duty*, Petition presented (*Lord Houghton*) *April* 1, [239] 280 ; after short debate, Petition ordered to lie on the Table ; Question, Mr. M'Lagan ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 4, 526
*Railway Time Tables*, Question, Mr. J. S. Hardy ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 10, [239] 1690
*The Railway Commissioners—Continuance of Powers*, Question, Mr. A. Mills ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 21, [237] 250
*Train Management*, Question, Major O'Gorman ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 21, [241] 20
General Report for 1877 . . . . [2099]

**Railway Returns (Continuous Brakes) Bill** (*The Lord Henniker*)
*l.* Presented ; read 1ª, after short debate *April* 11, [239] 1083 (No. 75)
Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 15, 1273
Committee ; Report *April* 16, 1361
Read 3ª* *May* 13
*c.* Read 1°* (*Mr. J. G. Talbot*) *May* 23 [Bill 185]
Read 2°* *May* 27
Committee* ; Report *May* 30
Read 3°* *June* 3
*l.* Royal Assent *June* 17 [41 *Vict.* c. 20]

**Ralli, Mr. P.**, *Bridport*
India—Famine in Cashmere, [242] 865
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 703

**Ramsay, Mr. J.**, *Falkirk, &c.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 62, [241] 2138, 2139
County Government, Leave, [237] 607
Criminal Law (Scotland)—Death of Mr. G. P. Chalmers, [238] 755
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 580
Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1994
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 611
Education Grants in Scotland, [241] 802, 807
Education (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [242] 1126 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* A, 1129 ; *add. cl.* 1131, 1133, 1134, 1135
Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res. [241] 785, 787
Elementary Education (New Code), Motion for an Address, [240] 849
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 619 ; *cl.* 7, 622 ; *cl.* 11, 624 ; Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 12, *ib.* ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. *ib.* 625, 627 ; Consid. *cl.* A, Amendt. 977
Greenwich Hospital—Age Pensions, [242] 1545
Hypothec (Scotland), 2R. [237] 363
Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [241] 846, 847
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [239] 1238
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1478
Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 554
237] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. 422
238] Comm. *cl.* 3, 1797 ; *cl.* 4, 1801 ; *cl.* 6, 1812, 1816 ; Amendt. 1818
240] 1075 ; *cl.* 12, 1185 ; Amendt. 1189, 1190, 1195 ; *cl.* 15, 1199 ; *cl.* 16, 1205 ; *cl.* 17, 1212 ; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1214, 1215 ; *cl.* 24, 1216 ; *cl.* 29, 1690, 1693, 1694 ; *cl.* 33, 1696, 1698 ; *cl.* 35, Amendt. 1699 ; *cl.* 36, 1707, 1708 ; *cl.* 41, 1714, 1716 ; *cl.* 44, Amendt. 1721 ; *cl.* 45, 1729, 1730 ; *cl.* 49, 1733, 1734 ; *cl.* 78, Amendt. 1891 ; *cl.* 79, Amendt. 1892 ; *cl.* 83, Amendt. 1893 ; *cl.* 85, 1897 ; *cl.* 97, 1901 ; *cl.* 98, Amendt. 1902, 1903 ; *cl.* 102, 1904 ; *cl.* 104, Amendt. 1906, 1907 ; *cl.* 105, 1909, 1912, 1916, 1919 ; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1922, 1933 ; *add. cl.* 1952 ; Amendt. 1962, 1965, 1969, 1982, 1983, 1988, 1989, 1990
241] Consid. 607 ; *add. cl.* 635 ; *cl.* 36, Amendt. 649 ; *cl.* 88, 837, 841

[*cont.*

**Ramsay, Mr. J.**—*cont.*
Supply—Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [240] 1018, 1019
Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 963, 966, 967
Charity Commissioners, [239] 1613
Civil Contingencies Fund, Re-payments to, [238] 1621
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1628
Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1622
Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 689, 697
"Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," [238] 1556
House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1459
Land Registry, [240] 986
Local Government Board, &c. [238] 1550 ; [239] 1644, 1645, 1647
Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 814, 815, 817, 818
Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1500
Lunacy Commission, Scotland, [240] 812, 813
Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 1000
Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [238] 1553, 1555
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 679
Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1013, 1014
Temporary Commissions, [238] 1614
Woods and Forests Office, [240] 89
Valuation, 2R. [237] 1586, 1593
Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [241] 1946, 1947
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1508 ; *cl.* 8, [241] 49
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. [238] 27
Weights and Measures, Comm. *cl.* 74, Amendt. [241] 412

*Ramsgate Improvement and Harbour Bill* (*by Order*)
*c.* Read 2°* *April* 11

**Rashleigh, Sir C.**, *Cornwall, E.*
Merchant Shipping Acts, 1854 and 1876—"Calenick," The, [237] 1326

**Rathbone, Mr. W.**, *Liverpool*
Army—Army and Militia Reserves, [241] 2052
China—Famine, [241] 328
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 197, 211 ; Comm. 1014
County Government, Leave, [237] 601 ; 2R. 1670
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), [241] 763
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 794
Education—Inspectors of Elementary Schools, [241] 822
Endowed Schools Commissioners—Educational Endowments, [240] 1603
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 608
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 522
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 872

[*cont.*

RATHBONE, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Land Registration, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1899
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, [239] 293
Military Forces of the Crown—The Reserve Men, [241] 759
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 672, 681
Spain—Fiscal Legislation—Duties on British Goods, [241] 1581
Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1436

**Rating of Towns (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 8]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 22, [240] 448
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Mulholland*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 177, N. 224; M. 47 (D. L. 144)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

READ, Mr. Clare S., *Norfolk, S.*
Adulteration of Seeds Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. [239] 1356
Brewers' Licences, Res. [242] 477
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 380, 397, 510; Comm. 994; *cl.* 2, 1703; *cl.* 10, 1858; *cl.* 15, 1871, 1882; *cl.* 16, 1889, 1897; *cl.* 21, 1917, 1919; *cl.* 22, 1932, 1989; Amendt. 1992; *cl.* 30, Amendt. 2017; *cl.* 31, 2082; *cl.* 53, 2091; *cl.* 54, 2094; *cl.* 55, 2099, 2125
242] *cl.* 68, 152, 164; Postponed *cl.* 33, 404, 405; *add. cl.* 435, 440, 444, 764, 768; Schedule 5, 807; Amendt. 819
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1589
County Government, Leave, [237] 603; 2R. 1868, 1895
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, [239] 1325
Factories and Workshops, Comm. [238] 78, 80
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 708, 714
Highways, Comm. [240] 1345; *cl.* 18, [241] 886, 892; *cl.* 20, 1079, 1082; *cl.* 21, 1090, 1092; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1097; *cl.* 25, 1102; *cl.* 31, 1107; *add. cl.* 1158
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [239] 1285
  Public Business, [240] 1074
  Saturday Sitting, [242] 230
Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 1253
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 383, 392
Valuation of Property, Comm. Amendt. [240] 1500, 1522, 1527; *cl.* 8, [241] 49; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 57, 59; *cl.* 16, 62, 64

**Real Estate Intestacy Bill**
(*Mr. Potter, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Price, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Anderson*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 28]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 10, [241] 1163

*Real Estate Intestacy Bill*—cont.
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Gregory*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 157, N. 193; M. 36 (D. L. 204)
Words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

REDESDALE, Earl of (Chairman of Committees)
Ballymena and Larne Railway, 3R. [241] 105, 106
Bishoprics, 2R. [239] 20; Comm. *cl.* 2, 515; Report, Amendt. 955, 958
Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards, [237] 244
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [240] 125
Conway Bridge (Composition of Debt), 2R. [241] 488
Criminal Law—Alleged Cruelty, [238] 725
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland), Comm. [242] 1171
Eastern Question—Congress, Negotiations for, [240] 721
  Treaty of Berlin—Alleged Agreement between England and Russia, [242] 382
Education Department—The London School Board Training Ship, [242] 1501
Highways, 2R. [242] 857
Locomotion—Railway Passenger Duty, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 283
Locomotives on Highways (Scotland), 3R. Amendt. [242] 1750
Message from the Queen—Calling out the Reserve Forces, [239] 272
Monuments (Metropolis), Comm. [240] 1572; [241] 5
Parliament—House of Lords—Strangers, [242] 200
  Private Bills—Standing Orders, [237] 912, 913
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 630
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 2R. [240] 1242; Comm. [241] 111; *cl.* 1, 114; 3R. 302, 310; Commons Amendts. Consid. 1439
Poor Law and Highway Boards (Union of Parishes), Address for Return, [238] 953
Public Parks (Scotland), 2R. [237] 1921
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1959, 1966; Report, [242] 3
Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1), Comm. Amendt. [241] 1445; [242] 213, 214
Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3), Comm. [242] 1500
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Powers), [241] 203; Res. [242] 338, 343

REDMOND, Mr. W. A., *Wexford*
Geological Survey of Ireland—The "Freeman's Journal," [237] 372
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 134
Poor Law—North Surrey District School—Detention of a Child, [238] 634
Public Health (Ireland), [239] 1883
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 300

[*cont.*

**Reed, Mr. E. J.,** *Pembroke*
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 610
- Navy—Naval Engineers, [237] 1206
  - Writers in the Dockyards, [240] 620
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1111, 1120
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 881
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1221, 1291, 1295 ; Report, 1443

*Registration of Land, &c.—Legislation*
- Question, Dr. Brady ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 24, [237] 369

**Repton, Mr. G. W. J.,** *Warwick*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [241] 964

**Ribblesdale, Lord**
- Army—Marking Deserters, [239] 108
- Army Reserve — Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 7

**Richard, Mr. H.,** *Merthyr Tydvil*
- Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 846
- Burials, Res. [237] 1775
- Church Livings, Res. [237] 1561
- Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. [242] 264
- Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 997, 1008
- Supplementary Estimate, Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1301, 1310 ; Comm. 1335

**Richmond and Gordon, Duke of (Lord President of the Council)**
- Africa — Cape, The — Kaffir Outbreak, [237] 1483
- Army—Mutiny Act, [238] 1836
- British Museum (Transfer of Collection), 2R. [242] 1284
- Cattle Diseases—Correspondence, [239] 1854
- Cattle Plague—Transit of Cattle by Land and Sea, [238] 1032
- Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards, [237] 241, 242, 243 ; [240] 1163
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 1R. [237] 1485, 1501, 1502, 1503 ; 2R. [238] 748 ; Comm. 827, 828 ; Re-comm. 1138, 1139, 1389 ; [240] 125, 350, 351 ; *cl.* 26, 723 ; *cl.* 33, 732 ; *cl.* 78, 738 ; Report of Amendts. 828 ; Commons Amendts. Consid. [242] 1626
- Conway Bridge (Composition of Debt), 2R. [241] 485
- Cyprus, Island of—Sanitary Condition, [241] 1434, 1436 ;—Slavery, [241] 1225, 1226
- Dental Practitioners, 2R. [241] 300
- Dublin University Commission, Report, [241] 956

[*cont.*

**Richmond and Gordon, Duke of**—*cont.*
- Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 1281
- Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Alleged Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1569, 1570, 1572
  - Congress at Berlin, [241] 1201 1427 ;—Convention with Turkey, [241] 1050
  - Papers, [237] 154
  - Prince Gortchakoff's Circular and Memorandum, [239] 1219
- Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 961
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners— Case of Mr. Armstrong, [241] 749, 752
- Education Department—The London School Board Training Ship, [242] 1501, 1632
- Education (Scotland), 1R. [238] 1827, 1831 ; 2R. [239] 277, 280 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 949 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 950 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. *ib.* 952
- Egyptian Obelisk—Cleopatra's Needle, [238] 826
- Endowed Schools Act, Motion for Returns, [242] 11, 12
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 1R. [239] 192, 199 ; 2R. 659 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1073 ; *cl.* 4, 1074 ; *cl.* 8, 1075 ; Amendt. 1076 ; *cl.* 12, 1077, 1081 ; 3R. 1193
- Epping Forest, 2R. [241] 1201
- Foreign Office—Abstraction of a Document—Memorandum of Agreement between England and Russia, [241] 481, 482
- Idiots, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [242] 344
- Ireland, Crime in—Returns, [240] 618 ; [241] 849
- Locomotives on Highways (Scotland), 2R. [242] 1498 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, 1630, 1631 ; 3R. 1751
- Medical Act, 1858, Amendment, 1R. [238] 1581 ; 2R. [239] 1269 ; Comm. [240] 615 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1062 ; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1063
- Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Hyde Park—Shelters, [241] 954, 955
  - Hyde Park Corner, [237] 317
  - Metropolitan Police, [242] 1633, 1758, 1760
- Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [239] 1855
- Parliamentary Papers, [237] 817
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 2R. [240] 1241 ; Comm. [241] 1111 ; 3R. 302
- Poor Law and Highway Boards (Union of Parishes), Address for Returns, [238] 953
- Precognition (Scotland)—Sudden or Suspicious Deaths, Motion for Returns, [239] 649
- Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, 2R. [240] 825 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1159
- Public Health (Ireland), 2R. [241] 851 ; Comm. 1051
- Public Parks (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [238] 369 ; *cl.* 8, 370 ; *cl.* 11, 371
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1950, 1961, 1963 ; Comm. *cl.* 37, 2045, 2047 ; *cl.* 41, *ib* ; *cl.* 89, 2048 ; Report, [242] 3
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [242] 1866
- Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), [241] 204
- Turkey — Reported Defensive Treaty with, [241] 952

RIDLEY, Sir M. W. (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Northumberland, N.*
Coal Mines — Haydock Colliery Explosion, [242] 1551
Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 7, [241] 1034 ; *cl.* 11, 1036, 1037
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 721
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1348
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. [241] 294
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, [240] 23

RIPON, Marquess of
Cattle Diseases—Correspondence, [239] 1854
Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards, [237] 234, 243, 244 ; [240] 1162
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 1R. [237] 1499 ; 2R. [238] 725 ; Comm. 830 ; [240] 125 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 26, 723 ; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 725 ; Report of Amendts. 827
Eastern Question—British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 714
Congress—Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 500, 508
Education (Scotland), 2R. [239] 274 ; Comm. *cl.* 7, 949 ; *cl.* 19, 951
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 1R. [239] 199 ; 2R. 661 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1073 ; *cl.* 8, 1076 ; *cl.* 12, 1079
Medical Act, 1858, Amendment, 1R. [238] 1589 ; 2R. [239] 1267 ; Comm. [240] 617 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1062 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.*

RITCHIE, Mr. C. T., *Tower Hamlets*
Army—Recruiting Sergeants, [241] 1470
Bethnal Green Museum, Res. [240] 36, 37
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 183 ; Personal Explanation, 331 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1701 ; *cl.* 9, 1735 ; Postponed *cl.* 33, [242] 427
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [239] 1292, 1299, 1302, 1304 ; *cl.* 12, 1307 ; Consid. 1417, 1418 ; 3R. Amendt. 1650
Epping Forest, Comm. [241] 575 ; 3R. 774
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 17, [238] 303, 307, 310, 311 ; *cl.* 27, 326 ; *cl.* 30, 328 ; *cl.* 32, 330 ; *cl.* 37, 331 ; *cl.* 99, 496
Interments in Churchyards, [239] 1416
Isle of Man—Small Pox, Outbreak of, [237] 528
Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [238] 298
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 315, 333
Mines, Accidents in, [238] 1491
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1307
Sugar Convention—Refining Sugar in Bond, [242] 227
Superannuation Act, 1859—The Customs Department, [242] 524
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1242
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1477
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1523 ; *cl.* 3, [241] 32

*Rivers Pollution Prevention Act*, 1876
Question, Mr. Tennant ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 9, [239] 1596 ; Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 12, [241] 1333

*Roads and Bridges, Loans for*
Question, General Sir George Balfour ; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 4, [238] 637

**Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill**
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
*c.* Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 4]
Read 2°, after debate *Jan* 24, [237] 419
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 21, [238] 1759
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Colonel Alexander*) *v.* : Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Question put ; A. 104, N. 5 ; M. 99 (D. L. 62)
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to ; Committee—R.P.
240] Question, Mr. Ramsay ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, 1075 ; Observation, Sir George Campbell, 1083
. Committee—R.P. *June* 4, 1182
. Committee—R.P. *June* 18, 1685
. Committee ; Report *June* 20, 1888 [Bill 224]
241] Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *July* 2, 590
Amendt. to leave out from "be" and add "referred to a Select Committee, with an Instruction to hear parties on whom exceptional local rates may be imposed by new Clause 88, by themselves, their counsel, or agents, against such exceptional local rates" (*Mr. Anderson*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Question put ; A. 123, N. 81 ; M. 42 (D. L. 191)
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill considered ; after long debate, further Proceeding adjourned
. Further Proceeding resumed *July* 4, 826
Question, "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration," put, and agreed to
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 9, 1071
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Anderson*) ; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c. ;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 3°
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 11 (No. 157)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 19, 1950 ; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Moved, "That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee" (*The Earl of Rosebery*) ; after debate, on Question ? resolved in the negative
. Committee *July* 22, 2044
Report *July* 23, [242] 3
Read 3ª * *July* 25
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 278]
*l.* Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts. (No. 179)
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 51]

*Roads—South Wales District*
Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 15, [237] 1730

ROBERTS, Mr. J., *Flint, &c.*
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 986

ROBERTSON, Mr. H., *Shrewsbury*
Post Office—Postmasterships, Res. [239] 216

RODWELL, Mr. B. B. H., *Cambridgeshire*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [241] 408, 500; *cl.* 10, 1859; *cl.* 55, 2104; *cl.* 68, [242] 159
County Government, Comm. [238] 915
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 664
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 17, [239] 1330
Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), 2R. [238] 1919
Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1352, 1357
Judicature Acts—Assizes and Quarter Sessions, [238] 759
Licensing Laws Amendment, [241] 1576
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1515
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1101
Parliamentary Papers, [237] 817
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1825
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1510; *cl.* 16, [241] 60, 63
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 140, 142

ROEBUCK, Mr. J. A., *Sheffield*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1063
Eastern Question—Congress, The, [239] 523
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 522

ROSEBERY, Earl of
Bishoprics, Report, [239] 954, 958; 3R. Amendt. 1855, 1865
Eastern Question—Treaty of Berlin—Alleged Agreement between England and Russia, [242] 344
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), 2R. [239] 656; Comm. *cl.* 12, 1078
General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862, Amendment, 2R. [241] 744
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 632, 633
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [241] 1955, 1963; Comm. *cl.* 89, Amendt. 2047; Report, Amendt. [242] 3

*Roumania*
*Commercial Treaty*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Spinks; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 22, [241] 2053
*Customs Tariff*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Spinks; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, [239] 1717
*The Jews*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 26, [239] 36
Correspondence (Turkey, No. 30), *P.P.* [2007]

*Russell, Earl, The late*
Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *May* 31, [240] 1033; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 3, 1084

RUSSELL, Sir C., *Westminster*
Copyright and Designs Act—Marks on China and Pottery, [238] 1954
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1386
Ventilation of Public Buildings—Police Courts, [238] 972
Weights and Measures, Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 409; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 411

*Russia*
*Purchase and Equipment of Privateers*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 21, [240] 357
*Religious Persecutions—The Evangelical Dissenters*, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 20, [240] 259
*Roumania*, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, [239] 1096
*Russia and Persia*, Question, Observations, The Earl of Dunraven; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 8, [238] 950
*Russia and Turkey—Batoum*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 15, [242] 2018;—*The Fleet in the Dardanelles*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 12, [242] 1767
[See title *Turkey—The Eastern Question, &c.*]

*Russia and the Porte—The Treaties of* 1856 *and* 1871
Moved to resolve, That, in the opinion of this House, the recent correspondence on the affairs of Turkey justifies Her Majesty's Government in taking every precaution to discourage the serious encroachments by which the Treaties of 1856 and 1871 are threatened" (*The Lord Campbell*) *Feb* 25, [238] 265; after long debate, a Question being stated, the Previous Question was put, "Whether the said Question shall be now put?" resolved in the negative
[See title *Turkey—The Eastern Question*]

RUTLAND, Duke of
Eastern Question—Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 861
Metropolis—Hyde Park—Shelters, [241] 953, 955
Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [240] 242

RYDER, Mr. G. R. D., *Salisbury*
Penal Servitude Commission—Fenian Convicts, [238] 1758
United States—The Bland Silver Act, [238] 1290

RYLANDS, Mr. P., *Burnley*
Army and Navy Services—Excess, [239] 1692
Civil Service Estimates, [238] 1509; Res. [242] 1443
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 515; Comm. *cl.* 22, 1996; *cl.* 30, 2064; Amendt. 2068, 2075, 2078; *cl.* 34, 2086; *cl.* 55, 2136; Comm. Postponed *cl.* 33, [242] 403; Schedule 5, 812
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1586, 1605
County Government, Comm. Amendt. [238] 893
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1308; 3R. 1747
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Annex to the Anglo-Turkish Treaty, Notice of Question, [241] 2050; [242] 38
  Negotiations, [239] 1442
  Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 762
Egyptian Finance, [239] 206, 224
Elementary Education Act, 1870—Wymington, [242] 1524
Grand Jury (Ireland), [238] 1298
Highways, Comm. [240] 1345; [241] 460; *cl.* 1, 465; *cl.* 11, 859; Amendt. 874, 876; *cl.* 13, 882; *cl.* 18, 887, 895; *cl.* 20, 900, 1078; *cl.* 31, Amendt. 1104, 1108
Inclosure Provisional Order (Orford), 2R. [240] 1350
Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 757
Law and Justice—Fines on Jurymen, [241] 1236
Military and Naval Expenditure, [240] 254
Mutiny, Comm. [238] 2030; 3R. [239] 207
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, Naval Yards, &c. [242] 1574
"Nineteenth Century"—Article on "Liberty in the East and West" (Mr. Gladstone)—Mr. Hanbury's Motion, [240] 1170
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House, [239] 122
  Morning Sittings, [239] 1229; Motion for Adjournment, 1232
  Orders of the Day, [237] 378
  Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1970
Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 411
Public Works Loans, Comm. *cl.* 5, [239] 1352
Supplementary Estimate, Ministerial Statement, [237] 535; Personal Explanation 1065; Motion for Adjournment, 1139, 1215, 1216, 1247
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [242] 1479
  Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 952, 958
  Charity Commission, [239] 1612
  Civil Service Commission, [239] 1617
  Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1534
  Consular Services, [240] 1285
  Convict Establishments, [240] 1007
  County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1009
  Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 949
  Diplomatic Services, [242] 1494

[*cont.*

RYLANDS, Mr. P.—*cont.*
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1259, 1280
  Foreign Office, [239] 1487, 1488
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1467
  Land Registry, [240] 987
  Law Charges, [240] 942
  Local Government Board, [238] 1550
  Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, [240] 1373
  Public Buildings, [240] 1365, 1371
  Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [238] 1553, 1554
  Science and Art Museum, Dublin, [238] 1541
  Stationery Office, [239] 1793
  Treasury, [238] 1544
Treaties of 1856 and 1871, Res. [240] 1391, 1416
Turnpike Roads Return, [241] 1070
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1626; *cl.* 3, [241] 23; *cl.* 5, 35; *cl.* 8, 46; *cl.* 16, 62, 66
Ways and Means, Report, [239] 744; Comm. [242] 1344

ST. ALBANS, Duke of
Railways, Management of, [237] 456
  Sir Francis Goldsmid, Fatal Accident to, [241] 310

*St. Katherine's Hospital—The Royal Commission*, 1871
Question, Observations, Viscount Enfield; Reply, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *Mar* 15, [238] 1382

ST. LEONARDS, Lord
Auxiliary Forces—Volunteers, [238] 615
Eastern Question, [237] 1198

*Sale of Food and Drugs Act*, 1875
Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 12, [237] 1535
*Adulteration of Beer at Maidstone*, Question, Mr. Wykeham Martin; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 30, [240] 927
*Sale of Spirits under Proof*, Question, Sir Frederick Perkins; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 27, [240] 743
*Violet Powder*, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 3, [240] 1072

**Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment Bill**
(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. P. A. Taylor, Mr. Whitwell*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *July* 9 [Bill 252]
Read 2°* *July* 15
Committee; Report *July* 30, [242] 775
As amended to be considered [Dropped]

*Sale of Intoxicating Liquors—Licensing Law*

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient to issue in England and Wales, between the present time and the next Session of Parliament, any new licences for the sale of wine, beer, or spirits 'to be consumed off the premises,' without the sanction, in the case of each new licence, of Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Home Department" (*Mr. Pease*) *May* 7, [239] 1540; Previous Question moved, "That that Question be now put" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); Previous Question put, and negatived

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill** (*Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Birley, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. James*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 5]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 28

**Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill** (*The O'Conor Don, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Redmond*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 44]
237] Read 2°, after debate *Jan* 21, 283
Committee—R.P. *Jan* 23, 364
Committee *Feb* 14, 1692

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. O'Sullivan*); after short debate, Question put; A. 20, N. 79; M. 59 (D. L. 12)

Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*); Question put; A. 20, N. 77; M. 57 (D. L. 13)

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. Onslow*); after short debate, Question put; A. 25, N. 37; M. 12 (D. L. 14)

Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*); after short debate, Question put; A. 6, N. 56; M. 50 (D. L. 15)

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*The O'Conor Don*); Motion agreed to; Committee—R.P.

Committee—R.P., after short debate *Feb* 18, 1916

Committee deferred, after short debate *Mar* 4, 238] 723

Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 5, 756; Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Sir Charles Forster *Mar* 7, 874; Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Sir Charles Forster *Mar* 14, 1293

239] Committee—R.P. *April* 1, 299
Committee—R.P. *April* 4, 622
Committee—R.P. *May* 13, 1812

Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Questions, Mr. Onslow, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answers, 240] The O'Conor Don *May* 16, 32

[*cont.*

*Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill*—cont.

240] Committee—R.P. *May* 16, 95
Committee—R.P. *May* 21, 438
Committee—R.P. *May* 24, 703
Committee—R.P. *May* 29, 860
Committee; Report *May* 30, 1020
As amended in Committee to be printed [Bill 215]

After short debate, Consideration, as amended, deferred *June* 17, 1675

Consideration, as amended, deferred till Thurs- 241] day, 11th July *June* 27, 413

Questions, Mr. R. Power, Mr. Repton; Answers, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Speaker *July* 8, 963

Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *July* 11, 1248

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Onslow*); Question proposed, "That 'now' &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 166, N. 55; M. 111 (D. L. 205)

Main Question, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration," put, and agreed to; Bill considered

After long time, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn

Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, The Chan- 242] cellor of the Exchequer *August* 1, 870

Moved, "That the Bill be read 3° upon Saturday" *August* 8, 1617

Amendt. to leave out "Saturday," and insert "Tuesday next" (*Mr. Onslow*); Question proposed, "That 'Saturday,' &c.;" after short debate, [House counted out]

Moved, "That the Bill be read 3° this day" *August* 9, 1716

After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "this day," and add "upon Tuesday next" (*Captain Pim*) *v.*; Question put, "That 'this day' &c.;" A. 61, N. 18; M. 43 (D. L. 269)

Main Question put; Ordered, That the Bill be read 3° this day

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *August* 10, 1721

Amendt. to leave out from "be," and add "re-committed" (*Mr. P. J. Smyth*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 63, N. 22; M. 41 (D. L. 270)

Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°

*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord O'Hagan*) *Aug* 12 (No. 197)
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 13, 1861
Committee *; Report *August* 14
Read 3ª, after short debate *August* 15, 2009
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 72]

SALISBURY, Marquess of (†Secretary of State for India) (*afterwards* Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)

China—Chefoo Convention, [242] 36, 38
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Re-comm. *cl.* 33, [240] 734
Cyprus—Financial Arrangements, [242] 21
Slavery, [241] 1948

[*cont.*

SALISBURY, Marquess of—*cont.*
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Alleged Agreement between England and Russia, [240] 1061 ; [242] 352, 367
Armenians, [240] 1243
Austro-Hungarian Monarchy—Speech of the Earl of Derby, Explanation, [239] 1362, 1363
Congress—Anglo-Turkish Convention, [242] 506, 508, 511, 514 ;—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1779, 1804, 1807, 1809, 1810, 1811, 1816 ;—Negotiations for, [240] 721
Ministerial Statement, [240] 1055, 1056
Treaty of San Stefano, [240] 1248
Emperor of Germany, Attempted Assassination of, [240] 1060
†India—The Deccan—Removal of Mr. Oliphant, [238] 1925
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 811, 828, 839, 840
†Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 52, 54
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, 2R. [240] 826 ; Comm. 1158

*Salmon Fishery Inspectors*
Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 8, [242] 1531

SAMUDA, Mr. J. D'A., *Tower Hamlets*
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1187 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1302 ; 3R. 1661
Epping Forest, Comm. [241] 574
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 732
Metropolis Waterworks (Purchase), 2R. Amendt. [238] 1224
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1103, 1120
Navy Estimates—Departmental Statement, [238] 1422, 1423, 1450, 1461
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 506

SAMUELSON, Mr. B., *Banbury*
Elementary Education Code—Natural Science, Res. [241] 785
Turkey—Cyprus, Occupation of, [241] 1242

SAMUELSON, Mr. H. B., *Frome*
Africa, Exploration of, [237] 458
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [240] 1465
Asia, Central—Russian Advance, [242] 1936
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. [242] 1712
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1188 ; Comm. *cl.* 17, 1334 ; *cl.* 20, 1346
Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. [242] 1828, 1830 ; 3R. 1844
Militia Volunteers for Service, [239] 413, 414
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2013, 2020 ; *cl.* 22, [239] 43 ; *cl.* 26, 64
Parliament—Business of the House, [242] 1641
Privileges of Members, [240] 656
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 393 ; *cl.* 1, 1825

[*cont.*

SAMUELSON, Mr. H. B.—*cont.*
Supply—Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1624, 1625
Foreign Office, [239] 1489
Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1644
Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1501
Prisons in Ireland, Superintendence, &c. of, [242] 1602, 1603
Turkey—Thessaly, Alleged Outrages in, [242] 1949, 1950, 1951
Turkey—Murder of Mr. Ogle, [239] 1596 ; [240] 25, 1561, 1612, 1613 ; Res. [242] 1956, 1968, 1984, 1996, 1998, 2002, 2003

SANDERSON, Mr. T. K., *Wakefield*
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 1643

SANDFORD, Mr. G. M. W., *Maldon*
Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1741
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1919 ; [239] 363, 368 ; *cl.* 1, 622
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1234
Supply—"Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," [238] 1557

SANDON, Right Hon. Viscount (Vice President of Committee of Council on Education) (*afterwards* †President of the Board of Trade), *Liverpool*
†Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1601
†Boiler Explosions, [242] 216
†Captain Hooper's Life-Saving Apparatus, [241] 1851
Cattle Plague, [239] 117
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869—Outbreak at Alford, [238] 1042
†Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 241, 242
†Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, [241] 1234
†Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 645
Education Department—Miscellaneous Questions
Education Code, 1878—Art. 17 (G)—Educational Returns, [238] 1751 ;—Art. 19, 1753
Grants in Elementary Schools, [239] 531
London School Board—Religious Teaching, [239] 531
Religious Instruction, [239] 530
†Report, [242] 2025
School Board—Education Rate, [238] 1839
School Board Elections, [239] 530
Elementary Education Act, 1876, [237] 821
Board School, Wymington, [239] 112
School Certificates of Birth, [239] 529
Endowed Schools (Leeds Poors Estate), Motion for an Address, [238] 1668
†Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [242] 1776
Ireland—Royal College of Science, Dublin, [237] 621
†Joint Stock Companies Acts, 1862 and 1867, Res. [239] 1711

[*cont.*

**Sandon**, Right Hon. Viscount—*cont.*
Medical Profession—Legislation, [237] 531
Mercantile Marine—Miscellaneous Questions
†Coal Laden Ships, [241] 1967
†Spontaneous Combustion of Coal—"Annie Richmond," [241] 490
†Steamship "Austin Friars," [242] 1639
†Training School Ships, [241] 963
†Merchant Seamen Bill — Select Committee, [240] 1609
†Merchant Shipping—Cardiff Pilots, [240] 31
†Merchant Shipping Act, 1854—Port of Cardiff, [240] 834
Railways—Miscellaneous Questions
†Brake Power, [239] 1367
†Continuous Brakes, [241] 1471
†Railway Accidents—Sir Francis Goldsmid, The Late, [239] 1689; [240] 1166; [241] 210
†Railway Time Tables, [239] 1690
†Train Management, [241] 20
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 803
†Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, [240] 1385, 1386
†Privy Council for Trade, &c. Committee of, [239] 1610
†Report, [240] 1153
†Trade of the United Kingdom, [242] 1172
†Tramways—Use of Mechanical Power, [240] 747, 1606

**Sandwich**, Earl of
Conservancy Navigation, &c. Boards, [237] 241; [240] 1163
Eastern Question—Dardanelles, The—Movements of the Fleet—Resignation of Ministers, [237] 435
Ecclesiastical Commission — Mr. Charles Armstrong, [239] 1081; [241] 744, 752
Parliament—Militia Officers, [239] 184

*Science and Art*
*Museum of Casts from the Antique*, Questions, Observations, The Earl of Wharncliffe; short debate thereon; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Mar* 25, [238] 1937; Question, Observations, Earl Cowper; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *July* 29, [242] 515
*Science and Art Museum (Dublin)*, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 1, [242] 864
*South Kensington Museum—The National Portrait Gallery*, Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 4, [237] 924; Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 16, [240] 24
*The National Gallery*, Observations, Mr. Hermon, Lord Francis Hervey; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 4, [241] 793
Parl. Papers—
National Portrait Gallery, 21st Report . . . . . . . . . . [2047]
Correspondence . . . . . . . . 50

*Science and Art—National Portrait Gallery, South Kensington*
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the time has come for the Treasury to carry

[cont.

*Science and Art—National Portrait Gallery, South Kensington*—cont.
out the promise made by it in March 1876, of appropriating certain specified portions of the Exhibition Buildings at South Kensington for the accommodation of the National Portrait Gallery, in addition to the apartments already occupied by that Gallery" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*) *Mar* 5, [238] 759; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 21, 1749

*Science and Art — The Bethnal Green Museum*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "it is desirable to give greater facilities for admission to the Bethnal Green Museum, by extending the arrangements now existing on the three free days to five in the week" (*Mr. Ritchie*) *v.*, [240] 37; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

**Sclater-Booth**, Right Hon. G. (President of the Local Government Board), *Hampshire, N.*
Army Reserves, [240] 262
Bathing Accidents, Fatal—Scarborough, [241] 1466
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. [239] 1358
County Boards Bill—Petty Sessional Districts, [237] 820
County Expenditure—Borough Contributions, [238] 755
County Government, Leave, [237] 583, 607; 2R. 1651, 1663, 1687, 1902, 1915; Comm. [238] 896, 904, 929, 1749
County Government Bill — Management of Rivers, [240] 30
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. Schedule, [242] 1955
Friendly Societies—Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, [237] 923
237] Highways, 723
239] 2R. 1257
240] Comm. 1345; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1346; *add. cl. ib.*
241] Re-comm. 461, 464; *cl.* 1, 465; *cl.* 4, 466, 468; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 469; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.*, 470, 471, 472; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 9, *ib.*; *cl.* 11, 473, 475, 476, 477, 478; Motion for reporting Progress, 479; Amendt. 857, 862, 873, 876, 877, 880; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 881, 882; *cl.* 14, 883; *cl.* 16, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 18, *ib.*, 884, 885, 886, 890, 894, 895; *cl.* 19, 897; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 898, 899, 900, 1079, 1080, 1081; *cl.* 21, 1084, 1085; Amendt. 1086, 1087, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093; *cl.* 22, 1094; Amendt. 1095; *cl.* 23, 1097, 1098; *cl.* 24, 1100, 1101; *cl.* 25, *ib.*, 1102; *cl.* 27, 1103; *cl.* 31, 1106; Amendt. 1108; *add. cl.* 1109; Motion for reporting Progress, 1112, 1153, 1157, 1161, 1241, 1337; Amendt. 1340, 1341, 1342, 1346, 1352, 1355, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1360, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1366
242] Consid. *add. cl.* 196, 197

[cont.

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Highways—Bicycles on Highways, [241] 324
- Inclosure Provisional Orders, Comm. Schedule, [242] 1842
- Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1529, 1531; Instruction, 1723, 1726
- Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Lower Thames Street, Dirty Condition of, [242] 1948
  - Water Supply, [239] 1285
  - Water Supply in South London, [241] 1238
- Noxious Vapours, Commission on—The Report, [238] 756; [239] 1720
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [241] 331
  - Order of Business, [241] 763
  - Public Business, [239] 1287; [240] 625
- Pollution of Rivers Act, 1876—Legal Proceedings, [241] 1333
- Poor Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Basingstoke Union Casuals, [241] 759
  - Compensation Allowances to Union Officers, [240] 1341
  - Dolgelly Guardians—Care of Children, [240] 1493
  - Eliza Littlehales, Case of, [240] 1885
  - Irish Paupers, Removal of, [241] 325; [242] 996;—Thomas Johnson, [240] 627
  - North Surrey District School—Detention of a Child, [238] 634
  - Roman Catholic Nurses in Workhouses, [240] 494
  - Saffron Walden Union, [240] 1070
- Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 555
- Poor Law—Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 677
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, [241] 856; Lords Amendts. Consid. 942, 1041, 1042, 1045
- Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Election, 2R. [239] 96
- Population Statistics—Registrar General's Returns, [242] 1531
- Public Health—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Adulteration of Beer at Maidstone, [240] 927
  - Public Health Act—Public Officers of Health, [237] 923
  - Sanitary Condition of Ascot, [241] 757
  - Small-Pox, [238] 754; [242] 224;—Deaths from Small-Pox in London, [241] 589
- Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. Amendt. [239] 1686
- Public Works Loans, 2R. [239] 608, 609, 620, 621, 1256; Comm. 1351; *cl.* 5, 1354; *add. cl.* 1356
- Rivers Pollution Prevention Act, 1876, [239] 1597
- Roads—South Wales District, [237] 1730
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 3R. [241] 1072
- Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, [237] 1536;—Sale of Spirits under Proof, [240] 743
- Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 776
- Supply—Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 951
  - Local Government Board, &c. [238] 1548, 1551; [239] 1632, 1636, 1639, 1640, 1641, 1642, 1643, 1645, 1646
  - Local Government Board, Ireland, [241] 1557

[*cont.*

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Turnpike Roads Return, [241] 1070
- Vaccination Acts, [238] 974, 975;—Case of Mr. Abel, 1140
- Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 477, 490, 507

240] Valuation of Property, 2R. 1316; Comm.
Motion for Adjournment, 1494, 1508, 1512,
1524, 1634
241] *cl.* 2, 21; *cl.* 3, 23, 27, 34; *cl.* 5, *ib.*; *cl.* 7,
36; *cl.* 8, 37, 39, 41, 43, 48, 55, 56; *cl.* 9,
57; *cl.* 10, 59; *cl.* 11, 60; *cl.* 16, 61, 62, 66

*Scotch and Irish Fishery Loan Accounts—Section* 10, 5 *Geo. IV., c.* 64
- Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *August* 12, [242] 1764

Scotland

Miscellaneous Questions
- *Church of Scotland—Opening of the General Assembly*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 30, [240] 927
- *Courts of Session—Legislation*, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 14, [238] 1295
- *Crown Teinds (Scotland)—Legislation*, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Jan* 31, [237] 723
- *Death of Mr. G. P. Chalmers*, Question, Mr. Ramsay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 5, [238] 755
- *Defences of the Firth of Forth*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 15, [238] 1399
- *Education Grants in Scotland*, Observations, Mr. Mark Stewart; short debate thereon *July* 4, [241] 797
- *Education Report*, Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 1, [241] 493
- *Education (Scotland) Act—The Code of* 1878 *and the Gaelic Language*, Withdrawal of Motion, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh *Feb* 19, [237] 1925
- *Endowed Schools—Legislation*, Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 25, [238] 1947
- *Grocers' Licenses*, Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 18, [237] 1850; Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 20, [240] 261
- *Gun Licence Act*, 1870—*Rabbits*, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, [239] 1089
- *Harbours*, Question, Observations, Viscount Macduff; Reply, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; short debate thereon *May* 17, [240] 162
- *Law and Justice—Office of Lord Clerk Register*—24 *&* 25 *Vict. c.* 71, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, [238] 1486; Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 26, [239] 37; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 20, [240] 1883

[*cont.*

SCOTLAND—*cont.*

*Local Taxation and Government*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 13, [239] 1719

*Lunacy Commission—The Vacancy*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 30, [240] 926

*Police Superannuation Fund*, Question, Mr. J. Stewart; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 23, [240] 497

*Poor Law*

*Case of Agnes Adams*, Question, Mr. P. Martin; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Feb* 21, [238] 58

*Deportation of Irish Paupers*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 12, [237] 1539

*Prisons (Scotland) Act—Prison Board Clerks*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *April* 16, [239] 1368

*Sale of Food and Drugs Act*, 1875 (*Scotland*), Question, Mr. W. Holms; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 23, [240] 495

*Scotch University Commission*, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 7, [238] 873

*Sheriff Clerks—Salaries*, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 21, [238] 1747

*The Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh*, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *May* 30, [240] 930

*The Judicial Body—Lord Craighill*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 18, [241] 1850

*The Solway Commissioners*, Question, Mr. Percy Wyndham; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 20, [240] 262

*Under Secretary of State for Scotland*, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 10, [239] 1691

*Scotland—Dunkeld Bridge Tolls*

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the administration of the Dunkeld Bridge Tolls, and to ascertain, with items in detail, the real state of the account of moneys received and expended by the Dukes of Athole in connection with the said trust" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *Jan* 29, [237] 626; after short debate, Question put; A. 79, N. 189; M. 118; (D. L. 5)

*Scotland—Hypothec*

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the landlord's right of Hypothec for the rent of land in Scotland is detrimental to the interests of tenant farmers, and unnecessary to protect those of landlords, and ought to be abolished, due provision being made to secure the rights of parties under existing contracts" (*Mr. Vans Agnew*) *June* 25, [241] 250 [House counted out]

*Scotland—Precognition—Sudden or Suspicious Deaths*

Moved for, Returns from each county in Scotland of the number of cases of sudden death or of death under suspicious or unknown circumstances which have been the subject of precognition by procurators fiscal in each of the years 1875 and 1876, and in which the investigations were from the first connected with charges of murder, culpable homicide, &c.; also specifying the number of such cases as have afterwards become the subject of criminal trials (supplementary to Lords Paper No. 4., 1878) (*The Earl of Minto*) *April* 5, [239] 647; after short debate, Motion agreed to (*P.P. l.* 4, 86)

*Scotland—Religious Denominations—Patronage Act*, 1874

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Patronage Act of 1874, and its effect upon the reciprocal relations of the various religious denominations in Scotland, and to ascertain how far the people of Scotland are in favour of maintaining the connection between Church and State in that Country" (*Mr. William Holms*) *June* 18, [240] 1738

Amendt. "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present relations of the Established Church with the other Churches in Scotland, and with the people at large, and in particular to inquire how far the Church Patronage Act of 1874 has tended to remove the causes of disunion and dissatisfaction among the Presbyterians of Scotland, and what further legislation would most conduce to that end" (*Mr. C. S. Parker*)

The Amendt., not being seconded, could not be put

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a Commission to inquire into the causes which keep asunder the Presbyterians of Scotland, with a view to the removal of any impediments which may exist to their re-union in a National Church, as established at the Reformation, and ratified by the Revolution Settlement and the Act of Union" (*Sir Alexander Gordon*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after further short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

SCOTT, Mr. M. D., *Sussex, E.*

Highways, Comm. *add. cl.* [241] 1356, 1358

**Sea Fisheries (Ireland) Bill** (*Dr. Ward, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins, Sir Joseph M'Kenna*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 40]
2R. [Dropped]

**Seely, Mr. C.**, *Lincoln City*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 55, [241] 2127
Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1057, 1107

**Selborne, Lord**
Bills of Sale, 2R. [240] 827
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), [241] 950
Cyprus, Island of—Financial Arrangements, [242] 32
Eastern Question—Congress—Correspondence and Protocols, [241] 1809
Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 967
Foreign Office—Abstraction of a Document—Memorandum of Agreement between England and Russia, [241] 481
Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), 2R. [241] 1432
Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 190
Message from the Queen—Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] 807, 811
Military Forces of the Crown—Employment of Indian Troops, [239] 1854, 1855 ; [240] 187, 218, 226
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 919
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 1R. [237] 1614

**Select Vestries**
*l.* Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª *Jan* 17

**Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.** († Under Secretary of State for the Home Department) (*afterwards* Secretary to the Treasury), *Essex, W.*
Admiralty and War Office Re-organization—Clerks of Royal Engineer Department, [240] 1037
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1313, 1314 ; Comm. [241] 1382 ; *cl.* 4, 1684
Arklow Harbour (Ireland), [241] 1848
Board of Works—Report of the Commission, [240] 1882
Cattle Disease—Miscellaneous Questions
  Importation of Foreign Cattle, [241] 960, 961, 962
  Inoculation, [241] 1465
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, 3R. Amendt. [242] 1425, 1431, 1432
Civil Service—Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), [241] 2060
  Writers, [242] 42
241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 133, 530, 563, 565 ; Comm. 973, 977, 990, 1026, 1070 ; *cl.* 2, 1609, 1612, 1627, 1675, 1723 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1725, 1726 ; *cl.* 9, 1737, 1741, 1745, 1747, 1749, 1750 ; *cl.* 10, 1855, 1857, 1860, 1861, 1864 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1865, 1876, 1882 ; *cl.* 16, 1884, 1886, 1889, 1894, 1895, 1900 ; *cl.* 21, 1903, 1909, 1910, 1912, 1913 ; Amendt. 1918, 1919, 1920, 1922 ; *cl.* 22, 1924, 1927, 1929, 1931, 1933, 1935, 1974, 1982, 1986, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1993, 2001, 2002 ; Amendt. 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007 ; *cl.* 23, 2008 ; *cl.* 24, 2009 ; *cl.* 26, Amendt.

[*cont.*

**Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.**—*cont.*
241] *ib.* ; *cl.* 28, 2010 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 2012, 2013, 2014, 2016 ; *cl.* 30, 2017, 2068 ; Amendt. 2071, 2072, 2074, 2076, 2078 ; *cl.* 31, 2080, 2081 ; *cl.* 32, 2083, 2084 ; *cl.* 33, 2085 ; *cl.* 34, Amendt. *ib.*, 2086 ; *cl.* 37, *ib.*, 2087 ; *cl.* 38, *ib.* ; *cl.* 39, 2089 ; *cl.* 44, Amendt. *ib.*, 2090 ; *cl.* 45, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 52, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 53, 2091, 2092, 2093 ; *cl.* 54, *ib.*, 2094, 2095 ; *cl.* 55, 2096, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2115, 2116, 2118, 2119, 2123, 2124, 2126, 2128, 2134 ; *cl.* 59, 2137 ; *cl.* 62, 2139 ; *cl.* 64, 2140
242] *cl.* 68, 142, 154, 160, 163 ; *cl.* 70, 167, 170 ; Amendt. 175 ; *cl.* 71, 179, 183 ; Amendt. 184 ; Postponed *cl.* 5, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193 ; *cl.* 33, Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*, 400, 402 ; *cl.* B, 427, 428, 429, 430, 432, 433 ; *cl.* D, *ib.* ; *add. cl.* 434, 437, 438, 439, 441, 442, 444, 445, 446, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 772 ; Schedule 3, Amendt. 773, 805, 806 ; Schedule 5, Amendt. *ib.*, 807 ; Amendt. 808, 809, 815, 818, 821 ; New Schedule, 822, 823, 826, 828 ; Consid. *cl.* 35, Amendt. 1278 ; *cl.* 60, Amendt. *ib.*, 1279, 1280
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1582, 1586, 1588, 1592, 1606, 1607, 1608 ; Amendt. 1687, 1693
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Importation of Cattle, [242] 2024
Conway Bridge (Composition of Debt), 2R. [240] 820
Corrib (Galway) River, 2R. [241] 844
Customs' Clerks, [239] 1091
Customs—Outport Clerks, [239] 1884 ; [242] 1763
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [239] 1290 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1320 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt. *ib.*
Customs Re-organization, [241] 323
†Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1991
Dog Licences, [241] 323
Dover and Calais Mail Contract, [240] 495 ; Res. 1238
Epping Forest, Leave, [240] 854 ; 2R. 1622 ; Comm. [241] 574 ; *cl.* 13, 577, 579 ; *cl.* 29, *ib.* ; 3R. 770, 771, 776
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [242] 1953
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 719
Harbour Loans, [241] 490
Harbours (Scotland), [240] 165
India—Indian Budget, [242] 868
Inland Navigation (Ireland), [241] 1466
Irish Board of Works—Report of Select Committee, [242] 221, 1870 ;—Action for Libel, 1767
Law and Justice—Judges' Substitutes, [239] 858
Mail Contracts—Contracts and Correspondence, [242] 998
Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* 8, [241] 847
Merchant Shipping—Dynamite, &c. [240] 623
Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 11, Amendt. [239] 756 ; *add. cl.* 758
Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), Comm. *cl.* 14, [241] 1936, 1938
†Mines Act—Inspectors' Reports, [238] 1841

[*cont.*

**Selwin-Ibbetson**, Sir H. J.—*cont.*
- Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. [241] 1030, 1031
- Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-7, Comm. [242] 1616, 1617
- Paris Exhibition — Government Workmen, [239] 1716
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [241] 1071
  - House of Commons—Salaries of Officials, [242] 1396
  - Morning Sittings, [239] 1237
- †Parliament—Public Business (Half-past Twelve Rule), Res. [237] 416
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Select Committee, [239] 471
- †Poor Law (Scotland)—Case of Agnes Adams, [238] 58
- Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Mail Contracts, [240] 25
  - Mail Service — Peninsular and Oriental Company, [240] 1255
  - Newspaper Registration, [240] 1339
  - United States Telegraph System, [240] 741
  - West Indian Mail Contract, [242] 1871
- Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties, Res. [240] 639
- Public Works Loans, Comm. *cl.* 5, [239] 1352
- Racecourses (Licensing), 2R. [237] †648; Comm. *cl.* 1, [240] 1485; *cl.* 6, 1488, 1489
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors—Licensing Law, Res. Previous Question moved, [239] 1542
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 380; *cl.* 1, 1837; *cl.* 6, [240] 705; *cl.* 8, 718
- Salmon Fishery Inspectors, [242] 1531
- Scotch and Irish Fishery Loan Accounts, [242] 1764
- †Smoke Nuisance Act, [239] 118
- Superannuation Act, 1859—The Customs Department, [242] 524
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 961, 965, 966, 967
  - Charity Commission, [239] 1612, 1614
  - Civil Service Commission, [239] 1616
  - Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1620, 1621, 1622, 1624, 1625
  - Convict Establishments, &c. [240] 1006, 1007
  - County Courts, [240] 979
  - County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1012
  - Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 946, 948, 949
  - Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 684, 688, 697
  - Foreign Office, [239] 1486
  - Friendly Societies, [239] 1629, 1630
  - Government Property, Rates on, [240] 1386
  - Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, [240] 1385
  - Home Office, [239] 1484
  - †House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1481
  - House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1453, 1454, 1455, 1456, 1457, 1459, 1461, 1464, 1470, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1476
  - International Exhibition at Paris, 1878—Royal Commission, [242] 1267

[*cont.*

**Selwin-Ibbetson**, Sir H. J.—*cont.*
  - Law Charges, [240] 941, 942
  - Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [242] 1262, 1263
  - Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 814, 815, 816, 817
  - London Bankruptcy Court, [240] 973
  - Lord Privy Seal, [239] 1508
  - Lunacy Commission (Scotland), [240] 813
  - Metropolitan Fire Brigade, [240] 1387
  - Metropolitan Police, [240] 996
  - Mint, Coinage, &c. [239] 1762, 1763
  - Miscellaneous, Charitable, and other Allowances (Great Britain), [240] 1312
  - Natural History Museum, Erection of, [240] 1383
  - Patent Law Amendment Act, &c. [239] 1765, 1768, 1770, 1772, 1775, 1776
  - Pauper Lunatics, England, [240] 1311
  - Paymaster General, London and Dublin, [239] 1777, 1778, 1779, 1780
  - Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [230] 997, 998, 1000
  - Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 994, 996
  - Post Office Telegraphs, [240] 1313
  - Privy Council for Trade, &c. Committee of, [239] 1608, 1609, 1611
  - Privy Council Office, [239] 1491, 1492, 1494
  - Public Buildings, [240] 1363, 1368
  - Public Works Office, Ireland, [242] 1586
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 668, 672, 673, 676, 678
  - Queen's Bench, &c. [240] 968, 969, 971, 972
  - Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1013, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018
  - Registration of Judgments in Ireland, [242] 1277
  - Report, [239] 395, 1686; [240] 1387
  - Royal Irish Academy, [241] 1543, 1544
  - Science and Art Department Buildings, [240] 1381
  - Secret Services, [240] 665, 666
  - Slave Trade, Suppression of, [240] 1308
  - Stationery Office, [239] 1781, 1782, 1784, 1786, 1792, 1795, 1797, 1798, 1800, 1802, 1803, 1805; [240] 50, 56, 59, 63, 70
  - Superannuations and Retired Allowances, [240] 1309, 1310, 1311
  - Treasury, [239] 1483
  - Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 83, 86, 87, 88, 89
  - Works and Public Buildings, [240] 94
- Telegraphs, 2R. [241] 1941; [242] 1697
- Tramways Orders Confirmation, Comm. [240] 1316
- War and India Offices, [242] 778
- Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1365

**Severne**, Mr. J., *Shropshire*
- Highways, Comm. [241] 456; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 467; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 882; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 885, 893; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1087; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1101; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1103

**Shaftesbury**, Earl of
- Cyprus, Island of—Slavery, [241] 1224
- Eastern Question — Congress — Armenians, [240] 1242

[*cont.*

Shaftesbury, Earl of—*cont.*
Factories and Workshops, 2R. [239] 947; 3R. [240] 1
Parliamentary Elections (Metropolis), 2R. [237] 1846
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 2R. [240] 1240; Comm. [241] 107; *cl.* 1, 114, 117; Re-comm. 307, 310; Commons Amendts. Consid. Amendt. 1436

Shaw, Mr. W., *Cork Co.*
Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1477
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 5, [242] 1811
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. [241] 727
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 166
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 284; Comm. [239] 391; *cl.* 1, 632; Motion for reporting Progress, 1832, 1835, 1840, 1848; *cl.* 8, [240] 717; *add. cl.* 894, 925, 1028, 1030, 1031; 3R. [242] 1725, 1742
Tenants' Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [238] 1693
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 267

Sheil, Mr. E., *Athlone*
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, Motion for Adjournment, [242] 1387

Sheridan, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
Coal Mines—Homer Hill Colliery Accident—Case of Thomas Shaw, [242] 2018
Criminal Law—Phœbe Newton, Case of, [241] 587
Russia and Turkey—Treaty of San Stefano, [239] 960

Sherlock, Mr. Serjeant D., *King's Co.*
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [242] 1802; *cl.* 5, 1805
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1835

Shute, Major-General C. C., *Brighton*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Adjutants of Volunteers, Res. [238] 644
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Compulsory Retirement of Officers, [239] 1881
  Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 649
  Regimental Lieutenant Colonels, [240] 26
  Royal Warrant, 1870—Time for Pension, [239] 1095
  Veterinary Department, [238] 1398
Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, [238] 718
  Land Forces, [238] 708
  Volunteer Corps, [240] 1471
  Works, Buildings, &c. Amendt. [242] 1413
Capital Punishment Abolition, 2R. [238] 1273

[*cont.*

Shute, Major-General C. C.—*cont.*
India—Madras Civil Service—Case of Mr. F. Lascelles, [242] 1528
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 544, 545, 546
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 1, [238] 1986, 1987, 1990; *cl.* 48, [239] 140
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1359

Sidebottom, Mr. T. H., *Staleybridge*
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] *717

Sidmouth, Viscount
Education Department—London School Board Training Ships, [242] 1633
Malta—Protest of the Maltese Nobles, [241] 850, 851
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," [242] 1627

*Sierra Leone*
Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 2, [239] 412

Simon, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Army—Perak Expedition—Allowances to Officers, &c. [237] 532; [238] 541; [240] 359; [242] 1526
Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. [238] 1135
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 427
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1574
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [237] 660, 688
Criminal Law Practice Amendment, 2R. [237] 1840
Currency—Small Silver Coinage, [240] 1683
Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1864
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. [239] 1060
Roumania—The Jews, [239] 36
Spain—"Octavia," Seizure of the, [238] 452; [240] 1883
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1278, 1279

Sinclair, Sir J. G. T., *Caithness-shire*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. Postponed *cl.* 54, [240] 1936, 1938

*Slave Trade in the Red Sea, The*
Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 29, [237] 623

Smith, Right Hon. W. H. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Westminster*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1314; Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 1377, 1378; *cl.* 2, 1379, 1380, 1389, 1426, 1683; *cl.* 4, 1684, 1685; [242] 225; 3R. 450
Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal, 2R. [240] 488
Eastern Question—Dardanelles, The—Movements of the Fleet, [237] 1534, 1622
  Mediterranean Fleet—Detention of British Seamen, [241] 1853, 1971

[*cont.*

**SMITH**, Right Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
- German Navy—"Der Grosser Kurfürst," Destruction of, [240] 1038
- Greenwich Hospital Funds, [241] 1844
- Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [240] 625
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Accountant General of the Navy, [241] 1850
  - Admiralty Payments, [238] 1840
  - Admiralty, Re-organization of, Report of Committee, [242] 1178
  - Boiler Committee, Report of, [238] 446; [241] 588
  - Census, [242] 1178
  - Channel and Particular Service Squadron, [242] 1768
  - Chief Engineers, [242] 992
  - Clare, Mr. John, Case of, [238] 1757
  - Coal Contracts, [238] 158
  - Commanders on the Active List, [242] 1177
  - Dockyards, H.M.—Writers, [237] 529; [240] 620;—Reorganization—The Clerks, 1608
  - Engine-room Artificers, [242] 1524
  - Greenwich Hospital Pensioners, [241] 1470; Age Pensions, [242] 391, 1545
  - Greenwich Out-Pensioners, [237] 1048, 1618
  - H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [238] 1959, 2032; [239] 286; [240] 1251; [241] 120, 121; [242] 2048
  - H.M.S. "Nelson," [237] 1847
  - H.M.S. "Undaunted," [237] 1850
  - H.M.S. "Vanguard," [239] 858; [242] 523, 2092
  - "Independencia," The, [238] 1744
  - Indian Troops and Stores—Contracts for Transport, [241] 125
  - Mediterranean Squadron, [237] 461, 462
  - Naval Artillery Volunteers, [241] 1849
  - Naval Courts Martial, [240] 1251
  - Naval Engineers, [237] 1207
  - Naval Forces in the Pacific, [239] 666
  - Navigating Officers, [240] 1036
  - Pilotage, Charges for, [238] 536
  - Reserved or Retired Officers, [238] 152
  - Roman Catholics, [237] 1732
  - Roman Catholic Chaplains, [238] 376, 1756
  - Royal Naval Artillery Volunteers, [238] 446
  - Sailing Regulations of the Fleet, [240] 1879
  - Thomas Maguire, Case of, [238] 1142
  - Torpedo Boats, [238] 977
  - Training Ship "Ganges," [242] 2021
  - Transport in the Mediterranean, [242] 1533
  - War Material at Tenedos, [239] 1096
  - Widows' Pension Fund, [240] 1342
  - Worn-out Boilers, Sale of, [239] 35
- Navy and Army Expenditure, 1876-7, Comm. [242] 1616
- Navy—Designs of Ships of War, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 1324
- Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, [237] 371, 1617; [238] 1494, 1744, 1745; [239] 528; [240] 35, 621, 1254; Res. [242] 1201
- Navy—Royal Naval Reserve, Res. [242] 1537
- Navy—Seamen and Marines' Widows' Pension Fund, Res. [238] 1503

[*cont.*

**SMITH**, Right Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
- Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [238] 1469
  - Comm. [242] 1567
  - Departmental Statement, [238] 1404, 1418, 1449, 1450, 1455, 1461, 1468
  - Dockyards, Naval Yards, &c. [242] 1582, 1585, 1586
  - Freight, &c. on Account of Army Department, [238] 1476, 1477
  - Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, [238] 1471
  - Military Pensions and Allowances, [238] 1473
  - Seamen and Marines, Clothing and Victuals, [238] 1469
  - Seamen and Marines, Wages, &c. [238] 1469
- Navy Supplementary Estimate—Transport of Native Indian Troops, [240] 805, 810
- Parliament—Marine Mutiny, [238] 447
- Parliament—Public Petitions Committee—Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1741
- Supplementary Estimate, Comm. [237] 1406, 1408
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 958
  - Civil Contingencies Fund, Re-payments to, [238] 1618
  - Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [238] 1626
  - Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1534, 1958
  - Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 950
  - Provisions, Forage, &c. [238] 1624
  - Registration of Deeds in Ireland, [242] 1276
  - Report, [242] 1691, 1692
  - Science and Art Museum, Dublin, [238] 1543
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - British Fleet in the Sea of Marmora, [240] 1256
  - Firing on a Boat's Crew by the Russians, [241] 2057
  - Greek Refugees, [238] 873
- Vote of Credit and Navy Estimates, [238] 877
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 606

**SMITH**, Mr. T. E., *Tynemouth, &c.*
- Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1594
- Merchant Seamen, Leave, [237] 310

*Smoke Nuisance Act, The*
- Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 28, [239] 118

**SMOLLETT**, Mr. P. B., *Cambridge*
- India—Madras Harbour, [237] 819; [240] 24
- India—East India (Increase of Taxation), Res. [239] 436
- Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 76
- Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [240] 1826

**Smyth, Mr. P. J.,** *Westmeath Co.*
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1392
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 349; *cl.* 8, [240] 719, 720; *add. cl.* 880, 882, 912, 913; Consid. [241] 1258; *add. cl.* 1301; *cl.* 1, 1312, 1313, 1314; 3R. Amendt. [242] 1721, 1722
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 870

**Smyth, Mr. R.,** *Londonderry Co.*
Criminal Law (Ireland)—Medical Witnesses, [241] 491
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 10, [238] 99
National School Teachers (Ireland), Res. [239] 1528
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [240] 122; *cl.* 6, 709; *add. cl.* 866, 915
Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1583

**Solicitor General, The (Sir H. S. Giffard),** *Launceston*
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [238] 425
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1646
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), Comm. Bill withdrawn, [242] 2040
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 69, [238] 475, 476; *cl.* 80, 478
Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1931
Law and Justice—Bankrupt Solicitors, [237] 620
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 561
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1201, 1202
Navy — H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, Res. [242] 1197
Parliament—Corrupt Practices, [240] 22
  Liabilities of Employers and Workmen, [240] 22
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1195, 1199
Sergeant M'Carthy, Case of, Motion for an Address, [241] 1411, 1414
Street Traffic—Military Bandsmen, [240] 21
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1130
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 964
  Queen's Bench, &c. [240] 969
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 2, [242] 1859, 1860; 3R. 2034

**Somerset, Duke of**
Army—Artillery—Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns, Motion for Returns, [241] 1328
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 1R. [237] 1501; [240] 125; Re-comm. *cl.* 26, Amendt. 722
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 879, 880
Eastern Question—Congress, Negotiations for, [240] 722
  Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 861
Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 968
Egyptian Obelisk (Cleopatra's Needle), [238] 826
National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 410

[*cont.*

**Somerset, Duke of**—*cont.*
Projectiles—Shells and Armour-plates, Motion for Returns, [239] 1271, 1273
Public Health Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [240] 1160
Railways—Continuous Brakes, [238] 1286
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 1R. [237] 1615

**Somerset, Lord H. R. C. (Comptroller of the Household),** *Monmouthshire*
Eastern Affairs—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, [242] 1761
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Her Majesty's Answer to Address, [237] 488

*South Kensington — National Portrait Gallery*
Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 4, [237] 924

*Spain*
Miscellaneous Questions
*Case of George White,* Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 15, [242] 2019; *August* 16, 2090
*Emigration Treaty with China,* Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 15, [241] 1468
*Fiscal Legislation—Duties on British Goods,* Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 16, [241] 1581
*Importation of Austrian Cattle from Spain,* Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 1, [241] 492
*Slavery in Cuba,* Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 25, [238] 1958
*The Insurrection in Cuba,* Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 25, [238] 299; *April* 15, [239] 1284
*The "Octavia" and the "Lark,"* Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 28, [238] 452; *June* 20, [240] 1883

**Speaker, The (Right Hon. H. B. W. Brand),** *Cambridgeshire*
*PARLIAMENT*
*Business of the House*
Private Members and Official Members—As regards the Business of the House, there is no distinction between private Members and official Members, [242] 392
Saturday Sittings—Mr. Speaker is not prepared, off-hand, to say whether there is any precedent for holding a Sitting on Saturday solely for the consideration of a Bill other than a Government Bill. And Mr. Speaker refers to the rights of Members in regard to private Bills, [242] 1640
Adjournment of the House—It has been the general practice that a Motion for the adjournment of the House should take precedence of other Business, [240] 1076

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

The 12.30 Rule—The application for Leave to bring in a Bill being in form a Motion before the House is, like every other Motion, subject to Amendment. Therefore a Notice of Amendment on a Motion for Leave brings the Bill within the operation of the Rule with regard to not taking opposed Business after half-past 12 o'clock, [237] 1538

Strangers—Notice being taken, That Strangers were present—Mr. Speaker said, he should follow the course which he had previously taken on similar occasions, and forthwith put the Question, "That Strangers be ordered to withdraw;" but no second Teller being named for the Ayes, Mr. Speaker declared that the Noes had it, [240] 478

The Ladies Gallery—Mr. Speaker informs the House of the course he has usually taken with respect to the admission of ladies to the Ladies Gallery when the discussion of a delicate question is likely to take place, [240] 480

*DIVISIONS*

Mr. Sullivan and Mr. O'Connor Power stating that they had inadvertently gone into the wrong Lobby, and that their votes had been counted contrary to their intention—Mr. Speaker said, that there was no mode by which the record of the vote could be altered. Both the hon. Members having been in the House when the Question was put, the result of their votes must be recorded as they were given, [242] 1814

On a Division on *Blind and Deaf-Mute Children* (*Education*) *Bill,* the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker declares his reason for voting with the Noes, [242] 1712

*ORDER*

*Debate*

Disorderly Interruption of Debate — Major O'Gorman, having frequently in a disorderly manner interrupted the Secretary of State for War, who was speaking in debate, was called to Order by Mr. Speaker; and having declined to submit to the authority of the Chair, Mr. Speaker called upon Major O'Gorman by his name. Who, on the morrow, expressing his regret and offering an apology to the House, Mr. Speaker said, that if it should be the wish of the House to proceed no further in the matter, it would be an agreeable duty on his part to declare the will of the House in favour of indulgence, [242] 1380, 1438

Un-Parliamentary Language—Mr. Lowe: The thing appears to have been done merely to see how many falsehoods could be put into a despatch—["Order!"]—Mr. Speaker said, that if the observation was intended to apply to any Member of this House, it was, of course, un-Parliamentary, [242] 879

Un-Parliamentary Language—Reflection on a foreign Sovereign—Lord Robert Montagu, applying the word "tyrant" to the Emperor of Russia, and using other expressions reflecting upon that Sovereign, and stating that the conduct of the Emperor was "applauded by hypocritical lovers of liberty in this House"—the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose to Order——Mr. Speaker said, the language employed by the noble Lord was not respectful to a Sovereign who is an ally and friendly to this country. It is also out of Order to attribute motives to Members of this House by calling them "hypocritical," and called upon the noble Lord to withdraw the expressions complained of, [237] 1639; see also [238] 799

Un-Parliamentary Language—Reflections on a Judge—Mr. O'Connor Power having, in the course of observations on the judicial conduct of Mr. Justice Keogh, described him as "a gentleman permitted to occupy a seat on the Judicial Bench who is nothing more than a political and religious firebrand"—Mr. Walpole rose to Order. Mr. Speaker said: I am bound to say that, in my judgment, the expression used by the hon. Member for Mayo is improper, and I consider that such an expression should be withdrawn. It appears to me that when it is proposed to call in question the conduct of a Judge, the Member desiring to do so should take that Constitutional course which is laid down, and move an Address to the Crown, [238] 1953

Un-Parliamentary Language—Dr. O'Leary—Weighing the merits of the question, and considering the effect of the public acts of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) on the negotiations of this country with other countries, he should say they had been of a most "damnable character." Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has used a most un-Parliamentary expression, and I must beg him to withdraw it, [238] 1192

Un-Parliamentary Language—Imputations on Members—The observations of the hon. Member, imputing misconduct to hon. Members of this House, and stating that personal squabbles are carried on in this House, are unbecoming; and Mr. Speaker said, he must call upon the hon. Member to be more careful in his expressions, [240] 934

Un-Parliamentary Language—Imputations on Members—Mr. Parnell said, "That was a legal quibble, worthy of the hon. and learned Member from whom it proceeded." Mr. Speaker said the expression was unwarrantable, and should be withdrawn, [239] 1405

Un-Parliamentary Language—An hon. Member in imputing disloyalty to any Member of this House would, no doubt, be out of Order, [237] 179; see also [240] 546

Un-Parliamentary Language—Mr. O'Donnell, having used certain expressions respecting the late Earl of Leitrim, and confusion arising — Mr. Speaker said, the language the hon. Member has addressed to the House is, no doubt, to be deprecated as being very strong; but, at the same time, I am not prepared to say that he is not within his right in using the expressions in question, [239] 1261

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Un-Parliamentary Language—Sir Wilfrid Lawson: Forty-eight hours afterwards they heard that all the savages and cut-throats of India had been brought to Malta—["Order!"]—Mr. Speaker: I am bound to say that the expression is not becoming; but, at the same time, I am not in a position to call upon the hon. Baronet to withdraw it as being un-Parliamentary, [242] 1092

Premature discussion of a Subject—The hon. Member has already given Notice that he will bring this matter (Accidents in Mines) under the consideration of the House; and although he has not fixed any day for that purpose, I am bound to say that, under these circumstances, his observations are now altogether irregular, [238] 1492; [239] 1249; [242] 1443

Premature discussion of a Bill, [241] 807

Premature discussion of Clauses—In moving that a Bill be now read the second time, to go through the Bill clause by clause was anticipating the work of Committee, [237] 1593

Right of Reply—A Member who has moved an Amendment has no right of reply, [240] 1527

Speaking a second time—A Member who has seconded the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, is not entitled to speak again in that debate, [237] 1532; [240] 123; [241] 1311

Nor to move an Amendment, [237] 408

When no Motion before the House—There being no Motion before the House, an hon. Member is not in Order in attempting to address the House, [240] 1611

An hon. Member proposing to offer observations when no Motion before the House, and being called to Order, said, he would put himself in Order by concluding with a Motion. Mr. Speaker said, he had on several occasions pointed out the great inconvenience resulting from the practice of hon. Members, who were not satisfied with the Answers given to their Questions, rising to move the adjournment of the House, [237] 1539; [238] 1951; [241] 130

Explanation—Limitation of Explanation, [239] 523; [240] 515; [241] 332; [242] 1709

Questions—Limitation of Answer—An hon. Member must keep within the limits of an Answer to the Question that has been put to him. He is not entitled to enter on a discussion as to the merits of the Question, [240] 1617; [241] 964

Limitation of Observations, [240] 360

Relevancy of Observations, [238] 214, 362, 1976; [239] 535, 1098, 1232, 1404, 1408, 1410, 1418; [240] 759, 760; [241] 1314, 1697; [242] 1696, 1700, 1716, 1719, 1779, 1805

Relevancy of a Question, [239] 1723

Supply—Relevancy to Vote, [240] 347

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Repetition of Argument—Mr. Speaker: I have to remind the hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) that he has repeated the same argument over and over again, and that he is thus trying very severely the forbearance of the House, [240] 1662

Reference to proceedings of a Select Committee—An hon. Member would not be in Order in referring to the proceedings of a Committee whose Report is not yet before the House, [238] 802

Reading from newspapers, &c.—An hon. Member would not be out of Order in reading from an article on which he proposed to found a Motion, [240] 1069

It is not regular to refer in debate to articles in newspapers which reflect upon the proceedings of the House, [241] 831

*BILLS*

Motion for Leave—An application for Leave to bring in a Bill is in the form of a Motion before the House, and every Motion is subject to Amendment, [237] 1538

Alterations in a Bill after Leave given—Leave having been given to Sir George Balfour to introduce a Bill on the subject of Hypothec, which was then presented and read the first time. On Motion, "That the Bill be now read the second time," it was found that the print differed from the Bill introduced. Mr. J. Lowther objected. Mr. Speaker said, he had noticed that some material alterations had been made in the Bill. Hon. Members might make clerical or verbal alterations in Bills; but it would not be in Order for an hon. Member to move the second reading of a Bill which, although bearing the same title, differed materially and substantially from the measure which he obtained leave to introduce. The course for the hon. Member to pursue was to withdraw the Order for the second reading of the Bill, and to ask leave to introduce a Bill in substitution for it, [237] 362

Printing and Distribution of Bills — It is the duty of an hon. Member who obtains leave to introduce a Bill, and who fixes the second reading for a particular day, to have the Bill printed: if that has not been done, it is a good reason for the postponement of the second reading

It is the constant practice of the House for Members in charge of Bills to be allowed to postpone the different stages of those Bills as unopposed Motions, [240] 859

Mr. Monk inquired whether it was not a matter of necessity that the Bill (Public Works Loans Bill) should be in the hands of hon. Members before the Second Reading was moved? Mr. Speaker said, no doubt it would be more convenient if hon. Members had the Bill in their hands; but he was not prepared to say that the right hon. Gentleman was out of Order in moving the second reading, [239] 609

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Discussion of Bills—The Question before the House being that the Order for the Second Reading of the Bill be read and discharged, an hon. Member has a right to discuss the subject-matter of the Bill, [239] 1590

On a Motion for the postponement of the second reading of a Bill, it is not competent for an hon. Member to discuss the merits of the Bill itself, [240] 858

Two Bills on the same subject, and identically the same, having been put down on the Order Book for the same day, Mr. Speaker declared the proceeding to be irregular—that whatever course the House might think proper to take with reference to the Bill then before the House, the other Bill should certainly be withdrawn, [240] 459

Money Bills—A clause involving a question of compensation imposing a charge upon the public cannot be put from the Chair unless it has been considered by a Committee of the Whole House upon the Bill, [241] 1301

Money Clauses—Mr. Speaker points out that certain clauses proposed to be inserted in the Highways Bill being money clauses ought to have been moved in Committee of the Whole House, [242] 196

Money Clauses—A Resolution providing compensation in respect of cattle slaughtered under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill "out of the local rates or the Consolidated Fund" required to be amended:—the words "or the Consolidated Fund" should be omitted, and the words "monies to be provided by Parliament" inserted instead, [241] 1591

Money Bills—Mr. Speaker pointed out that although with respect to Bills other than Money Bills two stages of a Bill were occasionally taken at one Sitting on grounds of urgency, there was no instance of this course being taken with regard to Money Bills, [239] 1419

*COMMITTEES*

Instructions to Committee—*Factories and Workshops Bill*—Order for Committee read: Mr. Fawcett moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert in the Bill provisions for regulating the hours of labour, and securing the attendance at school of children employed in agriculture." Mr. Goldney objected that an Instruction of that nature was not germane to a Bill "for the regulation of factories and workshops." Mr. Speaker said, that the Committee would not have power to deal with the question unless an Instruction of this kind be passed: Mr. Speaker saw no objection in point of Order to the Instruction proposed to be moved, [238] 63

According to the usual course, the Member in charge of a Bill names the time for its consideration as amended. To move that the Order be discharged in the absence of the hon. Member in charge of the Bill might cause the greatest inconvenience, and is a proceeding which should never be taken without Notice, [240] 1675

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

*SUPPLY*

Supply—The Committee of Supply can only be fixed by a Minister of the Crown, and, according to the Standing Order, the Committee of Supply must be fixed for Monday, Wednesday, or Friday. It might, however, be open to any hon. Member, when the Government has given Notice of their intention to take Supply on a particular day, to move, as an Amendment, that some other day should be substituted, [240] 1669

Supply—It is contrary to the Standing Orders of the House that Supplies should be proposed unless recommended by the Ministers of the Crown, [240] 1663

Supply—An hon. Member is not entitled to discuss a Vote already taken; nor under cover of a communication to advert to a Vote passed in this House, [240] 841

Adjournment of the House—The Question before the House being the adjournment of the House no Amendment can be moved, except one having reference to the time at which the House shall meet, [242] 2076

Amendments—An Amendment not being seconded cannot be put, [239] 431

Amendments—An Amendment being before the House, no other Amendment can be moved until that has been disposed of, [240] 1598

An Amendment had already been put to the House which appeared to deal with the question, and therefore another Amendment to the same purpose could not be put, [241] 829

On Consideration of Lords Amendments to a Bill, the whole Bill cannot be discussed, but only such Amendments as the Lords have made in it, [241] 846, 1059

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question"—resolved in the affirmative. After the vote of the House no other Amendment can be moved; the Question is, that the Bill be now read the third time, [240] 1602

Reference to past Debates—A Question referring to what occurred in a past debate of this Session is not in Order, [238] 1403

Reference to Speeches in the other House—It would not be in Order to quote speeches made during the current Session in the other House of Parliament, [237] 1262; [242] 228

Select Committees—Nomination of Members—It is necessary that Notice be given of the name of a Member proposed to be added to a Select Committee, [239] 1192

*PETITIONS*

In the ordinary course a Petition will go before the Committee on Public Petitions, and if they consider it of sufficient importance they will recommend that it be printed. If the Committee do not take that course, it is competent for an hon. Member to move that it be printed.—*Indian Taxation Petition*, [238] 1596

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

A Petition praying that the House will present articles of impeachment against Lord Beaconsfield and cause him to be arrested for high crimes and misdemeanours being offered—it was asked whether such a Petition was in Order. Mr. Speaker said, the Petition would in the ordinary course go before the Select Committee on Petitions, who, if they thought it out of Order, would, no doubt, make a Special Report to the House. Mr. Speaker saw nothing out of Order in the Petition, [242] 215

A certain document offered to the House although termed a Memorial was substantially a Petition, properly worded, and concluding with a prayer. Mr. Speaker thought that, under these circumstances, the document, although termed a Memorial, might be received if the House should think proper, [240] 1682

*PRIVILEGE*

The Report [of the Public Petitions Committee] involves a Question of Breach of Privilege on the part of persons who have forged signatures to a Petition to this House; and if this debate be adjourned it would take precedence of all other public proceedings of the House on the day to which it might be adjourned, [238] 1741

When an hon. Member complains of a breach of Privilege having been committed by the publication of what he regards as a libel on a Member of this House, he is bound to bring up the newspaper itself in which the article complained of appears, [239] 536

*QUESTIONS*

The House being engaged in the consideration of "Questions," the observations of the hon. Member, not being in the form of a Question, are out of Order, [239] 207

I have to point out to the hon. Member (Dr Kenealy) and this House that the hon. Member brought to the Table of the House yesterday a Question which was, in fact, substantially the same Question as that which he now proposes to put to the Secretary of State, with a view to its being put on the Notice Paper. The hon. Member was informed, by my direction, that such a Question could not be properly put according to the Rules and Practice of the House; and it was pointed out to him that if he desired to raise a question of that character it must be done by specific Motion, [239] 669

Argumentative Questions—Privilege of Members—Among the Rules and Orders of the House is one which declares that no Question is to be offered containing matter of argument or opinion. And Mr. Speaker declares at length his duties as the Guardian of the Rules and Orders of the House; and explains the course he had thought it his duty to pursue in regard to a Question proposed to be offered by the hon. Member for Stoke, [240] 35, 651; [242] 390

SPENCER, Earl
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [238] 738; Re-comm. *cl.* 78, [240] 738; Commons Amendts. Consid. [242] 1624
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 439; Comm. *cl.* 5, 584

SPINKS, Mr. Serjeant F. L., *Oldham*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 12, [239] 1312
Duke of Connaught and of Strathearne (Establishment), 3R. [242] 794
Manchester Corporation Water, Instruction, [237] 1726; Amendt. 1727, 1729
Poor Law—Basingstoke Union Casuals, [241] 759
Roumania Customs Tariff, [239] 1717
Turkey — Roumania — Commercial Treaty, [241] 2053
Vaccination Law (Penalties), 2R. [239] 499
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 577

STACPOOLE, Mr. W., *Ennis*
Army—Quartermasters, [239] 854, 1286
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 20, [239] 1346, 1347
Ireland—Appointment of a Coroner for Westmeath, [239] 1287
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1960
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 97, [239] 151
Mutiny and Marine Mutiny Acts, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1191, 1192
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, Motion for Adjournment, [242] 1386, 1387, 1391
Racecourses (Licensing), Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [240] 1239
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 686
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1693, 1701, 1712; *cl.* 1, [239] 1822; [240] 114; *add. cl.* 871, 902; Motion for reporting Progress, 922, 924; Consid. [241] 1276; *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, 1308, 1309, 1313; 3R. [242] 1717, 1720
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1700
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 153
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1161, 1163

STAFFORD, Marquess of, *Sutherland*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. [238] 1825

STAIR, Earl of
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Res. [242] 342

STANHOPE, Earl
Army—Mutiny Act, [238] 1833
Eastern Question—British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 690
Conference—The Presidency, [238] 1036
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [237] 1722
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal (Scotland), 2R. [238] 445

[*cont.*

**Stanhope**, Earl—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [238] 631
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration (Consolidated), 2R. [241] 484
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 3R. [241] 304

***Stanhope**, Hon. E. (†Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade) *afterwards* (‡Under Secretary of State for India), *Lincolnshire, Mid*
*Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1919
‡Army—Indo-European Troops in Malta, [240] 746
‡Officers of Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Pay, [241] 760, 1239
†Blake *v.* The Albion Life Assurance Society, [238] 1590
‡China—Chefoo Convention—Import of Opium, [241] 127
*County Government, 2R. [237] 1663
‡Eastern Question—Policy of the Government—Indian Contingent, [240] 775
‡Elders Widows' Fund, 2R. [241] 413
India—Miscellaneous Questions
‡Civil and Military Employment—General Richard Strachey, [241] 1463, 1464
‡Criminal Law — High Court of Madras, [241] 756
‡Deccan Riots Commission, [242] 1868
‡Ecclesiastical Salaries, [240] 27
‡Famine in Cashmere, [242] 865
‡Famine, The, [240] 744 ;—Mortality, [241] 321 ; [242] 642
‡Finance—Indian Debt, [242] 1525
‡Financial Statement, [240] 1037
‡Indian Army, [240] 1166 ;—‡31st Native Infantry, [240] 745
‡Jowaki Afreedis Expedition, [240] 1605
‡Madras Civil Service—Case of Mr. F. Lascelles, [242] 1528
‡Madras Harbour, [240] 24
‡Madras Wills for 1788 and 1789, [242] 1176
‡Maharajah Holkar, [242] 1636
‡Maharajah of Kuch Bahar, [240] 1073
‡Mysore, [242] 1763
‡Native Indian Forces—Terms of Service, [240] 498
‡Salt Tax, [241] 447; [242] 1762
†Trade between India and China, [239] 1287
‡Troops of Native States, [240] 1073
‡Vernacular Press Act, [241] 321, 494 ;—‡The Press Commisssioner, [240] 1071
‡India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [242] 1871, 1923
‡India Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, [242] 102, 113
†Mercantile Marine—Cefn-y-wrach Shoal, Cardiff, [239] 204
*Merchant Seamen, Leave, [237] 314 ;—‡Report of Committee, [240] 1171
†Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1691 ; [240] ‡24, 623
‡Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 339
‡Straits Settlements—Perak Expedition—Expenses, [240] 1254, 1390

**Stanhope**, Hon. E.—*cont.*
†Weights and Measures, 2R. [238] 719 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] ‡409 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 410 ; *cl.* 20, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 411 ; *cl.* 43, *ib.* ; *cl.* 79, Amendt. 412 ; *cl.* 80, Amendt. *ib.* ; *add. cl. ib.* ; Amendt. 413

**Stanhope**, Mr. W. T. W. S., *Yorkshire, W.R.*
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 20, [241] 1083; *cl.* 21, 1090 ; *add. cl.* 1344, 1360, 1362

**Stanley of Alderley**, Lord
Crime in Ireland, Res. [239] 1217
Cyprus, Island of—Slavery, [241] 1224
Eastern Question—British Fleet, Movements of the, [237] 708
Treaties of 1856—Greece, [238] 847, 850
India—Jaghire of Bungana Pally, Motion for an Address, [241] 1206, 1223
Monuments (Metropolis), Comm. [241] 6

**Stanley**, Hon. Colonel F. A. († Secretary to the Treasury) *afterwards* (Secretary of State for War), *Lancashire, N.*
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [240] 1315 ; Comm. [241] 1369 ; *cl.* 2, 1425, 1680, 1682
†Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1988
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Adjutants, Nationality of, [241] 758
Army Medical Officers, [240] 23
Artificers of the Royal Artillery, [239] 1595
Cavalry Colonels—Royal Warrant, 1878, [239] 1093
Colonel Wellesley, [240] 1072
Compulsory Retirement of Officers, [239] 1881
Enlistment—The Police, [242] 995
First Class Army Reserve, [239] 1692
Good Conduct Medals, [242] 1949
Half Pay—Royal Warrant, [241] 2061
India—Retiring Captains, [240] 742
Indian Service, [240] 1391
Married Soldiers, [239] 1717, 1883
Medical Officers, Roster for, [242] 2086
Medical Officers, Supply of—Report of Committee, [239] 1228
Medical Service, [240] 1881 ;—Examinations, [242] 992
New Line Ex-Indian Regiments—Report of Committee, [239] 1594
Paymasters, [239] 1093
Physical Competition for the Army, [240] 1606
Physical Examination of Officers—Report of Joint Committee, [242] 1400
Poisoning of Soldiers at Malta, [241] 2059
Promotion of General Officers, [242] 865
Purchase, Abolition of, [241] 1235
Recruiting Sergeants, [241] 1470
Regimental Debts Act, [241] 132
Regimental Lieutenant Colonels, [240] 26
Reserve Forces, [240] 30 ;—Pensions and Good Conduct Pay, [240] 1389
Reserve Soldiers, Pay of, [239] 1693 ;—Families of, 1721 ; [242] 1394
Reserves, Dismissal of the, [242] 524
Retired Volunteer Officers, [239] 1372

**Stanley**, Hon. Colonel F. A.—*cont.*
Retirement, [240] 258
Royal Engineer Department, [239] 1092
Royal Warrant, 1870—Time for Pension, [239] 1095
Straits Settlements—Perak Expedition—Allowances to Troops, [238] †541; [240] 359
Surgeon-Major Clarke, Case of, [242] 1405
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Miscellaneous Questions
Adjutants of, [241] 324
Army and Militia Reserves, [241] 759, 2052;—Families of Reserve Men, [239] 1519
Artillery Sergeants, [242] 1175
Fines for Drunkenness, [240] 1605
Militia, [240] 1426
Militia—Commissions in the Line, [239] 1719
Militia Colonels, [242] 525
Northampton Militia, [240] 1344
Retirement of Officers, [242] 225
Royal Cumberland Militia, [241] 2054
Tyrone Fusiliers, [240] 1342, 1610
Volunteer Artillery Adjutants, [240] 359
Volunteers and Yeomanry, Adjutants of, [241] 326
Yeomanry Adjutants, [242] 522
Yeomanry Sergeant Majors, [240] 1607
Army Estimates — Administration of Army, [242] 1420
Army Reserve, [240] 1479, 1482
Clothing Establishments, &c. [242] 1409
Commissariat, Transport, &c. [242] 1406
Medical Establishments and Services, [240] 1433, 1434, 1435, 1437, 1442, 1444
Militia, &c. Pay and Allowances, [240] 1445, 1446, 1447
Miscellaneous Effective Services, [242] 1419
Regular Forces in India—Home Charges, [242] 1421, 1422
Volunteer Corps, [240] 1467, 1469
Works, Buildings, &c. [242] 1413, 1418
Yeomanry Cavalry, Pay and Allowances, [240] 1447
Army Supplementary Estimate for Native Indian Troops, [240] 802, 805
†Civil Service Estimates, [238] 1508
†Customs Department—Playfair Commission, [238] 155
Cyprus, Island of—Health of the Troops, [242] 1946, 2023, 2089;—Occupation of, [241] 1242
†Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1994
Diplomatic Appointments—Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, Res. [240] 174, 177
†District Probate Registry, Lichfield, [238] 538
Eastern Question—Anglo-Turkish Convention—Indian Troops in Cyprus, [241] 2055
†Reserve Forces, [239] 172
†Exchequer Bonds (£1,000,000), Comm. [238] 723
Indian Troops Contingent—Payment—Rates of Exchange, [242] 995
Indian Troops, Cost of, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 752; [241] 1244
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Belfast, Disturbances at—The Military, [241] 1241
†Board of Works (Ireland) — Report of Comimssion, [238] 155

**Stanley**, Hon. Colonel F. A.—*cont.*
Royal College of Science, Dublin, [238] 378
†Suck Drainage District, [237] 1849
†Loans for Roads and Bridges, [238] 637
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent—Pay of Officers, [239] 1719;—Estimate, 1723
Militia Reserve Act — Non-commissioned Officers, [241] 496
Mutiny and Marine Mutiny Acts, Motion for a Select Committee, [239] 1192
†National Gallery—Purchase of Pictures (Civil Service Estimates), [239] 120
†National Portrait Gallery, Res. [238] 773
†Parliament—Business of the House, [239] 121
Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1380, 1386
†Parliament—Private Bills—Bradford Tramway Company, [238] 1956
†Parliament—Cost of Returns, Res. [238] 1054
†Public Offices—Purchase of Land, [238] 1044
South Africa—Miscellaneous Questions
Officers on Special Service, [240] 1390
Outbreak of Native Tribes—Military Operations, [239] 1229
War Expenditure, [239] 1286, 1595
†Supplementary Estimate, Motion for Adjournment, [237] 1024, 1069, 1071, 1072
†Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1618, 1619, 1620, 1621, 1622
†Civil Service Commission, [238] 1546
†Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 181
†Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1533
†Commutation of Annuities, [238] 1612
†Epping Forest Commission, [238] 1617
†Harbours, &c. [238] 1537
†Law Charges, [238] 1558
†Marlborough House, [238] 1522
†Provisions, Forage, &c. [238] 1624
†Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [238] 1553, 1555
†Queen's University (Ireland), [238] 1570
†Report, [238] 1632
†Royal Palaces, [238] 1520
†Science and Art Museum, Dublin, [238] 1541
Supplementary Army Estimate, [242] 1177, 1462, 1463, 1465, 1471, 1484, 1493
†Temporary Commissions, [238] 1615
†Treasury, [238] 1545

**Stansfeld**, Right Hon. J., *Halifax*
Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. Amendt. [239] 1509
County Government, Leave, [237] 598; 2R. Amendt. 1654, 1683, 1684; Comm. [238] 921
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 739
Endowed Schools (Leeds Poors Estate), Motion for an Address, [238] 1660
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 4, [241] 466; *cl.* 7, 470; *cl.* 11, 474, 476, 477, 478, 864; *cl.* 18, 883, 885, 887, 893; *cl.* 21, 1086; *add. cl.* 1361
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1515; Comm. *cl.* 6, [242] 306
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 712
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 25, 33; *cl.* 8, 54; *cl.* 16, 64

[*cont.*

STANTON, Mr. A. J., *Stroud*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 365
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 501 ; Schedule 3, Amendt. 888
Mercantile Amendment Act, 1856—Bills of Exchange, [238] 1592
Weights and Measures, Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. [241] 410

STARKEY, Mr. L. R., *Yorkshire, W. R., S. Div.*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [238] 92 ; *cl.* 10, 96 ; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 309, 312 ; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 314 ; *cl.* 30, 328 ; *cl.* 67, 458 ; *cl.* 68, 464

STARKIE, Mr. J. P. C., *Lancashire, N.E.*
Army — Auxiliary Forces — Yeomanry Adjutants, [242] 522
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 21, [241] 1911
Highways, Comm. [241] 458

**Statute Law Revision Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
*l.* Presented ; read 1ª* *June* 17 (No. 114)
Read 2ª* *July* 8
Committee* ; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª* *July* 11
*c.* Read 1º* (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *July* 12 [Bill 263]
Read 2º* *July* 15
Committee* ; Report *August* 7
Considered* *August* 8
Read 3º* *August* 9
*l.* Royal Assent *Aug* 13 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 79]

**Statute Law Revision (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. James Lowther*)
*c.* Ordered ; read 1º* *Mar* 1 [Bill 122]
2R. *April* 12, [239] 1258 ; Debate adjourned
Read 2º* *June* 6
Committee* ; Report *July* 31
Read 3º* *August* 1
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Chancellor*) *Aug* 2 (No. 185)
Read 2ª *August* 6, [242] 1285
Committee* ; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª* *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 13 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 57]

STEVENSON, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
Burials, Res. [237] 1808
Municipal Corporations Acts, [242] 520
Supply, Report, [240] 1152

STEWART, Mr. J., *Greenock*
Army—Defences of the Clyde, [238] 1752
Education (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 1130
Merchant Seamen — Report of Committee, [240] 1171
Navy—Torpedo Boats, [238] 977

[*cont.*

STEWART, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Police Superannuation Fund (Scotland), [240] 497
Religious Denominations (Scotland), Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1752
Sugar Convention—Refining Sugar in Bond, [242] 226

STEWART, Mr. M. J., *Wigton Bo.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Artillery Sergeants, [242] 1175
China—Chefoo Convention, [237] 248, 1423 ; —Import of Opium, [241] 127
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 232 ; Comm. Postponed *cl.* 5, [242] 189, 191
Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1993
Education (Scotland), [240] 745 ; Comm. *cl.* A, [242] 1129 ; *add. cl.* 1132
Education Grants in Scotland, [241] 797
Factories and Workshops, Comm. [238] 74
Japan—Treaty of 1858—Admission of Opium, [241] 127
Parliament—Business of the House, [238] 1402
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1097
Removal of Paupers, Res. [241] 668, 670
238] Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, 1803 ; *cl.* 6, 1815, 1817 ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1820
240] *cl.* 12, 1183, 1186 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1196 ; *cl.* 17, 1210, 1211 ; Amendt. 1213 ; *cl.* 24, 1687 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1690, 1693 ; *cl.* 33, 1696 ; *cl.* 36, 1704 ; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 1721 ; *cl.* 45, 1731 ; *cl.* 49, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 97, 1901 ; *cl.* 98, 1902, 1903 ; *cl.* 102, Amendt. 1904 ; *cl.* 105, 1910 ; Postponed *cl.* 54, 1921, 1925 ; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1972, 1974
241] Consid. *cl.* 56, Amendt. 829, 830
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [240] 719
Supplementary Estimate, Personal Explanation, [237] 1060
Supply—Local Taxation in Scotland, &c. [240] 818
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 680

STORER, Mr. G., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 16, [241] 1905, 1935
County Government, Comm. [238] 918
Factories and Workshops, Comm. [238] 80
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 524
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 185
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [239] 339 ; *cl.* 1, [240] 119
Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1449
Supply—Stationery Office, [240] 81
Valuation, 2R. [237] 1596
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1646
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1147

*Straits Settlements—The Perak Expedition*
Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. W. E. Forster ; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 5, [242] 1217
*Allowances,* Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon ; Answer, Colonel Stanley *May* 21, [240] 359

[*cont.*

*Straits Settlements—The Perak Expedition*—cont.
*Pay of the Indian Troops*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 13, [240] 1390
*The British Residents*, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 7, [240] 1354
*The Expenses*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 6, [240] 1254

STRATHNAIRN, Lord
Army—Mutiny Act, [238] 1835
Records of Military Services, [242] 2010, 2013, 2015
Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, Motion for an Address, [239] *840

SUDELEY, Lord
Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, 2R. [238] 1136; Comm. *cl.* 3, [239] 187; *add. cl.* 191
Navy—H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [238] 1925

*Sugar Convention*
Questions, Mr. Wait; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, [238] 154; *April* 4, [239] 528
*Refining Sugar in Bond*, Question, Mr. J. Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 25, [242] 226

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M., *Louth Co.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Royal Cumberland Militia, [241] 2054
Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 844
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 22, [241] 1986; Postponed *cl.* 5, [242] 192
County Government, 2R. [237] 1913; Comm. [238] 939
Dublin Southern District Tramways, 2R. [237] 1045
Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 26
Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, 2R. [240] 17
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 1114
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 489, 492, 496, 497
India—Madras Wills for 1788 and 1789, [242] 1176
Press Law, [238] 1592
Indian Vernacular Press Act, Motion for an Address, Motion for Adjournment, [242] 130
Intermediate Education (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [242] 295; Schedule, 328, 333; Consid. 1781; *cl.* 5, 1814; *cl.* 6, 1823
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Crime—Murder of the Earl of Leitrim and Others, [239] 1365
Law and Justice—Sir John Ennis, [238] 1396;—Mr. Justice Keogh, Charge of, [238] 1948; Motion for Adjournment, 1950, 1954; [239] 37
Ireland—Galtee Estate, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1551

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M.—*cont.*
Irish Church Act (1869) Amendment (No. 2), 2R. [241] 1568
Irish Land Act (1870), Res. [241] 1136, 1139
Merchant Seamen, Nomination of Committee, [238] 259
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1187
Municipal Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [238] 818, 819, 820
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 16, [238] 2010, 2011, 2014, 2017, 2021; *cl.* 48, [239] 141; *add. cl.* 154, 162
Navy—Roman Catholic Chaplains, [238] 376
Roman Catholics, [237] 1732
Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, [238] 1419
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House, [237] 257
Derby Day—Adjournment of the House, [240] 1180, 1181
Public Business—Sunday Closing in Ireland, [237] 156
Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1968; [239] 1224
Representation of Clare, [241] 1462, 1463, 2060, 2061;—Legislature of Victoria—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, [242] 42
Parliament—New Writ for Clare County—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Res. [242] 44, 47
Parliament — Privilege — Mr. O'Donnell and "The Globe," Res. [239] 1406, 1410
Parliament—Public Business—Easter Recess, Res. [239] 1102
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 144, 171
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ire-
237] land), 2R. 301
238] 756
239] Comm. 331, 335, 363, 367, 378, 381, 387, 390; Motion for reporting Progress, 394; *cl.* 1, 640, 643, 644, 1815, 1818, 1826, 1835
240] *cl.* 3, 441, 443; *cl.* 4, 444; *cl.* 6, 447, 714; *cl.* 8, 716, 717, 718, 719; *add. cl.* 882, 909; Amendt. 916, 918, 920, 921, 1030
241] Consid. 1267; *cl.* 2, 1318
242] 3R. 1716
Supplementary Estimate, Comm. [237] 1409, 1410
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 181, 182, 183, 244
Convict Establishments, [240] 1007
Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 701
House of Commons, Offices of the, [239] 1481
House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1473, 1474
Irish Academy, [241] 1542, 1543
Local Government Board in Ireland, [241] 1557
Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 993, 995
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, [241] 1538
Queen's University in Ireland, [238] 1571, 1576, 1578
Reformatory, Industrial, &c. Schools, [240] 1014
Report, [238] 1633
Stationery Office, [239] 1784, 1789, 1800, 1802, 1810; [240] 60, 77, 80

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

SULLIVAN, Mr. M. A.—*cont.*

Telegraphs, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [242] 1696, 1699

Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 269, 276

University Education (Ireland), Res. [240] 1147

Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 3, [241] 28

**Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill**

(*Mr. Parnell, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)

*c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 114]
Bill withdrawn* *May* 8

*Superannuation Act,* 1859—*The Customs Department*

Question, Mr. Ritchie ; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 29, [242] 524

*SUPPLY*

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

*Civil Service Estimates,* Observations, Mr. Dillwyn, General Sir George Balfour ; Reply, Colonel Stanley ; Observations, Mr. Rylands *Mar* 18, [238] 1505

*Civil Service Estimates* (*Supplementary*)—*Class I., Vote* 4—*The Clockmill Estate,* Question, Sir Windham Anstruther ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 25, [238] 1958

*Discussions on the Estimates,* Observations, Mr. Dillwyn ; short debate thereon *May* 30, [240] 933

*Supplementary Army Estimates,* Question, Mr. Hayter ; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 5, [242] 1177

*Supplementary Estimate* (*Naval and Military Services*), Notice of Motion, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 24, [237] 368 ; Question, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington ; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 28, 534 ; Question, Mr. Rylands ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 10, [239] 1692 ; Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. J. Cowen, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. M'Laren ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Assheton Cross ; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Hayter ; Question, Mr. Mundella ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 5, [242] 1179

*The Estimates—Revenue and Expenditure,* Question, Mr. Mundella ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 6, [242] 1301

*The National Gallery—Purchase of Pictures* (*Civil Service Estimates*), Question, Mr. O'Reilly ; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 28, [239] 119

*The Irish Estimates,* Observations, Mr. Parnell *June* 17, [240] 1659

*The Supplementary Estimates,* Question, Mr. Childers ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, [241] 2060

[*cont.*

SUPPLY—*cont.*

Order for Committee read ; Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair " *June* 28

[House counted out]

Order for Committee read ; Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair " *July* 19

[House counted out]

*The Vote of Credit and the Navy Estimates,* Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 7, [238] 877

*Supply—Civil Service Estimates*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 7, To leave out from " That," and add " in order to facilitate the consideration of the Civil Service Estimates, it is desirable that a Select Committee should be appointed at the commencement of each Session of Parliament, to go through the details of such Estimates, and report generally upon those particulars which may appear most to demand the attention of the House " (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *v.*, [242] 1442 ; Question proposed, " That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Question put ; A. 64, N. 46 ; M. 18 (D.L. 251)

*SUPPLY*

237] Resolved, That this House will, upon Wednesday, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Jan* 21

*Supplementary Estimate* (*Naval and Military Services*), Notice of Motion, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 24, 368 ; Question, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington ; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 24, 375 ; Question, The Marquess of Hartington ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 28, 534

Considered in Committee *Jan* 28, 535—ARMY AND NAVY SERVICES—

Moved, " That a sum, not exceeding £6,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty, beyond the Ordinary Grants of Parliament, towards defraying the Expenses which may be incurred, during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in increasing the efficiency of the Naval and Military Services at the present crisis of the War between Russia and Turkey " (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); after long debate, Committee—R.P.

Notice of Amendment, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 29, 624

Notice of Amendment, Captain Pim *Jan* 30, 657

Order for Committee read; Moved, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair "

Amendt. to leave out from " That," and add " this House, having been informed in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech that the conditions on which Her Majesty's neutrality is founded had not been infringed by either belligerent engaged in the war in the East of Europe, and having since received no infor-

[*cont.*

Supply—*cont.*

mation sufficient to justify a departure from the policy of neutrality and peace, sees no reason for adding to the burthens of the people by voting unnecessary Supplies" (*Mr.*
237] *W. E. Forster*) *v. Jan* 31, 729; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Feb* 1, 823; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *Feb* 4, 928; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Personal Explanation, Mr. Trevelyan *Feb* 5, 1057

Debate resumed *Feb* 5, 1069; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *Feb* 7, 1215; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*The Marquess of Hartington*); after further debate, Motion withdrawn; Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Richard*); after further debate, Motion withdrawn

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put; A. 295, N. 96; M. 199

Div. List, A. and N., 1311

Supply considered in Committee *Feb* 7

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty, beyond the ordinary Grants of Parliament, towards defraying the Expenses which may be incurred, during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in increasing the Efficiency of the Naval and Military Services at the present crisis of the War between Russia and Turkey"—Committee—R.P.

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Feb* 8, 1332; Motion agreed to

Supply considered in Committee, 1335

Question [Feb. 7] again proposed; after long debate, Question put; A. 328, N. 124; M. 204

Div. List, A. and N., 1417

Resolution reported, and, after debate, agreed to *Feb* 11, 1424

Considered in Committee *Feb* 18 (£1,000,000) Exchequer Bonds; Resolution reported *Feb* 19

238] Considered in Committee *Mar* 4, 665—Army Estimates—Departmental Statement of the Secretary of State for War

Resolutions reported *Mar* 6, 825

Moved, "That the said Resolutions be now read a second time;" Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 7, 943

First Resolution read a first time; on Question, "That the Resolution be read a second time;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

238] Second Resolution read a first time, 945; on Question, "That the Resolution be read a second time"

Amendt. to leave out "£4,572,000," and insert "£4,565,090" (*Mr. Parnell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That '£4,572,000' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Resolution agreed to

Subsequent Resolutions agreed to

Moved, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Mar* 11, 1048; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Considered in Committee *Mar* 15, 1404—Navy Estimates—Departmental Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty—Resolutions reported *Mar* 18

Considered in Committee *Mar* 18, 1516—Civil Service and Revenue Departments Supplementary Estimates, 1877-8—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Class III.—Law and Justice—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art

Resolutions reported *Mar* 19, 1632

First Twenty-nine Resolutions agreed to

The last Resolution read a second time

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution;" after short debate, Question put; A. 237, N. 16, M. 221 (D. L. 58)

Considered in Committee *Mar* 19, 1606—Civil Services, Supplementary Estimates, 1877-8—Class V.—Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services—Class VI.—Superannuation and Retired Allowances, and Gratuities for Charitable and other Purposes—Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Special, and Temporary Objects—Revenue Departments—Army Supplementary Estimate, 1877-8—Navy Supplementary Estimate, 1877-8—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, Excesses 1876-7.

239] Considered in Committee *Mar* 28, 174—Civil Services and Revenue Departments (£3,777,540 on Account)

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Biggar*); after debate, agreed to 178

Question [March 28] again proposed *Mar* 29, 228

Moved, "That the Item of £2,100, for Queen's Colleges, Ireland, be omitted" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after short debate, Question put; A. 42, N. 237; M. 195 (D. L. 82)

Resolution reported *April* 1, 394

Resolution read a second time

Amendt. to leave out "£3,777,540," and insert "£3,775,440" (*Mr. Parnell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That '£3,777,540,' &c.;" Question put; A. 41, N. 10; M. 31 (D. L. 92)

Considered in Committee *May* 6, 1452—Civil Service Estimates—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments

[*cont.*

Supply—*cont.*

239 Resolutions reported *May* 9, 1686
First Two Resolutions agreed to
Res. 3; Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution"
Resolution agreed to
Subsequent Resolutions agreed to

. Considered in Committee *May* 9, 1607—Civil Service Estimates — Class II.— Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Resolutions reported *May* 13

. Considered in Committee *May* 13, 1761—Civil Service Estimates—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments — Resolutions reported *May* 14

240] Considered in Committee *May* 16, 41—Civil Service Estimates — Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments

. Resolutions reported *May* 20, 348
First Resolution read a second time
Amendt. to leave out "376,545," and insert "£105,545" (*Mr. Parnell*) *v.*; Question put, "That '£376,545' stand part of the said Resolution;" A. 115, N. 13; M. 102 (D. L. 142); Resolution agreed to
Subsequent Resolutions agreed to

Considered in Committee *May* 23 (£1,500,000) Exchequer Bonds — Resolution reported *May* 24

. Considered in Committee *May* 24, 657—Civil Service Estimates — Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—
Resolutions reported *May* 27

. Considered in Committee *May* 27, 802—Army Supplementary Estimate for Native Indian Troops—Navy Supplementary Estimate—Civil Service Estimates—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Resolutions reported *May* 28

*Discussions on the Estimates*, Observations, Mr. . Dillwyn; short debate thereon *May* 30, 933

. Considered in Committee *May* 30, 938—Civil Services and Revenue Departments—Further Vote on Account (£2,040,710) — Class III.—Law and Justice—Resolutions . reported *June* 3, 1152

*The Irish Estimates*, Observations, Mr. Par- . nell *June* 17, 1659

. Considered in Committee *June* 6, 1258—Civil Service Estimates — Class V.— Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services—Class VI.—Superannuation and Retired Allowances, and Gratuities for Charitable and other Purposes—Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Special, and Temporary Objects —Revenue Departments

. Resolutions reported *June* 7, 1387
First Twenty-two Resolutions agreed to
After short debate, further Proceeding adjourned

. Further Proceeding resumed *June* 17, 1669
Twenty-third Resolution read a second time
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £580,045, be granted for the Post Office Packet Service"

[*cont.*

Supply—*cont.*

Amendt. to leave out "£580,045," and insert "£579,785" (*Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh*); Question proposed, "That £580,045 stand part of the Resolution;" Amendt. withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to
Subsequent Resolution agreed to

240] Considered in Committee *June* 7, 1359—Civil Service Estimates — Class I. — Public Works and Buildings—Resolutions reported *June* 13

. Considered in Committee *June* 13, 1433—Army Estimates—Resolutions reported *June* 14

241] Considered in Committee *July* 15, 1537—Civil Service Estimates—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art

. Resolutions reported *July* 16, 1685
First Resolution postponed
Second to Ninth Resolutions, inclusive, agreed to
Tenth Resolution; after short debate, Resolution agreed to
Remaining Resolutions agreed to
Postponed Resolution to be considered upon Monday next

242] Considered in Committee *Aug* 5, 1219—Civil Service Estimates — Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art—Class III. —Law and Justice—Resolutions reported *Aug* 7

. Considered in Committee *Aug* 6, 1406—Army Estimates — Civil Services — Class I.—Public Works and Buildings—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Class III. — Law and Justice
Resolutions reported *Aug* 7
First eighteen Resolutions agreed to
Nineteenth Resolution postponed
Subsequent Resolutions agreed to
*Aug.* 8—Postponed Resolution considered; £88,245, Royal Parks and Gardens
Amendt. to leave out "£88,245," and insert "£87,745" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); on Question, "That '£88,245,' &c.;" A. 82, N. 29; M. 53 (D. L. 262)

. Considered in Committee *Aug* 7, 1456—Army Supplementary Estimate — Civil Service Estimates—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Class III. —Law and Justice—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art—Class V.—Consular, Colonial, and other Foreign Services—Post Office Packet Service (Supplementary

. Resolutions reported *Aug* 8, 1610
Second Resolution postponed
Other Resolutions, after debate, agreed to

. Considered in Committee *Aug* 8, 1567—Navy Estimates—Civil Services—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Class III.—Law and Justice

. Resolutions reported *Aug* 9, 1690
Fifth Resolution, £678,000, Naval and Transport Services
Amendt. to leave out "£678,000," and insert "£658,000" (*Mr. D. Jenkins*); Question proposed, "That '£678,000,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Resolution agreed to

[*cont.*

## SUMMARY.

### Appropriation of Grants.

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Deficiencies, 1876-7 ... ... ... | | 13,248 | 13 | 10 |
| Supplementary, 1877-8 ... ... | | 524,233 | 0 | 0 |
| Exchequer Bonds, 1877-8 ... | | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Vote of Credit, 1877-8, War between Russia and Turkey ... | | 6,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| | | £7,537,481 | 13 | 10 |
| **1878-9.** | | | | |
| Navy Services ... ... ... | | 12,129,901 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Services ... ... ... | | 17,791,300 | 0 | 0 |
| Army (Indian Home Charges) | | 1,080,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Civil Services—viz. : | £ | | | |
| I. Public Works and Buildings ... ... | 1,430,245 | | | |
| II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments... | 2,157,103 | | | |
| III. Law and Justice | 5,687,735 | | | |
| IV. Education, Science, and Art ... | 3,852,390 | | | |
| V. Colonial and Consular Services ... | 537,135 | | | |
| VI. Superannuation, &c. ... ... ... | 1,190,016 | | | |
| VII. Miscellaneous | 31,381 | | | |
| | | 14,886,005 | 0 | 0 |
| Revenue Departments, &c. ... | | 8,000,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School... ... ... | | 148,802 | 0 | 0 |
| Exchequer Bonds ... ... ... | | 1,500,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Abyssinian Expedition ... ... | | 19,865 | 0 | 0 |
| Total ... | | £63,093,854 | 13 | 10 |

## SUMMARY.

### Ways and Means.

### Grants out of the Consolidated Fund.

| | £ | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| For the service of the years ending 31st March 1877 and 1878; | | | | | | |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 1 ... ... ... ... ... | | | | 6,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 9 ... ... ... ... ... | | | | 1,537,047 | 6 | 5 |
| For the service of the year ending 31st March 1879; viz. | | | | | | |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 9 ... ... | 12,000,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 21 .. ... | 7,500,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Under Act 41 & 42 Vict. c. 45 | 14,500,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Under this Act ... | 21,556,807 | 7 | 5 | | | |
| | | | | 55,556,807 | 7 | 5 |
| Total ... | | | | £63,093,854 | 13 | 10 |

---

## DEFICIENCIES 1876-7.

| | Total of Vote. £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Committee *Aug* 8—Report *Aug* 9 | | | |
| Greenwich Hospital and School | 434 | 7 | 5 |
| Committee *Mar* 19—Report *Mar* 20 | | | |
| Civil Services, viz., | | | |
| Class I.—Public Works and Buildings. | | | |
| Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens | 395 | 8 | 5 |
| Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade ... ... ... | 675 | 1 | 6 |
| Lighthouses Abroad ... ... | 3,299 | 19 | 7 |
| Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments. | | | |
| Colonial Office ... ... | 36 | 12 | 6 |
| Lord Lieutenant's Household ... | 1 | 6 | 4 |
| Office of Public Works, Ireland, ... | 400 | 16 | 5 |

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont.

| | Total of Vote. £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Class III.—Law and Justice. | | | |
| Criminal Prosecutions, Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. ... ... ... | 419 | 11 | 10 |
| Land Registry Office ... ... | 23 | 4 | 10 |
| Register House Departments, Edinburgh ... ... ... | 671 | 13 | 5 |
| Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland ... ... | 3,190 | 7 | 9 |
| County Prisons and Reformatories, Ireland ... ... ... | 869 | 1 | 11 |
| Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland ... ... ... | 1,469 | 6 | 4 |
| Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art. | | | |
| National Gallery ... ... | 97 | 10 | 6 |
| National Gallery of Ireland ... | 20 | 17 | 8 |
| Queen's Colleges, Ireland ... | 780 | 1 | 11 |
| Class V.—Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services. | | | |
| Commissions for Suppression of the Slave Trade ... ... | 42 | 1 | 3 |

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont.

| | Total of Vote. | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS. | £ | s. | d. |
| Miscellaneous Expenses ... | 421 | 4 | 3 |
| Total Civil Services Deficiencies | 12,814 | 6 | 5 |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £12,814, be granted, &c." | | | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £12,034, &c." (*Major Nolan*); after debate, A. 11, N. 294; M. 283 | | | |
| Vote agreed to [238] 1625 | | | |
| Total of Vote ... | £13,248 | 13 | 10 |

## SUPPLEMENTARY 1877-8.

| COMMITTEE *Mar* 19—REPORT *Mar* 20 | £ |
|---|---|
| ARMY (Provisions, Forage, Fuel and Light, Transport, &c.) [238] 1629 | 150,000 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to | |
| NAVY (Army Department (Conveyance of Troops) ... ... ... | 35,800 |

COMMITTEE *Mar* 18—REPORT *Mar* 19

CIVIL SERVICES, viz. :

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

| | |
|---|---|
| Royal Palaces ... [238] 1516 | 4,400 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Marlborough House [238] 1520 | 4,100 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens ... | 6,452 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1522 | |
| Clockmill Estate | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,569, be granted, &c.;" Question put; A. 109, N. 13; M. 96; Vote agreed to [238] 1523 | 3,569 |
| Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade | 150 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1534 | |
| Wellington Monument [238] 1537 | 651 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Natural History Museum [238] 1538 | 9,000 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Public Offices Site [238] 1539 | 9,545 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Dublin Museum of Science and Art, Land and Buildings [238] 1541 | 10,200 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Lighthouses Abroad [238] 1543 | 2,630 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

| | |
|---|---|
| Treasury, including Parliamentary Counsel ... [238] 1544 | 1,200 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont.

| | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| | £ |
| Colonial Office ... ... ... | 350 |
| Civil Service Commission | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,750, be granted, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 191, N. 8; M. 183 [238] 1546 | 1,750 |
| Local Government Board (including Pauper Lunatics) [238] 1548 | 50,412 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Mint ... ... ... ... | 4,000 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1552 | |
| Patent Office ... ... ... | 1,229 |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £100 grant in aid of preparation and publication of Hansard's Parliamentary Debates;" after short debate, Vote withdrawn [238] 1555 | |
| Public Works Loan Commission, &c. | 1,350 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1553 | |
| Chief Secretary's Office, Ireland ... | 871 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1557 | |

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

| | |
|---|---|
| Law Charges, England [238] 1558 | 23,400 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to | |
| Criminal Prosecutions ... ... | 16,000 |
| Bankruptcy Court, London ... | 2,000 |
| County Courts ... ... ... | 13,598 |
| County Prisons, Great Britain ... | 5,300 |
| Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain ... ... ... | 6,056 |
| Register House Departments, Edinburgh ... ... ... ... | 1,065 |
| Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland ... ... ... | 1,260 |
| Bankruptcy Court, Ireland ... ... | 210 |

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

| | |
|---|---|
| Public Education, England and Wales | 60,000 |
| National Gallery ... ... ... | 350 |
| Queen's University, Ireland ... | 352 |
| Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £352, be granted, &c." [238] 1560 | |
| Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £121, be granted, &c." (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after long debate, Question put; A. 18, N. 118; M. 100 | |
| Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £296, be granted, &c." (*Major Nolan*); after debate, Question put; A. 17, N. 113; M. 96 | |
| Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £316, be granted, &c." (*Mr. P. Martin*); Question put; A. 16, N. 113; M. 97 | |
| Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £335, be granted, &c." (*Mr. O'Clery*); Question put; A. 16; N. 114; M. 98 | |

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote.

Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £340, be granted, &c." (*Lord Francis Conyngham*); A. 16; N. 114; M. 98
Original Question put, and agreed to; Vote agreed to

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 19—REPORT *Mar* 20 £
Diplomatic Services [238] 1606 20,033
After debate, Vote agreed to
Grants in Aid of Expenditure in certain Colonies ... ... ... 2,090
Suez Canal (British Directors) ... 400
After debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1611
Treasury Chest ... ... ... 6,326

CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATIONS, RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

Superannuations and Retired Allowances ... ... ... ... 6,000
Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad ... ... ... 3,000
Commutation of Annuities [238] 1611 18,000
After debate, Vote agreed to

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.

Temporary Commissions
Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £8,000, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item of £4,633, for Salaries of Local Government (Ireland) Commission, be omitted" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after debate, Question put, and negatived; Vote agreed to ... ... [238] 1612 8,000
Miscellaneous Expenses [238] 1615 2,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to
Epping Forest Commission [238] 1616 11,300
After short debate, Vote agreed to
Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company ... ... ... 6,218
Ashantee Expedition, Gratuities and Prize Pay ... ... ... 640
Grant to Lord Cochrane ... ... 5,000
Re-payments to the Civil Contingencies Fund ... ... [238] 1617 5,239
After debate, Vote agreed to

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, &c.

Post Office Telegraph Disallowances 2,237
After short debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1623
Total of Vote ... £524,233

COMMITTEE *Feb* 18—REPORT *Feb* 19
Exchequer Bonds, 1877-8 ... £1,000,000

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote. £

COMMITTEE *Jan* 28, *Feb* 7, *Feb* 8—REPORT *Feb* 11

VOTE OF CREDIT, WAR BETWEEN RUSSIA AND TURKEY
*Jan* 28—Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,000,000, be granted, &c.;" after long debate, Committee—R.P. [237] 535
*Jan* 31—Moved, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.;" Amendt. (*Mr. W. E. Forster*); after long debate, Debate adjourned [237] 729
*Feb* 1—Debate resumed [237] 823
*Feb* 4—Debate resumed [237] 928
*Feb* 5—Debate resumed [237] 1069
*Feb* 7—Debate resumed; Amendt. withdrawn [237] 1215
Main Question again proposed; after long debate, Question put; A. 295, N. 96; M. 199; Committee—R.P.
*Feb* 8—After long debate, Question put; A. 328, N. 124; M. 204 [237] 1335
*Feb* 11—Res. reported; and, after debate, agreed to [237] 1424 6,000,000

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1877-8.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 15—REPORT *Mar* 18
Departmental Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty (*Mr. W. H. Smith*) in moving the Navy Estimates
Moved, "That 60,000 Men and Boys be employed for the Sea and Coastguard Service for the year ending the 31st March, 1878, including 14,000 Royal Marines" *Numbers*
After debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1404 60,000

Total of Vote. £
(1.) Wages to Seamen and Marines 2,702,240
After short debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1469
(2.) Victuals and Clothing for ditto 1,146,192
After short debate, Vote agreed to [238] 1469
(3.) Admiralty Office ... ... 200,760
(4.) Coast Guard Service, Royal Naval Reserve, &c. [238] 1469 207,510
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(5.) Scientific Branch [238] 1470 106,041
After short debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *Aug* 8—REPORT *Aug* 9
(6.) Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad [242] 1567 1,350,140
After short debate, Vote agreed to

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| Committee *Mar* 15—Report *Mar* 18 | £ |
| (7.) Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad ... ... ... | 76,740 |
| (8.) Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad ... [238] 1470 | 66,400 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to | |
| (9.) Marine Divisions ... ... | 21,139 |
| Committee *Aug* 8—Report *Aug* 9 | |
| (10.) Naval Stores for the Building, Repair, and Outfit of the Fleet and Coast Guard, Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. : | |
| Section I. Naval Stores ... | 1,199,300 |
| Section II. Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. ... | 1,042,000 |
| Committee *Mar* 15—Report *Mar* 18 | |
| (11.) New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs ... ... ... | 539,115 |
| (12.) Medicines and Medical Stores ... | 77,230 |
| (13.) Martial Law and Law Charges ... | 7,994 |
| (14.) Miscellaneous Services ... | 134,725 |
| Total for the Effective Service ... | 8,877,526 |
| (15.) Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retired Pay to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines ... ... | 891,605 |
| (16.) Military and Civil Pensions and Allowances : | |
| Section I. Military Pensions and Allowances ... ... | 790,297 |
| Section II. Civil Pensions and Allowances ... ... | 284,223 |
| Total for the Naval Service ... | 10,843,651 |
| For the Service of other Departments of Government. | |
| (17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops) ... ... ... | 210,250 |
| Total Navy Estimates ... | £11,053,901 |

### Supplementary.

| | |
|---|---|
| Committee *May* 27—Report *May* 28 | |
| (17.) Transport of Native Indian Troops | 398,000 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to [240] 805 | |

*Comm. Aug* 8

| Extraordinary Naval and Transport Services, viz. : | £ |
|---|---|
| (1.) Wages, &c. ... | 5,000 |
| (6.) Dockyards, &c. ... | 116,000 |
| (10.) Buildings, &c. | |
| Sec. I. ... ... | 183,000 |
| Sec. II. ... | 110,000 |
| (11.) New Works ... | 1,500 |
| (12.) Medicines ... | 2,500 |
| (14.) Miscellaneous ... | 5,000 |
| (17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops) | 255,000 |

Resolution reported *Aug* 9
Resolution read a second time

[*cont.*

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| | £ |
| After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "£678,000," and insert "£658,000" (*Mr. David Jenkins*); Question proposed, "That '£678,000,' &c.;" after further short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Res. agreed to ... ... [242] 1690 | 678,000 |
| Total of Sums voted for Naval Services ... | ...£12,129,901 |

---

## ARMY ESTIMATES, 1878-9.

Committee *Mar* 4—Report *Mar* 7

Departmental Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) in moving the Army Estimates

Moved, "That a number of Land Forces not exceeding 135,452 be maintained for the Service, &c. from the 1st day of April 1878, to the 31st day of March 1879" [238] 665

After long debate, Vote agreed to

| Numbers. | *Numbers* |
|---|---|
| (A.) Total number of Men (including the Staff of the Militia Forces) on the Home and Colonial Establishments of the Army, exclusive of those Serving in India ... ... | 135,452 |

| I.—Regular Forces. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| | £ |
| (1.) Pay of the General Staff, Regimental Pay and Allowances, and other Charges ... ... | 4,572,000 |
| (2.) Divine Service [238] 718 | 49,300 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to | |
| (3.) Administration of Military Law | 28,600 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to [238] 718 | |

Resolutions reported *Mar* 6, [238] 825

Moved, "That the said Resolutions be now read the second time;" after debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 7, [238] 943

First Res.; after debate, agreed to

Second Res.; Amendt. to leave out "£4,572,000," and insert "£4,565,090" (*Mr. Parnell*) *v.*; Question put, "That '£4,572,000' stand part of the Res.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to

Subsequent Res. agreed to

| | |
|---|---|
| Committee *June* 13—Report *June* 14 | |
| (4.) Medical Establishments and Services ... [240] 1433 | 256,500 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote.

II.—Auxiliary and Reserve Forces. £

(5.) Militia Pay and Allowances ... 535,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1444

(6.) Yeomanry Cavalry, Pay and Allowances
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £74,400, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £68,440, &c." (*Major O'Beirne*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [240] 1447 74,400

(7.) Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £485,300, be granted, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 126, N. 7; M. 119; Vote agreed to ... 485,300 [240] 1449

(8.) Army Reserve Force Pay and Allowances (including Enrolled Pensioners)
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £185,500, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £95,500, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [240] 1474 185,500

Committee *Aug* 6—Report *Aug* 7

III.—Commissariat and Ordnance Store Establishments, &c.

(9.) Commissariat Transport and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. ... ... [242] 1406 386,800
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(10.) Provisions, Forage, Fuel, Transport, and other Services ... 3,185,000

(11.) Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies [242] 1407 806,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(12.) Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores ... 1,330,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [242] 1410

IV.—Works and Buildings.

(13.) Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £854,300, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £851,300, &c." (*General Shute*); after debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [242] 1412 854,300

V.—Various Services.

(14.) Establishments for Military Education ... ... ... 162,400

(15.) Miscellaneous Effective Services 33,300
After short debate, Vote agreed to [242] 1419

(16.) Administration of the Army ... 251,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to [242] 1419

Total Effective Services £13,196,900

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote

VI.—Non-Effective Services. £

(17.) Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c. ... ... ... 33,300

(18.) Pay of General Officers ... 92,000

(19.) Retired Full Pay, Half-pay, Pensions, and Gratuities, including Payments allowed by Army Purchase Commissioners ... ... 870,300

(20.) Widows' Pensions, &c. ... 121,000

(21.) Pensions for Wounds ... ... 16,900

(22.) Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions) ... ... 35,600

(23.) Out-Pensions ... .. 1,025,000

(24.) Superannuation Allowances ... 164,600

(25.) Militia, Yeomanry, Cavalry, and Volunteer Corps ... ... 40,200
*Losses Written off as Irrecoverable* ... ... —

Total Non-Effective Services £2,398,900

Total Effective and Non-Effective Services ... ... £15,595,800

Supplementary, 1878-9.

Committee *May* 27—Report *May* 29 £
Native Indian Troops, viz.— £
(1.) Pay and Allowances... 180,000
(10.) Provisions, &c. ... 170,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to 350,000 [240] 802

Committee *Aug* 7—Report *Aug* 8
Army Services, viz.— £
(1.) Pay and Allowances... 190,000
(10.) Provisions, &c. ... 535,000
(11.) Clothing, &c. ... 15,000
(12.) Warlike, &c. Stores... 882,500
(13.) Works, Buildings, &c. 203,300
(23.) Out-Pensions ... 19,700
Moved, "That a further sum, not exceeding £1,845,500, be granted, &c." [242] 1456
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,820,500, &c." (*Mr. Hayter*); after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... 1,845,500

Committee *Aug* 6—Report *Aug* 7 £
Army (Indian Home Charges) ... 1,080,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [242] 1421

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1878-79.

⁂ The Votes marked † are "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

Committee *June* 7—Report *June* 13 Total of Vote.

Great Britain: £

(1.) † £28,416, Royal Palaces ... 37,716
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1359

[*cont.*

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. £ |
|---|---|
| (1*a*.) † £4,950, Marlborough House...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1360 | 6,450 |
| *Comm. Aug* 6 | |
| (2.) † £88,245, Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £88,245, be granted, &c."<br>Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Whitwell*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [242] 1423 | 117,495 |
| *Report Aug* 9 | |
| Postponed Res. [*Aug* 6] considered<br>(2.) £88,245, Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens<br>Amendt. to leave out "£88,245," and insert "£87,245" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); Question proposed, "That '£88,245,' &c.;" after debate, A. 82, N. 29; M. 53; Res. agreed to [242] 1687 | |
| COMMITTEE *June* 7—REPORT *June* 13 | |
| (3.) † £24,723, Houses of Parliament<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1360 | 32,823 |
| (4.) † £97,608, Public Buildings ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1361 | 130,008 |
| (5.) † £11,650, Furniture of Public Offices ... ... ... | 15,400 |
| (6.) † £141,045, Revenue Department Buildings, England ... ... | 187,995 |
| (7.) † £33,330, County Court Buildings ... ... ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1373 | 44,430 |
| (8.) † £11,534, Metropolitan Police Courts ... ... ..<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1373 | 15,284 |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 6—REPORT *Aug* 7 | |
| (9.) † £6,262, Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland ... ... .. | 8,212 |
| COMMITTEE *June* 7—REPORT *June* 13 | |
| (10.) † £90,300, New Courts of Justice, &c. ... ... ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1375 | 120,300 |
| (11.) † £100,200, Surveys of the United Kingdom ... ... ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1375 | 133,500 |
| (12.) † £11,509, Science and Art Department Buildings ... ... | 15,259 |
| (13.) † £3,795, British Museum Buildings ... ... ... | 4,995 |
| (14.) † £60,050, Natural History Museum | |

[*cont.*

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. £ |
|---|---|
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £60,050, be granted, &c."<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £40,050, &c." (*Mr. E. Jenkins*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived; Vote agreed to [240] 1382 | 80,000 |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 6—REPORT *Aug* 7 | |
| (15.) † £15,050, Edinburgh University Buildings ... ... ... | 20,000 |
| COMMITTEE *June* 7—REPORT *June* 13 | |
| (16.) † £11,283, Harbours, &c. under Board of Trade ... ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1385 | 15,033 |
| (17.) † £133,091, Rates on Government Property (Great Britain and Ireland) ... ... ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1386 | 199,491 |
| (18.) † £7,500, Metropolitan Fire Brigade<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1386 | 10,000 |
| IRELAND: | |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 6—REPORT *Aug* 7 | |
| (19.) † £13,057, Public Buildings ... | 164,357 |
| ABROAD: | |
| COMMITTEE *June* 7—REPORT *June* 13 | |
| (20.) † £9,310, Lighthouses Abroad ... | 12,310 |
| (21.) † £32,867, Diplomatic and Consular Buildings ... ... | 43,667 |
| Total of Estimate ... | £1,414,725 |
| SUPPLEMENTARY 1878-9. | |
| *Comm. Aug* 7 | |
| (1.) Royal Palaces ... ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [242] 1493 | 5,520 |
| (19A.) Science and Art Museum, Dublin | 10,000 |
| *Report Aug* 9 | |
| Postponed Res. [*Aug* 7] considered<br>(2.) † £5,520, Royal Palaces<br>Amendt. to leave out "£5,520," and insert "£5,020" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); Question proposed, "That '£5,520,' &c.;" after short debate, A. 93, N. 31; M. 62; Res. agreed to [242] 1689 | |
| Total Civil Services, Class I. ... | £1,430,245 |

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

ENGLAND:

| | |
|---|---|
| COMMITTEE *May* 6—REPORT *May* 9 | £ |
| (1.) † £37,292, House of Lords Offices<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,292, be granted, &c." | |

[*cont.*

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| | £ |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,092, &c." (*Mr. E. Jenkins*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £36,967, &c." (*Mr. O'Connor Power*); after short debate, A. 18, N. 72; M. 54 | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £37,192, &c." (*Mr. Biggar*); A. 29, N. 81; M. 52 | |
| Vote agreed to [239] 1452 | 44,692 |
| (2.) † £41,907, House of Commons Offices | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £41,907, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [239] 1479 | 50,207 |
| (3.) † £49,710, Treasury, including Parliamentary Counsel | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £49,710, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £47,710, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Vote agreed to ... [239] 1481 | 59,610 |
| (4.) † £73,345, Home Office and Subordinate Departments [239] 1483 | 87,945 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to | |
| (5.) † £61,065, Foreign Office ... | 73,165 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to [239] 1486 | |
| (6.) † £32,217, Colonial Office ... | 38,617 |
| (7.) † £27,518, Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments ... | 33,018 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to [239] 1490 | |
| (8.) † £2,305, Privy Seal Office | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,305, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. O'Connor Power*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; original Question put; A. 80, N. 93; M. 47; Vote agreed to [239] 1497 | 2,765 |
| COMMITTEE *May* 9—REPORT *May* 13 | |
| (9.) † £141,612, Board of Trade and Subordinate Departments | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £141,612, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £140,712, &c." (*Mr. Biggar*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to [239] 1607 | 169,912 |
| (10.) † £27,156, Charity Commission (including Endowed Schools Department) ... [239] 1611 | 32,556 |
| After debate, Vote agreed to | |
| (11.) † £22,519, Civil Service Commission | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,519, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,519, &c." (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*); after short debate, A. 50, N. 60; M. 10; Vote agreed to [239] 1614 | 26,919 |

[cont.

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| | £ |
| (12.) † £14,141, Copyhold, Inclosure and Tithe Commission ... ... | 16,941 |
| (13.) † £6,830, Inclosure and Drainage Acts Expenses ... ... ... | 8,130 |
| (14.) † £43,225, Exchequer and Audit Department | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £43,325, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £43,125, &c." (*Mr. Biggar*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [239] 1619 | 51,925 |
| (15.) † £5,085, Friendly Societies, Registry ... ... [239] 1627 | 6,085 |
| After short debate, Vote agreed to | |
| (16.) † £320,193, Local Government Board | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £320,193, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That the Item £2,000, Salary of President, be omitted" (*Mr. Parnell*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [239] 1630 | 384,193 |
| COMMITTEE *May* 13—REPORT *May* 14 | |
| (17.) † £12,594, Lunacy Commission | 14,994 |
| (18.) † £42,535, Mint | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £42,535, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £42,520, &c." (*Mr. O'Donnell*); Amendt. negatived; Vote agreed to [239] 1761 | 51,035 |
| (19.) † £14,024, National Debt Office | 16,724 |
| (20.) † £22,675, Patent Office | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,675, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That the Item of £1,500, Salary of Clerk, be omitted" (*Mr. Mellor*); after debate, A. 33, N. 87; M. 54 | |
| Moved, "That the Item of £185, Salary of Office Keeper, be omitted" (*Mr. Macdonald*): A. 15, N. 108; M. 93 | |
| Moved, "That the Item of £100, Salary of Lord Chancellor's Messenger, be omitted" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [239] 1764 | 27,175 |
| (21.) † £20,247, Paymaster General's Office | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,247, be granted, &c." | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £19,047, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. negatived; Vote agreed to [239] 1776 | 24,247 |
| (22.) † £8,353, Public Works Loan Commission ... ... ... | 9,953 |
| (23.) † £18,277, Record Office ... | 21,877 |
| (24.) † £39,553, Registrar General's Office ... ... ... ... | 47,453 |
| (25.) † £376,545, Stationery Office and Printing ... ... | |
| Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £376,545, be granted, &c." | |

[cont.

*Supply*—cont. — Total of Vote. £

Moved, "That the Item of £3,000, special grant for Hansard's Debates, be omitted" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £376,245, &c." (*Mr. Biggar*); Amendt. negatived

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £376,445, &c." (*Mr. Biggar*); A. 26, N. 278; M. 252

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £376,145, &c." (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after debate, Amendt. negatived

Moved to report Progress (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after debate, A. 34, N. 200; M. 166

Moved, "That the Chairman, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after debate, Motion withdrawn

*Comm.*—R.P. [239] 1781

† £376,545, Stationery Office; Question again proposed; Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Parnell*); after debate, Motion negatived

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £105,545, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); A. 20, N. 123; M. 103

Vote agreed to [240] 41 — 451,745

*Report May* 20

First Res. Amendt. to leave out "£376.545," and insert "£105,545" (*Mr. Parnell*); Question put, That "£376,545" stand part of the Res.; A. 115, N. 13; M. 102

Other Res. agreed to

COMMITTEE *May* 16—REPORT *May* 20

(26.) † £19,492, Woods, Forests, &c. Office of ... ... [240] 82 — 23,292

After short debate, Vote agreed to

(27.) † £33,250, Works and Public Buildings, Office of

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £33,250, be granted, &c."

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £32,791, &c." (*Mr. Macdonald*); after short debate, A. 25, N. 231; M. 206

Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. M'Carthy Downing*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [240] 98 — 39,850

COMMITTEE *May* 24—REPORT *May* 27

(28.) † £20,000, Secret Service

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted, &c."

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,000, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after debate, A. 34, N. 49; M. 15; Vote agreed to ... [240] 657 — 24,000

SCOTLAND:

(29.) † £5,390, Exchequer and other Offices

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,390, be granted, &c."

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont. — Total of Vote. £

Moved to omit Item of £97, Salary of H.M. Limner (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved to omit Item of £600, Salary of Secretary of Bible Board (*Mr. Biggar*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved to omit Item of £240, Salary of Law Agent to Bible Board (*Mr. Biggar*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved to omit Item of £99, for Queen's Plates (*Major O'Beirne*); after short debate, A. 25, N. 94; M. 69; Vote agreed to [240] 678 — 6,390

(30.) † £10,848, Fishery Board

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,848, be granted, &c."

Moved, "That the Vote be disallowed" (*Mr. J. W. Barclay*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,848, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after debate, A. 10, N. 142; M. 132; Vote agreed to ... [240] 691 — 12,948

COMMITTEE *May* 27—REPORT *May* 28

(31.) † £4,754, Lunacy Commission ... — 5,654

After short debate, Vote agreed to [241] 812

(32.) † £5,654, Registrar General's Office ... ... ... ... — 6,754

(33.) † £15,618, Board of Supervision

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,618, be granted, &c."

Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. J. W. Barclay*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [241] 814 — 18,718

COMMITTEE *July* 15—REPORT *July* 16

IRELAND:

(34.) † £5,350, Lord Lieutenant's Household

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,350, be granted, &c."

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,026, &c." (*Major O'Beirne*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [241] 1545 — 7,000

(35.) † £20,178, Chief Secretary's Office, &c. ... [241] 1546 — 26,778

After short debate, Vote agreed to

(36.) † £1,568, Charitable Donations and Bequests Office

Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [241] 1546 — 2,078

(37.) † £95,796, Local Government Board

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £95,796, be granted, &c."

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £91,396, &c." (*Mr. Gray*)

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote.

Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Meldon*); A. 32, N. 78; M. 46 £
Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. O'Sullivan*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [241] 1551 127,596

*Comm. Aug* 6
(38.) † £22,435, Public Works Office, Ireland
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £22,435, be granted, &c.;" Motion withdrawn [242] 1423

*Comm. Aug* 8—*Report Aug* 9—After short debate, Vote agreed to ... [242] 1586 29,785

COMMITTEE *July* 15—REPORT *July* 16
(39.) † £4,524, Record Office ... 6,024
(40.) † £12,659, Registrar General's Office ... ... ... ... 16,709
(41.) † £16,244, Valuation and Boundary Survey ... ... 21,644
Total of Estimate ... £2,127,103

SUPPLEMENTARY, 1878-9.
COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8
(18.) Mint, including Coinage ... 30,000
Total Civil Services, Class II. ...£2,157,103

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.
COMMITTEE *May* 30—REPORT *June* 3
ENGLAND: £
(1.) † £54,505, Law Charges ... 72,655
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 940
(2.) † £138,097, Criminal Prosecutions 183,997
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 943
(3.) † £133,210, Chancery Division, High Court of Justice
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £133,210, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item of £6,821, Salaries of Official Referees, be reduced by the sum of £3,000" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after short debate, Motion put, and negatived; Vote agreed to ... [240] 952 177,610
(4.) † £47,440, Queen's Bench, &c. Divisions, High Court of Justice ... 63,190
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 968
(5.) † £70,274, Probate, &c. Registries, High Court of Justice ... 93,674
(6.) † £10,044, Admiralty Registry, High Court of Justice [240] 969 13,344
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(7.) † £8,142, Wreck Commission ... 10,692
(8.) † £28,945, Bankruptcy Court (London) ... [240] 972 38,395
After short debate, Vote agreed to

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote. £
(9.) † £326,527, County Courts ... 435,277
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 973
(10.) † £4,068, Land Registry
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,068, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,068, &c." (*Mr. Whitwell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [240] 980 5,418
(11.) † £10,884, Police Courts (London and Sheerness)
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,884, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress (*Mr. O'Connor Power*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to ... [240] 989 14,484
(12.) † £295,190, Metropolitan Police 442,650
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 996
(13.) † £870,948, Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain ... 871,998
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 996
(14.) † £332,118, Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £332,118, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £331,518, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, A. 14, N. 208; M. 194
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £331,668, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, A. 18, N. 213; M. 195; Vote agreed to ... [240] 1001 442,668
(15.) † £365,409, Prisons, England ... 487,209
(15*a*.) † £28,037, County Prisons, &c., Great Britain ... [240] 1008 55,637
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(16.) † £183,665, Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £183,665, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item of £103,000 for Industrial Schools, England, be reduced by the sum of £7,000" (*Mr. W. Holms*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [240] 1012 244,865
(17.) † £19,456, Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum [240] 1018 25,756
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(18.) Revising Barristers, England ... 18,690

COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 7
SCOTLAND:
(19.) † £50,788, Lord Advocate, and Criminal Proceedings ... ... 67,588
(20.) † £46,223, Courts of Law and Justice ... [242] 1269 61,523
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(21.) † £27,380, Register House Departments ... ... ... 36,380
(22.) † £61,160, Prisons, Scotland ... 81,410

[cont.

[cont.

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| IRELAND : | £ |
| (23.) † £65,678, Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions ... ... | 87,428 |
| (24.) † £29,867, Chancery Division, High Court of Justice ... ... | 39,767 |
| (25.) † £21,169, Queen's Bench, &c. Divisions, ditto ... ... | 28,219 |
| (26.) † £8,662, Land Judges' Offices, ditto ... [242] 1271<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to | 11,362 |
| (27.) † £8,567, Probate, &c., Registries, ditto ... ... ... | 11,417 |
| (28.) † £7,738, Court of Bankruptcy... | 10,138 |
| (29.) † £1,280, Admiralty Court Registry ... ... ... | 1,700 |
| (30.) † £14,672, Registry of Deeds<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,672, be granted, &c."<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,042, &c." (*Mr. M. Brooks*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [242] 1273 | 19,472 |
| (31.) † £2,155, Registry of Judgments<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,155, be granted, &c."<br>Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Hopwood*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [242] 1277 | 2,855 |
| (32.) † £103,885, Dublin Metropolitan Police (including Police Courts) ... | 138,385 |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 6—REPORT *Aug* 7 | |
| (33.) † £817,652, Constabulary ... | 1,090,202 |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 8—REPORT *Aug* 9 | |
| (34.) † £111,253, Prisons, Ireland<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £111,253, be granted, &c."<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £110,753, &c." (*Mr. O'Connor Power*); after debate, Motion withdrawn<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £111,153, &c." (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*); A. 21, N. 51; M. 30; Vote agreed to [242] 1586 | 148,153 |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 6—REPORT *Aug* 7 | |
| (35.) † £61,158, Reformatory and Industrial Schools ... ... | 81,458 |
| (36.) † £4,786, Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum ... ... | 6,376 |
| (37.) † £49,133, Magistrates and Miscellaneous Legal Charges ... | 65,483 |
| *Res. May* 30 reported, and, after short debate, agreed to, [240] 1152<br>*Res. Aug* 6 reported; Nineteenth *Res.* postponed; other *Res.* agreed to<br>*Aug* 8—£14,672, Registry of Deeds<br>Moved to leave out "£14,672," and insert "£14,357" (*Mr. Meldon*)<br>Question, That "14,672," &c. put, and agreed to [242] 1610<br>*Res. Aug* 7 reported, and, after debate, agreed to, [242] 1613 | |
| Total of Estimate ... | £5,687,525 |

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| SUPPLEMENTARY, 1878-9. | £ |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8 | |
| (18.) Revising Barristers, England ... | 210 |
| Total Civil Services, Class III. ... | £5,687,735 |
| CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART. | |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 5—REPORT *Aug* 6 | |
| ENGLAND : | £ |
| (1.) † £1,432,808, Public Education<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,432,808, be granted, &c.;" after long debate, Vote agreed to ... [242] 1219 | 2,149,208 |
| (2.) † £205,014, Science and Art Department<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £205,014, be granted, &c."<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £195,014, &c." (*Mr. Errington*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [242] 1257 | 307,414 |
| (3.) † £84,790, British Museum ...<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to [242] 1261 | 112,990 |
| (4.) † £9,133, National Gallery ... | 11,983 |
| (5.) † £1,500, National Portrait Gallery ... [242] 1262<br>After short debate, Vote agreed to | 2,000 |
| (6.) † £12,850, Learned Societies, &c. Great Britain and Ireland ... | 17,050 |
| (7.) † £8,244, London University ... | 10,944 |
| (8.) † £3,010, Deep Sea Exploring Expedition (Report) ... .. | 4,000 |
| (9.) † £24,500, Paris International Exhibition<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,560, be granted, &c."<br>Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,467, &c." (*Mr. Meldon*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn [242] 1265 | 36,700 |
| SCOTLAND : | |
| (10.) † £331,812, Public Education ... | 497,612 |
| (11.) † £1,835, Board of Education ... | 2,435 |
| (12.) † £14,074, Universities, &c. ... | 18,574 |
| (13.) † £1,580, National Gallery ... | 2,100 |
| IRELAND : | |
| COMMITTEE *July* 15—REPORT *July* 16 | |
| (14.) † £434,091, Public Education ... | 651,091 |
| *Report July* 16<br>First Res. (Vote 14) postponed<br>*Aug.* 8—First Res. considered and agreed to [242] 1610 | |
| (15.) † £480, Endowed Schools Commissioners .. ... ... | 640 |
| (16.) † £1,799, National Gallery ... | 2,389 |
| (17.) † £4,162, Queen's University ... | 4,962 |

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote.

(18.) † £10,717, Queen's Colleges £
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,717, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £717, &c." (*Major Nolan*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Motion put; A. 172, N. 18; M. 154; Vote agreed to [241] 1537 12,817
(19.) † £1,881, Royal Irish Academy
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,881, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*The O'Donoghue*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [241] 1542 2,481

Total of Estimate ... £3,847,390

SUPPLEMENTARY, 1878-9

COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8
(4.) National Gallery ... ... 5,000

Total Civil Services, Class IV. ... £3,852,390

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES. £

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 7
(1.) † £134,520, Diplomatic Services
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £134,520, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item for Salaries be reduced by £1,250" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after debate, Question put, and negatived; Vote agreed to [240] 1258 201,520
(2.) † £166,053, Consular Services ... 248,853
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1283
(3.) † £31,634, Colonies, Grants-in-Aid
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,634, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item £2,000, Salary of High Commissioner for South Africa, be reduced by £1,200" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived; Vote agreed to [240] 1290 41,984
(4.) † £2,129, Orange River Territory and St. Helena ... ... 2,819
(5.) † £1,220, Suez Canal (British Directors) ... ... ... 1,620
(6.) † £5,742, Suppression of the Slave Trade [240] 1308 7,542
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(7.) † £10,547, Tonnage Bounties, &c. 13,997

Total of Estimate ... £518,335

SUPPLEMENTARY, 1878-9.

COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8
(1.) Diplomatic Services [242] 1494 10,800
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(8.) Government of Cyprus ... 8,000

Total Civil Services, Class V.... £537,135

[*cont.*

*Supply*—cont. Total of Vote.

CLASS VI. — SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 7 £
(1.) † £221,961, Superannuation and Retired Allowances [240] 1309 443,561
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(2.) † £15,650, Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c. ... ... 31,250
(3.) † £22,400, Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad ... 29,750
(4.) Pauper Lunatics, England ... 380,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [240] 1311
(5.) Pauper Lunatics, Scotland ... 68,000
(6.) † £20,900, Pauper Lunatics, Ireland ... ... ... ... 83,800
(7.) † £13,387, Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland ... ... ... 17,737
(8.) Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiency ... ... 127,617
(9.) † £3,144, Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, &c., Great Britain
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,144, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item of £500, for the Clarges Annuity, be omitted" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after short debate, A. 12, N. 58; M. 46; Vote agreed to [240] 1312 4,184
(10.) † £3,097, Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Ireland ... 4,117

Total Civil Services, Class VI. ... £1,190,016

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS. £
(1.) † £16,579, Temporary Commissions ... ... ... 21,979
(2.) † £7,152, Miscellaneous Expenses 9,402

Total Civil Services, Class VII. ... £31,381

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1877-78.

COMMITTEE *June* 7—REPORT *June* 17 £
Vote I. † £735,698, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Customs Department ... ... ... 980,798
Vote II. † £1,359,270, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department ... ... ... 1,812,270
Vote III. † £2,484,915, For Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and of Government Annuities and Insurances, and of the Collection of the Post Office Revenue ... ... ... 3,313,215
Vote IV. † £580,045, For the Post Office Packet Service ... ... 773,245
Vote V. † £743,372, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Telegraph Service [240] 1313 1,114,972
After short debate, Vote agreed to

Total Estimates ... ... £7,994,500

[*cont.*

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| *June* 7—*Res.* reported<br>First Twenty-two *Res.* agreed to<br>*June* 17—*Res.* 23, "That a sum, not exceeding £580,045, be granted, &c." Amendt. to leave out "£580,045," and insert "£579,085" (*Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh*); Amendt. withdrawn [240] 1669 | £ |
| SUPPLEMENTARY, 1878-9. | |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8 | |
| (4.) Post Office Packet Service ... | 6,000 |
| Total Revenue Departments ... | £8,000,500 |

[*cont.*

| *Supply*—cont. | Total of Vote. |
|---|---|
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 8—REPORT *Aug* 9 | |
| Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School ... ... ... | £148,802 |
| COMMITTEE *May* 23—REPORT *May* 24 | |
| Exchequer Bonds ... ... | 1,500,000 |
| COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8 | |
| Abyssinian Expedition, 1867-8 ... | 19,865 |

---

**Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland) (1877) Amendment Bill**

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. James Lowther*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *June* 19 [Bill 223]
Read 2°* *June* 24
Committee*; Report *June* 26
Read 3°* *June* 27
*l.* Read 1ᵃ* (*Lord Chancellor*) *June* 28 (No. 139)
Read 2ᵃ *July* 8, [241] 956
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Read 3ᵃ* *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 27]

**Supreme Court of Judicature (Officers) Bill** [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)

*l.* Presented; read 1ᵃ* *July* 12 (No. 158)
Read 2ᵃ* *July* 15
Committee*; Report *July* 16
Read 3ᵃ* *July* 18
*c.* Read 1°* *July* 22 [Bill 268]
Read 2°* *July* 24
Committee*; Report *July* 25
Read 3°* *July* 29
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 35]

**SWANSTON, Mr. A.,** *Bandon*

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [240] 873

**SYNAN, Mr. E. J.,** *Limerick Co.*

241] Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. 248, 332; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1616; *cl.* 10, 1858; *cl.* 15, 1883; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1885, 1887, 1893; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1910, 1912, 1913; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1923, 1928, 1984, 1985, 2001, 2003, 2006, 2008; *cl.* 23, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 28, 2010; *cl.* 30, 2078; *cl.* 54, 2093, 2095; *cl.* 55, 2099
242] *cl.* 68, 139, 153, 155, 164; *cl.* 70, 168, 174; *cl.* 71, Amendt. 175, 184; *add. cl.* 438, 443, 448, 763, 764, 765; Motion for reporting Progress, 773, 774; Schedule 3, 804; Schedule 5, 808, 818
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], [241] 1597

[*cont.*

SYNAN, Mr. E. J.—*cont.*
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 547
Provisional Orders for Irish Waterworks, [241] 856
University Education (Ireland), Res. [240] 1124
Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension), 2R. [240] 149

**TALBOT, Mr. J. G.** (†Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Kent, W.*

Burials, Res. [237] 1825
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. [238] 1479
Licensing—Licensed Houses, [238] 975
Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 550
†Railway Accidents, 1877—Continuous Footboards, [242] 1525
†Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1), Lords Amendts. Consid. [242] 1856

**TALBOT DE MALAHIDE, Lord**

Tramways (Use of Mechanical Powers), Res. [242] 342

**TAYLOR, Mr. D.,** *Coleraine*

Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 99, [238] 485; *add. cl.* 505
Grand Jury Law Amendment (Ireland), Leave, [238] 526; [241] 1240
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 504
Tenant Right (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 1049
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 272

**TAYLOR, Mr. P. A.,** *Leicester Bo.*

Bishoprics, Comm. [242] 1646
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  Ellen Heeson, Case of, [241] 210
  John Roberts, Case of, [238] 1140
  Thomas Griffiths, Case of, [240] 832
Education Code, 1878—Art. 17 (G)—Educational Returns, [238] 1751

[*cont.*

**Taylor, Mr. P. A.**—*cont.*
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 14, Amendt. [238] 118, 119
Grantham County Court—Margaret Carroll, Case of, [240] 833
Greenwich Hospital—Age Pensions, [242] 1538
Greenwich Hospital Funds, [241] 1844
Greenwich Out-Pensioners, [237] 1047, 1617
India—Criminal Law—High Court of Madras, [241] 756
Lunatic Asylums—Post-Mortem Examinations, [240] 742
Metropolis—Coffee Stalls in the Street, [240] 1878
Mutiny, Comm. [238] 1982; *cl.* 22, [239] 39; Amendt. 45, 48, 51
Navy — Reserved or Retired Officers, [238] 152
Post Office—Appointment of Officials, [237] 1050
Prison Discipline—Flogging, [239] 34
Queen's Message—Marriage of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, [242] 256; Report, 393
Teachers and School Returns, [240] 27

**Telegraphs Bill** [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª* *April* 15 (No. 77)
240] Read 2ª *May* 31, 1034
Order for Committee discharged; Bill referred to a Select Committee *June* 3
And, on *June* 6, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—D. Somerset, E. Stanhope, E. Belmore, L. Carlingford, L. Winmarleigh
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 1 (*P.P.* 141)
Bill reported* *July* 1
Committee* *July* 4 (No. 142)
Report* *July* 8
Read 3ª* *July* 9
*c.* Read 1°* (*Lord J. Manners*) *July* 12 [Bill 257]
241] 2R. deferred *July* 18, 1941
Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 22, 2057; Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Lord John Manners
242] *August* 9, 1641
Moved, "That the Second Reading be fixed for Twelve of the clock on Saturday" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *August* 9, 1695
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Lord John Manners*); after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sullivan*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
After further short debate, original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee on the Bill" (*Lord John Manners*)
Amendt. to leave out "this day," and insert "upon Tuesday next" (*Mr. Onslow*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That 'this day,' &c.;" Question put; A. 87, N. 30; M. 57 (D. L. 264)
Main Question put; Resolved, That this House will, this day, resolve itself into the said Committee
. Committee; Report *August* 12, 1854
Considered*; read 3° *August* 13
*l.* Commons Amendts. (No. 206)
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 76]

**Temple, Right Hon. W. F. Cowper-,** *Hants, S.*
Epping Forest, 2R. [240] 1623; 3R. [241] 776
Metropolis—Free Porters of the City of London, [239] 663
Metropolitan Building Act, 1855—All Saints' Church, Lambeth, [238] 540

**Templetown, Viscount**
Army—Marking Deserters, [239] 108

**Tenant Right (Ireland) Bill**
(*Lord Hill-Trevor, The Marquess of Hamilton, Mr. Mulholland, Captain Corry, Mr. Chaine*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 31]
239] Read 2°, after debate *May* 8, 1583
Committee*—R.P. *May* 24
240] Committee—R.P. *May* 30, 1032
. Committee; Report *June* 6, 1325
. Moved, "That the Bill be now considered" *June* 13, 1490
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon Monday next" (*Mr. Macartney*); Question proposed "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived; words added
Considered; debate adjourned *June* 19
241] Adjourned Debate resumed *July* 5, 944; Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered
Amendt. to the Bill, in the words inserted in the Committee, at the end of Clause 2, viz., "the court, in determining the amount of compensation to be paid to any person making any such claim, shall take into consideration of the terms of the lease, the rent at which the premises were held, and any stipulation, proviso, covenant, or agreement therein contained or referred to for the erection of buildings or the making any improvements by the lessee," by leaving out from the word "into," in line 2, to the end of the said words, in order to insert the words "account in reduction of the claim any express stipulation, proviso, covenant, or agreement for the erection of buildings or making any other improvements by the lessee, contained or referred to in the lease, or subject to which the holding shall have been demised" (*Mr. Isaac*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c."
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Butt*); after further short debate, Question put; A. 19, N. 52; M. 33 (D. L. 198)
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, deferred
. Further Proceeding resumed *July* 8, 1048
Amendt. again proposed; Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Motion withdrawn
Original Question again proposed; Amendt. thereto withdrawn
An Amendt. to Clause 2 agreed to
Read 3°* *July* 9

[cont.

*Tenant Right (Ireland) Bill*—cont.
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Earl of Longford*) *July* 11 (No. 156)
242] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *August* 5, 1163
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and add ("this day three months") (*The Viscount Lifford*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; Cont. 8, Not-Cont. 25; M. 17; resolved in the negative; and Bill to be read 2ª this day three months

**Tenant Right (Ulster) Bill** (*Mr. Macartney, Mr. William Wilson, Mr. Charles Lewis*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 54]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 24

**Tenants' Improvements (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. Patrick Martin, Major Nolan, Mr. O'Clery, Mr. Fay*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 13]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 20, [238] 1673
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Bruen*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 17, N. 258; M. 241 (D. L. 61)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

**Tenants' Protection (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. Arthur Moore, Mr. Patrick Smyth*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 109]
2R. [Dropped]

TENNANT, Mr. R., *Leeds*
Employers Liability for Injuries, 2R. Amendt. [239] 1047
237] Factories and Workshops, 2R. Amendt. 1454, 1482
238] Comm. *cl.* 13, 118; *cl.* 14, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 22, 314; Amendt. 315; *cl.* 27, 319; *cl.* 30, 328; *cl.* 31, Amendt. 329; *cl.* 37, Amendt. 330; *cl.* 38, Amendt. 332, 333; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 335, 336, 338; *cl.* 60, 341; *cl.* 90, 483; *add. cl.* 502
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 68
Rivers Pollution Prevention Act, 1876, [239] 1596

**Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Bill** [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
*l.* Presented; after short debate, Bill read 1ª *Feb* 14, [237] 1601 (No. 23)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Feb* 22, [238] 140
Committee, after short debate *Mar* 8, 951 (No. 38)
Report* *Mar* 12 (No. 40)
Read 3ª* *Mar* 14
*c.* Read 1°* (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 28
Read 2°* *August* 10 [Bill 137]
Committee; Report, after short debate *August* 12, [242] 1856
Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 15, 2016
[*cont.*

*Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Bill*—cont.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Solicitor General*) *August* 15, 2026
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir George Bowyer*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 73]

**Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill** (*Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Forsyth*)
*c.* Motion for Leave (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg*) *April* 8, [239] 943; Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate resumed *July* 12, [241] 1389
Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 262]
Referred to the Examiners

THORNHILL, Mr. T., *Suffolk, W.*
Highways, [241] 1241

**Threshing Machines Bill** (*Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Macdonald*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 30 [Bill 97]
Read 2°* *Mar* 13
Committee*; Report *Mar* 20
Considered* *Mar* 21
Read 3°* *Mar* 22
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Walsingham*) *Mar* 25 (No. 50)
Read 2ª *April* 4, [239] 516
Committee*; Report *April* 5
Read 3ª* *April* 9
Royal Assent *April* 16 [41 *Vict.* c. 12]

THURLOW, Lord
National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 396

THYNNE, Lord H. F. (Treasurer of the Household), *Wiltshire, S.*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [237] 1987
Army Reserve Forces, Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, [239] 1288

TORRENS, Mr. W. T. M., *Finsbury*
Army Clothing, [238] 450
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. Amendt. [241] 967, 1026
County Government, Comm. [238] 926
Factories and Workshops, Consid. *cl.* 53, Amendt. [238] 1911
India—Mysore, [242] 1763
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Consid. [241] 1292
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1242
Supply—British Museum, [242] 1262
Law Charges, [240] 943
Telegraphs, 2R. [242] 1698
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 604

**Town Councils, Local Boards, and other Local Governing Bodies Bill** (*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Burt, Mr. Morley*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 22]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 6, [238] 825
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*); Question put; A. 151, N. 160; M. 9 (D. L. 43)
Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Pell*); Question put; A. 94, N. 170; M. 76 (D. L. 44)
Further proceeding adjourned
Further Proceeding on 2R. [Dropped]

**Training Schools and Ships Bill** (*Captain Pim, Mr. Wheelhouse*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 48]
Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 8, [241] 963
Moved, "That the Bill be read 2° this day" *August* 9, [242] 1711
Amendt. to leave out "this day," and add "upon Tuesday next" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*; Question put, "That 'this day,' &c.;" A. 39, N. 42; M. 3 (D. L. 265)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put; Resolved, That the Bill be read 2° upon Tuesday next
Bill withdrawn* *August* 13

**Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill** (*Mr. Collins, The Marquess of Hamilton, Mr. Shaw, Mr. William Wilson*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 47]
2R., after short debate, Debate adjourned *Mar* 27, [239] 98
2R., Debate further adjourned *Mar* 28
Read 2°* *June* 6
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 1, [241] 580
Committee deferred
Committee [Dropped]

**Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill** (*Mr. J. G. Talbot, Viscount Sandon*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *April* 15 [Bill 151]
Read 2°*, and committed to the Select Committee on the Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills *May* 13
Re-comm.* *May* 29 [Bill 194]
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report; Re-comm. *June* 6, [240] 1316 [Bill 207]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 17
Considered* *June* 18
Read 3°* *June* 20
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Henniker*) *June* 21 (No. 130)
Read 2ª* *June* 25
Committee discharged, after short debate *July* 15, [241] 1441
Committee put off *July* 25, [242] 213
Committee, after short debate *August* 6, 1282
Report* *August* 8 (No. 193)
Read 3ª* *August* 9

[*cont.*

*Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill*—cont.

*c.* Lords Amendts. *August* 9 [Bill 299]
Lords Amendts. considered *August* 12, 1855; after short debate, Consideration of Lords Amendts. deferred
Lords Amendts. agreed to *August* 14
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxxxi]

**Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill** (*Mr. J. G. Talbot, Viscount Sandon*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *April* 15 [Bill 152]
Read 2°* *May* 13
Re-comm.* *May* 30
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 6
Considered*; read 3° *June* 7 [Bill 198]
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Henniker*) *June* 17 (No. 122)
Read 2ª* *June* 18
Committee*; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª* *July* 4
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 242]
*l.* Royal Assent *July* 22 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. clxiii]

**Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill** (*Mr. J. G. Talbot, Viscount Sandon*)

*c.* Read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 174]
Read 2°*, and committed to the Select Committee on Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills
Re-comm.* *May* 29
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report; Re-comm. *June* 6 [Bill 195]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 17
Read 3°* *June* 18 [Bill 208]
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord Henniker*) *June* 20 (No. 128)
Read 2ª* *June* 25
Order for Committee discharged *July* 15, [241] 1448
Committee *August* 8, [242] 1499
Report* *August* 9
Read 3ª* *August* 12
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 312]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. ccxxxii]

**Tramways Orders Confirmation (Glasgow, &c.) Bill**
(*Viscount Sandon, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

*c.* Ordered* *May* 8

*Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills (by Order)*

*c.* Moved, "That every Opposed Tramway Bill of the present Session, whereby it is proposed to authorize the use of steam or other mechanical power, be referred to a Select Committee of Nine Members, Five to be nominated by the House and Four by the Committee of Selection; and that such of the Petitioners against the Bills as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel or Agents, as shall have presented their Petitions in accordance with the Standing Orders, be heard upon their Petitions, if they think fit, and Counsel heard in favour of the Bills against such Petitions:
"That Five be the quorum of the Committee" (*Mr. Raikes*) *Feb* 5, [237] 1047; Motion agreed to

[*cont.*

*Tramways* (*Use of Mechanical Power*) *Bills*—cont.

Moved, That Mr. Arthur Peel, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Knight, Admiral Egerton, and Mr. Maurice Brooks be Members of the Select Committee on Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *Feb* 25, [238] 296; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Ordered, That the Report and Minutes of Evidence of the Select Committee on Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) 1877, be referred to the Select Committee on Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills (*Sir Charles Adderley*) *Feb* 28

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills to consider under what conditions (if at all) the use of steam or other Mechanical Power may be authorised upon Tramways during the present Session, and to take evidence thereon if they shall think fit *Mar* 8

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*)

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to deal with all Tramway Bills of the present Session, whether opposed or unopposed, which have been referred to them, notwithstanding that the Promoters may be desirous to withdraw from any such Bills the Clauses whereby it was proposed to authorize the use of steam or other mechanical power:—That the Dublin Southern District Tramways Bill be re-committed to the said Committee" *April* 15, [239] 1275; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. O'Conor*); Motion withdrawn

Main Question put, and agreed to

The Report . . . . . . . *P.P.* 224

Question, Mr. Wheelhouse; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 27, [240] 747; Question, Colonel Beaumont; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 17, 1606

*l.* Moved, "That the Orders of the 4th of February last, and of the 31st of May last, which limits the time for the second reading of Private Bills, be dispensed with in respect to the Blackburn and Over-Darwen Tramways Bill; Glyn Valley Tramway Bill; Belfast Street Tramways Bill; Aberdeen District Tramways Bill; Boston District Tramways Bill; and Wallasey Tramways Bill; in order that the Bills be now read a second time" (*The Earl of Redesdale*) *June* 25, [241] 203; Motion agreed to

Orders of February 4 and May 31 dispensed with

Moved, "That the said Bills be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Redesdale*); Motion agreed to; Bills read 2ª

Moved, "That a Message be sent to the Commons for the Report of the Select Committee of that House, together with the Minutes of Evidence, &c." (*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*); Motion agreed to

[*cont.*

*Tramways* (*Use of Mechanical Power*) *Bills*—cont.

Moved to resolve, That this House is not prepared to sanction the use of steam power on tramways generally under the conditions proposed in the Bills now waiting to be committed without further inquiry:

That further and well considered legislation appears desirable in regard to tramways to be worked by steam along public highways throughout the country in conjunction or in competition with railways, such tramways being free from many of the obligations to which railways are subject, and frequently proposed to be laid on one side instead of the centre of the road thereby affecting the property of frontagers injuriously and unequally (*The Earl of Redesdale*) *July* 26, [242] 338; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

*Treaties of* 1856 *and* 1871

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 13, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, all future Treaties between this Country and Foreign Powers under which this Country is engaged, separately or in conjunction with any other Power, to interfere by force of arms, or by armed demonstration, or by the contribution of any military contingent or pecuniary subsidy, to attack or defend any Government or Nation with reference to its internal arrangements or foreign relations, or on any other contingency whatsoever, ought to be laid upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament before being ratified, in order that an opportunity may be afforded to both Houses of expressing their opinion upon the provisions of such Treaties" (*Mr. Rylands*) *v.*, [240] 1391; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

*Treaty Obligations — Treaty of Paris,* 1856, *and Protocol of Treaty of London,* 1871

Observations, Mr. Courtney; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 29, [239] 220

TREVELYAN, Mr. G. O., *Hawick, &c.*

Education (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 1135

Parliament—Household Franchise, Res. [238] 159

Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [238] 1811, 1814, 1815; Amendt. 1816; *cl.* 12, Amendt. [240] 1193, 1194, 1196

Supplementary Estimate, Motion for Adjournment, [237] 813, 824; Personal Explanation, 1057, 1059, 1061, 1067, 1068, 1309

Supply—Army and Navy Services, [237] 574

TREVOR, Lord A. E. HILL-, *Downshire*

Absentee Proprietors (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1590

Tenant Right (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1583; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [240] 1325, 1326; Consid. 1490; Consid. *cl.* 2, [241] 945, 947.

TRURO, Lord
Admiralty and War Office (Retirement of Officers), 2R. [242] 855
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Hampshire Rifle Volunteers, [242] 858, 859, 862; Personal Explanation, 1750
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Artillery — Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns, Motion for Returns, [241] 1329
India—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1459
Militia Artillery Uniforms, [239] 1195
Criminal Law—Alleged Cruelty, [238] 724, 725, 1032, 1036
Education Department—London School Board Training Ships, [242] 1632
Explosives Act—Storage of Gunpowder on Shipboard—"Pereora," [242] 13
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. [241] 741
Metropolis—Hyde Park—Shelters, [241] 955
Metropolitan Police Force, Address for Return, [242] 629, 636, 1633, 1634, 1751, 1760
National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 408
Parliament—House of Lords—Strangers, [242] 201
Railways—Sir Francis Goldsmid, Accident to, [241] 317
Vivisection, Address for Papers, [241] 753;—Royal Commission, Petitions, 1321, 1324, 1325

**Truro Bishopric Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of London*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª* *May* 31 (No. 103)
Bill withdrawn* *June* 17

**Truro Chapter Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Exeter*)
*l.* Presented; read 1ª* *June* 17 (No. 112)
Read 2ª *June* 20, [240] 1875
Committee; Report *June* 24, [241] 118
Read 3ª* *June* 25
*c.* Read 1º* (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *July* 2 [Bill 234]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *July* 4, 844
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Courtney*); Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2º
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Considered; read 3º *July* 11
*l.* Commons Amendts. (No. 159)
Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 44]

TURKEY
LORDS
*The Eastern Question*
237] *Papers—The Correspondence*, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Jan* 18, 154;—*Greece—The Correspondence*, Question, Observations, Lord Emly, Lord Houghton; Reply, The Earl of Derby; Observations, Earl Granville *Jan* 29, 610;—*Earl of Derby's Note of May* 6, Observations, Earl De La Warr; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *Feb* 4, 913

*Turkey*—LORDS—cont.
*Statement by Her Majesty's Government*, Question, Observations, The Duke of Argyll;
237] Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Jan* 24, 365
*The Dardanelles—Movements of the Fleet—Resignation of Ministers*, Question, The Earl of Sandwich; Answer, The Earl of Beaconsfield; short debate thereon *Jan* 25, 435
*The Mediterranean, Dardanelles, &c.—Movements of the British Fleet*, Questions, Observations, Lord Campbell, Earl Stanhope; Reply, The Earl of Derby; Question, Observations, The Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery; Debate thereon *Jan* 31, 689
*Advance of the Russian Armies*, Questions, Lord Campbell, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 1, 817
*The Armistice and Terms of Peace*, Questions, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 4, 911
*Negotiations for Peace*, Observations, The Earl of Airlie; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 5, 1026
*Advance of the Russians on Constantinople*, Questions, Observations, Lord St. Leonards, Earl Granville; Replies, The Earl of Beaconsfield, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *Feb* 7, 1198
*The Armistice—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople*, Question, Observations, Lord Hammond; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *Feb* 8, 1315
*The Dardanelles—Movements of the Fleet—Postponement of Notice*, Observations, Lord Campbell; Questions, The Earl of Dunraven, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Beaconsfield, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 11, 1420
*Position of Affairs—The British Fleet*, Questions, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 12, 1483
*The Conference—Constantinople—Movements of the Fleet*, Questions, Lord Campbell, Earl Granville, Lord Dunsany; Answers, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 14, 1598
*The Terms of the Armistice—The Treaties of* 1856 *and* 1871, Observations, Lord Campbell *Feb* 15, 1721
*The Armistice—The Treaties of* 1856 *and* 1871, Observations, The Earl of Derby, Earl Granville, Lord Campbell *Feb* 18, 1841
*Movements of the Fleet*, Questions, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 18, 1842
*The British Ambassador at the Porte*, Personal Vindication, Observations, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 18, 1843
*The Occupation of Gallipoli*, Question, The Duke of Argyll; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 19, 1920
238] *The Movements of the Fleet—The Conference*, Observations, Questions, Lord Campbell, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 21, 43
*The Greek Provinces of Turkey*, Notice, The Duke of Argyll; Questions, Lord Emly, Earl Manvers; Answers, The Earl of Derby, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Feb* 25, 262

[cont.

[cont.

*Turkey*—Lords—cont.

*Russia and Turkey—The Terms of Peace,* Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr;
238] Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 26, 371; Questions, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 1, 529; *Mar* 4, 615; *Mar* 18, 1480; *Mar* 19, 1580

*The Turkish Fleet,* Question, Observations, Lord Dorchester; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 28, 441

*The Treaties of* 1856—*Greece,* Observations, The Duke of Argyll; Reply, The Earl of Derby; Debate thereon *Mar* 7, 830

*The Congress,* Questions, Earl De La Warr, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 8, 949

*The Conference—Greece,* Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 11, 1021

*The Conference—The Presidency,* Question, Observations, Earl Stanhope, Lord Campbell, Lord Denman; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 11, 1036

239] *Prince Gortchakoff's Circular and Memorandum,* Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *April* 12, 1219

*The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy—Speech of the Earl of Derby,* Statement, The Marquess of Salisbury; short debate thereon *April* 16, 1362

240] *Negotiations for a Congress,* Question, Viscount Cardwell; Answer, The Marquess of Salisbury; Observations, The Earl of Redesdale *May* 27, 721

*The Congress*

*Acceptance by the Powers,* Ministerial Statement, The Marquess of Salisbury; Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield; short debate thereon *June* 3, 1055

*The Armenian Christians,* Question, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; short debate thereon *June* 6, 1242

*The Treaty of San Stefano,* Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; Observations, The Earl of Harrowby *June* 6, 1247

*Alleged Agreement between England and Russia,* Question, Earl Grey; Answer, The Marquess of Salisbury *June* 3, 1061; Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *June* 17, 1569

241] *Rumoured Defensive Treaty with Turkey,* Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 8, 952

*The Convention between England and Turkey,* Questions, Earl Granville; Answers, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 9, 1050; Question, Observations, Lord Dunsany; Reply, Viscount Cranbrook *July* 16, 1572

*The Congress at Berlin,* Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 11, 1201

*The Congress—The Treaty of Berlin,* Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 15, 1426

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—Lords—cont.

*Congress of Berlin—The Correspondence and Protocols,* Observations, The Earl of Beacons-
241] field *July* 18, 1753

Correspondence relating to the Congress at Berlin, with the Protocols of the Congress, presented (by Command); after long debate, Correspondence and Protocols ordered to lie on the Table [*Turkey,* No. 39 (1878).]

*The Foreign Office—Abstraction of a Document —The Memorandum of Agreement between England and Russia,* Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *July* 1, 480

*The Treaty of Berlin*

242] *The Port of Batoum,* Observations, Viscount Powerscourt *July* 23, 34; Explanation, The Earl of Beaconsfield *July* 25, 202; Personal Explanation, Earl Granville *July* 26, 336

*Alleged Agreement between England and Russia,* Question, Observations, The Earl of Rosebery; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; debate thereon *July* 26, 344

*The Congress at Berlin—The Anglo-Turkish Convention,* Observations, Lord Campbell; debate thereon *July* 29, 479

*Island of Cyprus*

241] *Slavery,* Question, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; Question, Earl Granville; Observations, The Earl of Kimberley; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 11, 1224; Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; short debate thereon *July* 19, 1948

*Sanitary Condition,* Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 15, 1433

*The Financial Arrangements,* Question, Observations, The Earl of Camperdown; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; debate
242] thereon *July* 23, 18

Turkey

COMMONS

*The Eastern Question—The Congress*

*Alleged Triple Alliance,* Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
237] *Jan* 29, 622

*The Eastern Question,* Questions, Mr. Potter, Dr. Kenealy, Mr. E. Jenkins, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 1, 821

*The Eastern Question—A Conference or Congress,* Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 7, 1211

*The Congress—Civil and Religious Liberty in Poland,* Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, 1848

*The Congress,* Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, 1851

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—COMMONS—cont.

238] *The Congress or Conference*, Observations, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, 977; Observations, Sir Robert Peel; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; debate thereon *Mar* 14, 1336; Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 19, 1593; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 15, 1403

*The Treaty between Russia and Turkey—Complete Reference to the Congress*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 15, 1403

*The Congress—Advance of the Russian Army*, Questions, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison, Mr. Onslow; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 1287

*The Congress—Greece*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1047; Questions, Mr. Hanbury; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 15, 1400; *Mar* 18, 1490

*Russia and Turkey—Papers*, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 28, 120

*Further Papers*, Questions, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 29, 204

Question, Observations, The Marquess of Hart-
239] ington; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 1, 288; Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 2, 416; Notice of Question, Mr. Gladstone *April* 3, 475; Questions, Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 4, 521; Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 526; Notice, Mr. Gladstone, 532; Questions, Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 5, 733

240] *Negotiations for a Congress*, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 27, 748

*The Congress—The Armenians*, Notice, Sir Joseph Kennaway *June* 3, 1068;—*The English Representatives—The Armenians*, Questions, Mr. Hayter, Sir John Kennaway; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Bourke *June* 4, 1167

*The Congress—Acceptance by the Powers*, Ministerial Statement, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, 1076

*The Congress—Representation of Greece*, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, 1082; *June* 4, 1168

*The Congress—The Correspondence*, Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Hayter; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 6, 1252

*The Congress of Berlin—The Papers*, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 11, 241] 1245

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—COMMONS—cont.

*The Congress of Berlin*, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, The Chancellor of the
241] Exchequer *July* 18, 1853

*The Congress of Berlin and Anglo-Turkish Convention*, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 19, 1972

*Congress of Berlin—Instructions to the British Plenipotentiary*, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. C. Beckett-Denison, Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr.
242] Bourke *July* 25, 218

*The Congress of Berlin—Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, 228

*The Congress of Berlin—Instructions to Lord Odo Russell, June* 8, 1878, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 26, 389

*The Congress of Berlin—Thessaly*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 29, 518

*Congress of Berlin — Greece*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 12, 1767

*Treaty of Berlin*

*Treaty of Berlin*, Question, Mr. Otway;
241] Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 16, 1581

*Treaty of Berlin—Article* 18, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, 2055

*Treaty of Berlin—Transit Dues in Austria and Turkey*, Question, Mr. Jacob Bright;
242] Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 25, 220

*Treaty of Berlin—The Turkish Indemnity*, Question, Mr. Laing; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 29, 521

*Treaty of Berlin—Bulgaria*, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 29, 526

*Treaty of Berlin — Articles* 2 *and* 61, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 1, 868

*Treaty of Berlin—Roumania*, Observations, Sir George Campbell; short debate thereon *August* 14, 2004

*Treaty of Berlin, Article* 18 — *Reforms in Turkey*, Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 15, 2025

*The Eastern Question—The War*

237] *The Dardanelles—Movements of the Fleet*, Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 28, 534

*Reported Armistice*, Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 29, 624

*The Armistice—Advance of the Russian Forces*, Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 31, 728

*The Armistice*, Questions, Major Nolan, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 4, 926

*The Dardanelles—Entry of the Fleet*, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 7, 1208

[*cont.*

*Turkey—The Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte*—cont.

debate, Moved, the Previous Question (*The Lord Dorchester*); Previous Question put, "Whether the said Question shall be now put?" Resolved in the Negative

*Turkey—The Eastern Question—Greece—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—The Negroponte Correspondence*

Moved, "That this House, having had laid before it the Correspondence between Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople and the Foreign Office, relating to certain charges which had been made against the Right honourable the Member for Greenwich, based on his Letters to a M. Negroponte, views with regret the part taken in the matter by Her Majesty's Ambassador" (*Mr. Evelyn Ashley*) *Mar* 12, [238] 1156; after long debate, Question put; A. 132, N. 206; M. 74 (D. L. 46)

*Turkey—The Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte—The Conference*

Postponement of Motion, Lord Campbell *Mar* 14, [238] 1275

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for any recent diplomatic correspondence with Her Majesty's Government on the terms of peace between Russia and the Porte" (*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) *Mar* 21, 1707; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Parl. Papers—

Papers relating to the Eastern Question, *Turkey*, Nos. 1 to 45

Treaties relating to Black Sea, Dardanelles, and Bosphorus, *Turkey*, No. 16

Turkey and Greece, Nos. 19, 20

Dr. Leslie and others, No. 21

Preliminary Treaty of San Stefano, Nos. 22, 27, 31 [Maps relating thereto, No. 23]

Affairs of Crete, Nos. 28, 35

Treaties relating to Navigation of Danube, No. 29

Affairs of Roumania, No. 30

Thessaly and Epirus, No. 32

Congress at Berlin — Correspondence, No. 33 [Maps relating thereto, No. 37]

Death of Mr. Ogle, No. 34

Convention, Great Britain and Turkey, Nos. 36, 43

Treaty of Berlin, Nos. 38, 44

The Protocols, &c. No. 39

Treaty of Paris, 1856, No. 40

Regulation, Danubian Principalities, 1830, No. 41

Mediterranean Fleet—Orders to Admiral Hornby [1933]

*Turnpike Acts Continuance*

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the Sixth and Seventh Schedules of 'The Annual Turnpike Acts Continuance Act, 1877'" *Jan* 31:—Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Beach, Mr. Wentworth Beaumont, Lord George Cavendish, Mr. George Clive, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Salt, Mr. Spencer Stanhope, and Lord Henry Thynne

**Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. Bill**

(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *July* 8 [Bill 245]
Read 2°* *July* 15
Committee*; Report *July* 18
Read 3°* *July* 22
*l.* Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *July* 23 (No. 170)
Read 2ª* *August* 9
Committee*; Report *August* 12
Read 3ª* *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 16 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 62]

*Turnpike Roads Returns*

Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 9, [241] 1070

**Under Secretaries of State Bill**

(*Mr. Secretary Cross, The Lord Advocate*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *May* 16 [Bill 181]
Read 2°, after short debate *May* 27, [240] 821
Bill withdrawn* *July* 16

**Union Justices (Ireland) Bill** (*Mr. O'Sullivan, Major Nolan, Mr. Richard Power*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 42]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 21, [237] 263; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*); after short debate, Question put; A. 62, N. 223; M. 161 (D. L. 2)
Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day seven months" (*Mr. William Johnston*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 38, N. 138; M. 100 (D. L. 3)
Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for seven months

**Union Officers (Ireland) Bill**

(*Mr. Redmond, Mr. Gray, Dr. Ward, Mr. Fay*)

*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 41]
2R. [Dropped]

*United Kingdom, Trade of the*

Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 5, [242] 1172

*United States*
*Bland Silver Act, The,* Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, [238] 1290
*Consuls—Convention with the United States,* Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 12, [242] 1765
*Treaty of Washington—The Twenty-Second Article—Award of the Fisheries Commissioners,* Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 1, [239] 285; *June* 14, [240] 1492
Correspondence . . . . *P.P.* [2056]

*University Commission—The Medical Professorships*
Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 18, [241] 1843

**University Tests Bill**
(*Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Dodson, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice*)
*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *August* 13 [Bill 305]

*Vaccination Acts*
Questions, Mr. Hopwood, Earl Percy; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 8, [238] 973
*Case of Mr. Abel,* Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 12, [238] 1139
*The Isle of Man—Outbreak of Small Pox,* Questions, Sir James Lawrence, Mr. Ritchie; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 28, [237] 528; Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Jan* 29, 624; Questions, Mr. Hick, Mr. John Bright; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 22, [238] 1840

**Vaccination Law (Penalties) Bill**
(*Mr. Pease, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Leeman*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 74]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 3, [239] 477
After debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Lord Randolph Churchill*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after further short debate, Question put; A. 82, N. 271; M. 189 (D. L. 95)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

**Valuation Bill**
(*Mr. Ramsay, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Joseph Cowen*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 35]
2R., after short debate, Debate adjourned *Feb* 13, [237] 1586
Read 2°* *Mar* 27
Bill withdrawn* *July* 23

**Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Amendment Bill** (*Sir Windham Anstruther, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Ramsay*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 4 [Bill 124]
Read 2°* *Mar* 21
Committee*; Report *June* 4 [Bill 205]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 5
Committee—R.P. *July* 18, [241] 1941
Order for Committee discharged; Bill withdrawn *July* 25, [242] 334

**Valuation of Property Bill.**
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Salt*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 94]
Read 2°, after short debate *June* 6, [240] 1316
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 14, 1494
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no re-adjustment of the system of assessment will be complete or satisfactory to ratepayers until a representative County Board is established, with power of hearing appeals on questions of value, and for securing uniformity of assessment" (*Mr. Clare Read*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate resumed *June* 17, 1624; after debate, Question put; A. 131, N. 107; M. 24 (D. L. 174)
After further debate, main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
Committee—R.P. *June* 21, [241] 21
Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 1, [242] 869
Order for Committee discharged; Bill withdrawn

*Vernacular Press (India) Act, The*
*The Press Commissioner,* Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 3, [240] 1071; Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *June* 27, [241] 321; Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answers, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 1, 494; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 11, 1241
Orders of the Day postponed
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she will be graciously pleased to give directions that all proceedings which may be taken by the authorities under the Indian Vernacular Press Act be reported to the Secretary of State and laid before Parliament from time
242] to time" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *July* 23, 48
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "Lord Lytton improperly obtained the sanction of the Home Government for a measure described as intended to repress seditious newspapers, but really placing every kind of publication at the mercy of the Indian Executive" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *v.*, 69; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 152, N. 208; M. 56; Div. List, A. and N., 127

[*cont*

*Vernacular Press (India) Act*—cont.
Question proposed, "That 'Lord Lytton,' &c." 242]129; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sullivan*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived
Question, "That "Lord Lytton, &c." put, and negatived
Parl. Papers—
The Native Press—Correspondence, &c. . . . . . . [2040] [2077] [2078]
Vernacular Press Act . . . . . . 274

VERNER, Mr. E. W., *Armagh Co.*
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1497; Comm. [242] 274
Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases, 2R. Amendt. [241] 725
Parliament—Business of the House—Saturday Sitting, [242] 392
Removal of Paupers, Res. Amendt. [241] 686
Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment, Comm. [241] 580
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 270, 272
Waste Lands (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [238] 11

*Victoria—The Constitutional Crisis*
Question, Observations, The Earl of Kimberley, The Earl of Carnarvon; Reply, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 15, [238] 1390; Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 15, 1400; Questions, The Earl of Kimberley; Answers, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 21, 1706; *April* 1, [239] 268
Correspondence . . *P.P.* [1982] [1985]

VIVIAN, Mr. H. Hussey, *Glamorganshire*
Aberdeen District Tramways, 3R. [240] 1584, 1592
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 186
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [239] 1682, 1725, 1729
Eastern Affairs, Res. [242] 603
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 18, [241] 894
Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent, [240] 496
Mining Disasters, Res. [241] 96

*Vivisection*
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Return of the names of Hospitals or other places registered for experiments upon living animals under the 39th and 40th Vict. chap. 77; also the number of such experiments from the 1st January, 1877, to 1st January, 1878; and for the Reports of the Inspectors appointed under the Act" (*Earl De La Warr*) *July* 4, [241] 753; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
*The Royal Commission—Petitions*, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, Viscount Cardwell *July* 12, [241] 1321

**Volunteer Corps (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. O'Clery, Major Nolan, Lord Francis Conyngham, Major O'Beirne*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 21 [Bill 85]
2R. [Dropped]

**Voters (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. Biggar, Mr. Patrick Martin, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Fay*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 6]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 13, [237] 1568
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 96, N. 134; M. 38 (D. L. 11)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

**Voters (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill**
(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Butt, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Sullivan*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 65]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 22

WADDY, Mr. S. D., *Barnstaple*
Church of England—Burial Service, [237] 922
Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1935
Merchant Shipping—Eddystone Lighthouse, [238] 1043
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [240] 623
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 532
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [239] 1833, 1839
Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1444
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, [240] 22

WAIT, Mr. W. K., *Gloucester*
Army Enlistment—The Police, [242] 995
Sugar Convention, 1877, [238] 154; [239] 528

WALKER, Lt.-Colonel O. O., *Salford*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 180
Metropolis—New Law Courts, [237] 322

WALLACE, Sir R., *Lisburn*
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1186

*Wallasey Tramways Bill (by Order)*
*c.* Read 3° * *June* 17

WALPOLE, Right Hon. Spencer H., *Cambridge University*
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Mr. Justice Keogh, Charge of, [238] 1952
Parliament—New Writ for Clare County—Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Res. [242] 47
Ritualism, Res. [241] 929
Supply—British Museum, [242] 1261, 1262

WALSH, Hon. A. *Radnorshire*
Public Health—Sanitary Condition of Ascot, [241] 757

WALSINGHAM, Lord
Threshing Machines, 2R. [239] 516, 518

WALTER, Mr. J., *Berkshire*
Burials, Res. [237] 1793
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. [239] 1681
Habitual Drunkards, 2R. [241] 723
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1297

*War and India Offices, The*
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *July* 31, [242] 778

WARD, Dr. M. F., *Galway*
Army—Kaffir Outbreak—Army Surgeons, [237] 1618
Army Medical Department—Candidates, [237] 1849
Borough Franchise (Ireland), 2R. [239] 1966, 1967
Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1992
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 32, Amendt. [238] 329; *cl.* 67, Amendt. 457; *cl.* 68, 463; *cl.* 69, 468; Amendt. 473, 474; *cl.* 99, 493; *add. cl.* 589, 595
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [237] 1954, 1955
Ireland—Endowed Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [240] 1230
Navy Estimates—Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, [238] 1471
Parliament—Order—Disorderly Conduct of a Member, [242] 1389
Parliament—Progress of Public Business, Res. [241] 1477
Parliament—Public Business, Nomination of Select Committee, [238] 365
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 188
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 295; Comm. 1696; *cl.* 1, [239] 1850; *cl.* 6, [240] 446
Supplementary Estimate, Report, [237] 1450
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [239] 239
Queen's University in Ireland, [238] 1566

**Waste Lands (Ireland) Bill**
(*Mr. MacCarthy, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Downing, Mr. Shaw*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 18 [Bill 18]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 20, [238] 1
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Verner*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 118, N. 147; M. 29 (D. L. 22)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

**Watch Cases (Hall Marking) Bill**
(*Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Eaton, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Torr, Mr. Torrens*)
*c.* Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 13 [Bill 128]
Read 2°*, and referred to the Select Committee on Gold and Silver (Hall Marking)

*Waterford, Dungarvan, and Lismore Railway (Extension) Bill (Lords) (by Order)*
*c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 17, [240] 128
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Delahunty*; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn; after further short debate, Question put; A. 222, N. 76; M. 146 (D. L. 140)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

WATERLOW, Sir S. H., *Maidstone*
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 984; 3R. 1435; Consid. 1518
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 47, [238] 338; *cl.* 65, 346; *cl.* 69, 472; *cl.* 100, 498
Local Government and Taxation in London, Res. [239] 709
Tenant Right (Ireland), Comm. [240] 1032

*Watermen and Lightermen of the Thames—Petition*
Question, Captain Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 7, [238] 875

WATKIN, Sir E. W., *Hythe*
Brewers' Licences, Res. [242] 476
Customs—Outport Clerks, [239] 1884
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 47, [238] 337
Inland Revenue—Brewers' Licence Tax, [240] 1340
Judicial Appointments, Res. [239] 1927
Naval Stations in the Pacific—Esquimalt Harbour, [239] 1283
Naval Strength of the Country—Arming the Mercantile Marine, [239] 853
Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875—Violet Powder, [240] 1072
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power) Bills, Res. [239] 1279

WAVENEY, Lord
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Army and Militia Reserves, [242] 1295
  India—Indian Staff Corps, [241] 1449, 1452
  Marking Deserters, [239] 111
  Mutiny Act, [238] 1833, 1836
Army—Artillery—Muzzle-loading and Breech-loading Rifled Guns, Motion for Returns, [241] 1325
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia Artillery, [240] 1061
  Militia Artillery Uniforms, [239] 1193
  Militia—Fines for Drunkenness, [242] 1297
Army Reserve—Allowances to Families of Reserve Men, Address for Correspondence, [240] 10
Ballymena and Larne Railway, 3R. [241] 102
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 1R. [241] 19; 2R. 415
Projectiles—Shells and Armour Plates, Motion for Returns, [239] 1273

## *WAYS AND MEANS*

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

*Extra Expenditure*, Questions, Mr. Childers; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 24, [241] 124; *July* 4, 757

*Financial Schedules*, Question, Mr. Hermon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 1, [239] 287

*Inland Revenue*

*Brewers' Licence Tax*, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 7, [240] 1340

*Customs and Inland Revenue Act—Depreciation of Machinery*, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 1, [242] 864

*Distributor of Stamps in Kerry*, Question, Mr. Blennerhassett; Answer, Sir William Hart Dyke *Mar* 28, [239] 115

*Dog Tax — Useless Dogs*, Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 22, [237] 317; Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, [238] 1044; Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 6, [239] 1449; Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 27, [241] 323

*Dog Tax (Ireland)*, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 7, [239] 1517

*Inhabited House Duty*, Question, Mr. Hankey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 21, [237] 249

*Out-Door Licences*, Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 20, [240] 1884

*Railway Passenger Duty*, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 13, [242] 1869

*National Debt, The—The New Sinking Fund*, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 8, [239] 856

*The Customs Department—Appointment of Sir Charles Du Cane*, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 20, [240] 1887

*The Financial Statement*, Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, [238] 976; Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Mundella; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 5, [239] 668

*Tobacco Duties Acts*, 1830—*The Cultivation of Tobacco in Ireland*, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 19, [241] 1968

Inland Revenue Returns, 1866 to 1877 . . . . . . . . *P.P.* 120

## *WAYS AND MEANS*

Resolved, That this House will, upon Wednesday, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Jan* 21

Considered in Committee *Feb* 11, [237] 1452

[*cont.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*cont.*

Moved, "That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to raise any sum, not exceeding £6,000,000, by an issue of Exchequer Bonds, Exchequer Bills, or Treasury Bills;" after short debate, Motion agreed to

Resolutions thereon; Resolutions reported *Feb* 13

[See titles *Consolidated Fund* (£6,000,000) *Bill—Exchequer Bonds, &c. Bill*]

Considered in Committee *Feb* 27

(1.) Resolved, That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Commissioners of Her Majesty Treasury be authorised to raise any sum of money, not exceeding £1,000,000, by an issue of Exchequer Bonds

(2.) Resolved, That the principal of all Exchequer Bonds which may be so issued shall be paid off at par, at any period not exceeding five years from the date of such Bonds

(3.) Resolved, That the interest of such Exchequer Bonds shall be payable half-yearly, and shall be charged upon and issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof

Resolutions reported *Feb* 28

[See title Exchequer Bonds (£1,000,000) Bill]

Considered in Committee *Mar* 19

(1.) Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March, 1877 and 1878, the sum of £1,537,047 6*s*. 5*d*. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom

(2.) Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £12,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom

Resolutions reported *Mar* 20

Considered in Committee *April* 4, [239] 556—FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER on moving the first Resolution,

"That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Duties of Customs now charged on Tea shall continue to be levied and charged on and after the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, until the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine, on importation into Great Britain or Ireland (that is to say): on

| | | *s.* | *d.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tea . . . . . | the lb. | 0 | 6" |

After long debate, Resolution agreed to

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the following Duties of Customs shall be charged on and after the 5th day of April 1878, on Tobacco imported into the United Kingdom, in lieu of the Duties now payable thereon (that is to say):

[*cont.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*cont.*

Tobacco Manufactured, viz. :—

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Segars . . . the lb. | 0 | 5 | 4 |
| Cavendish or Negrohead the lb. | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| Snuff containing more than 13lbs. of moisture in every 100lbs. weight thereof . . the lb. | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Snuff not containing more than 13lbs. of moisture in every 100lbs. weight thereof . . the lb. | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| Being Cavendish or Negrohead Manufactured in Bond . . . the lb. | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Other Manufactured Tobacco . . the lb. | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Tobacco Unmanufactured, viz. :— | | | |
| Containing 10lbs. or more of moisture in every 100lbs. weight thereof the lb. | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| Containing less than 10lbs. of moisture in every 100lbs. weight thereof the lb. | 0 | 3 | 10" |

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), 605 ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 204, N. 24 ; M. 180 (D. L. 96)

(3.) Resolved, That, in lieu of the Drawback now payable on Tobacco, there shall be allowed on and after the 5th day of June 1878, a Drawback on the exportation, or deposit in a bonded warehouse to be used as ship's stores, of Tobacco, of Three Shillings and Seven Pence per pound, subject to the provisions of "The Manufactured Tobacco Act, 1863," (26 Vic. c. 7) for ascertaining the amount of Drawback payable, and under such regulations as the Commissioners of Customs may see fit to adopt"

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there shall be charged, collected, and paid for one year, commencing on the 6th day of April, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, in respect of all Property, Profits, and Gains mentioned or described as chargeable in the Act of the sixteenth and seventeenth years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter thirty-four, the following Duties of Income Tax (that is to say) :

For every Twenty Shillings of the annual value or amount of Property, Profits, and Gains chargeable under Schedules (A) (C) (D) or (E) of the said Act, the Duty of Five Pence ;

And for every Twenty Shillings of the annual value of the occupation of Lands, Tenements, Hereditaments, and Heritages chargeable under Schedule (B) of the said Act,—

In England, the Duty of Two Pence Halfpenny ;

In Scotland and Ireland respectively, the Duty of One Penny Three Farthings ;

Subject to the provisions contained in section one hundred and sixty-three of the Act of the fifth and sixth years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter thirty-five, for the exemption of persons whose income is less than One Hundred and Fifty Pounds, and in section eight of 'The Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1876,' for the relief of persons whose income is less than Four Hundred Pounds ;" after short debate, Resolution agreed to

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, on and after the first day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, in lieu of the Annual Duty of Five Shillings imposed by the Act of the thirtieth and thirty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter five, there shall be granted and charged the Annual Duty of Seven Shillings and Sixpence for and in respect of every Dog of the age of Two Months or upwards, for which a Licence to keep the same shall be taken out under the said Act, such Licence terminating on the thirty-first day of December following the day on which it is granted ;" after short debate, Motion withdrawn

(5.) Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Laws relating to the Customs and the Inland Revenue

Resolutions reported *April* 5, 743

First Resolution agreed to

Second Resolution read 2° ; Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution ;" after short debate, Question put ; A. 100, N. 17 ; M. 83 (D. L. 100

Subsequent Resolutions agreed to

Bill ordered (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) ; read 1°* [Bill 146]

[See title *Customs and Inland Revenue Bill*]

Considered in Committee *April* 11, 1105

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, on and after the first day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, in lieu of the Annual Duty of Five Shillings imposed by the Act of the thirtieth and thirty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter five, there shall be granted and charged the Annual Duty of Seven Shillings and Sixpence for and in respect of every Dog of the age of Two Months or upwards, for which a Licence to keep the same shall be taken out under the said Act, such Licence terminating on the thirty-first day of December following the day on which it is granted"

After debate, Amendt., to leave out "Two," and insert "Six" (*Mr. Monk*) ; Question proposed, "That 'Two,' &c. ;" after further debate, Question put, and negatived ; the word "Six" inserted

After further debate, main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Resolution reported *April* 12, 1239

After short debate, Resolution agreed to

Instruction to the Committee on the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, That they have power to make provision therein in pursuance of the said Resolution

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*

240] Considered in Committee *May* 23

(1.) Resolved, That, towards raising the supply granted to Her Majesty, the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorised to raise any sum of money, not exceeding £1,500,000, by an issue of Exchequer Bonds

(2.) Resolved, That the Principal of all Exchequer Bonds which may be so issued shall be paid off at par, at any period not exceeding three years from the date of such Bonds

(3.) Resolved, That the Interest of such Exchequer Bonds shall be payable half-yearly, and shall be charged upon and issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof

(4.) Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £6,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom

Resolutions reported *May* 24

Considered in Committee *May* 29

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £1,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom

Resolution reported, and agreed to *May* 30

Instruction to the Committee on the Consolidated Fund (No. 3) Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution

242] Considered in Committee *July* 29

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £14,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom

Resolution reported *August* 30

Considered in Committee *August* 6, 1303

Moved, "That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorised to raise any sum not exceeding Two Million Pounds by the creation of securities chargeable on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Resolution agreed to

Moved, "That the said Commissioners may raise such sum by Exchequer Bonds, Exchequer Bills, or Treasury Bills, or by either, or by all of such modes;" Resolution agreed to

Moved, "That the principal of all Exchequer Bonds which may be so issued shall be paid off at par, at the expiration of any period not exceeeding three years from the date of such Bonds," 1364

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. E. Jenkins*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Resolution agreed to

Moved, "That the interest of all such Exchequer Bonds shall be paid half-yearly, and shall be charged upon and issued ont of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof," 1366; after debate, Resolution agreed to

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*

Resolutions reported *August* 7

Considered in Committee *August* 8

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £21,556,807 7*s.* 5*d.* be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom

Resolution reported *August* 9

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

Grants out of the Consolidated Fund.

| | £ s. d. | £ s. d. |
|---|---|---|
| For the service of the years ending 31st March 1877 and 1878; | | |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 1 ... ... ... ... ... | | 6,000,000 0 0 |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 9 ... ... ... ... ... | | 1,537,047 6 5 |
| For the service of the year ending 31st March 1879; viz. | | |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 9 ... ... | 12,000,000 0 0 | |
| Under Act 41 Vic. cap. 21 .. ... | 7,500,000 0 0 | |
| Under Act 41 & 42 Vict. c. 45 | 14,500,000 0 0 | |
| Under this Act ... | 21,556,807 7 5 | |
| | | 55,556,807 7 5 |
| Total ... | | £63,093,854 13 10 |

*Ways and Means—Brewers' Licences*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "licences to conduct recognized trades are unjust and impolitic in principle, and that the licence tax inflicted on the interests of the Brewers ought to be repealed whenever the state of the Revenue will permit the remission of taxation" (*Sir Edward Watkin*) *v.* [242] 476; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate [House counted out]

*Ways and Means—Customs—The Wine Duties*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 1, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present system of levying Customs Duties on Wines" (*Mr. William Cartwright*) *v.*, [238] 559; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 85, N. 65; M. 20 (D. L. 37)

*Ways and Means—Income Tax*
Moved, "That, considering the successive and inevitable re-enactments since 1842 of 'The Property and Income Tax,' it is expedient that, without needless delay, the unequal incidence of the Tax be corrected, and that by the adjustment of its provisions the Income Tax be adapted for permanent use in the levy of Imperial Revenue" (*Mr. Hubbard*) *Feb* 26, [238] 384; after debate, Motion withdrawn

**Weights and Measures Bill**
(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Attorney General*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 111]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 4, [238] 719
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *Mar* 14, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir George Bowyer, Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Staveley Hill, Lord Lindsay, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Pell, Mr. Edward Stanhope, Mr. Stanton, and Mr. Whitwell
Report of Select Comm. * *April* 5 (*P.P.* 133)
Committee (*on re-comm.*) deferred, after short debate *June* 17, [240] 1673 [Bill 143]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 21
Committee; Report *June* 27, [241] 408
Considered * *July* 9 [Bill 229]
Read 3° * *July* 12
*l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Henniker*) *July* 15 (No. 161)
Read 2ª, after short debate *July* 22, 2038
Committee *July* 25, [242] 208
Report * *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 29
*c.* Lords Amendts. [Bill 283]
*l.* Royal Assent *August* 8 [41 & 42 *Vict.* c. 49]

*Wellesley, Hon. Colonel—Appointment as First Secretary of Embassy at Vienna*
Question, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, [239] 1714
[See titles *Army, and Diplomatic Service*]

WESTMINSTER, Duke of
National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, [239] 407

WHARNCLIFFE, Earl of
Navy — H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, [239] 646
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, [237] 7, 18, 49
Science and Art—Museum of Casts from the Antique, [238] 1937, 1945

WHEELHOUSE, Mr. W. St. James, *Leeds*
Admiralty, Re-organization of the—Report of Committee, [242] 1177
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. [238] 1579; [239] 1358; [242] 1712
[*cont.*

WHEELHOUSE, Mr. W. St. James—*cont.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [241] 172; Comm. 1001
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1571
County Government, Leave, [237] 608
Criminal Law Evidence Amendment, 2R. [237] 681
Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance), 2R. [238] 1918
Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote), 2R. [237] 1483; [240] 1323; Comm. [242] 1713
Elementary Education Act—Superior Elementary Education, [239] 1371
Endowed Schools (Leeds Poors Estate), Motion for an Address, [238] 1662, 1664
Factories and Workshops, 2R. [237] 1473, 1480; Comm. Schedule 2, Amendt. [238] 885, 886, 887
Highways, Comm. [241] 457
Income Tax, Res. [238] 398
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [237] 494
Mercantile Marine—American Officers, [237] 253
Merchant Shipping Act, 1854—Certificates of Masters and Mates, [237] 252
Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Layard—Negroponte Correspondence, Res. [238] 1185
Parliament — Public Petitions Committee — Fictitious Petitions, Report, [238] 1974
Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. Amendt. [241] 251
Poor Law — Dolgelly Guardians — Care of Children, [240] 1493
Poor Law—Election of Poor Law Guardians, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 549
Rating of Towns (Ireland), 2R. [240] 464
Real Estate Intestacy, 2R. [241] 1180
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [237] 286; Comm. 1697, 1708; *add. cl.* [240] 876; Consid. [241] 1271; *add. cl.* 1301; 3R. [242] 1733
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 954
County Courts, [240] 975
Friendly Societies, [239] 1628
Land Registry, [240] 986
Local Government Board, &c. [239] 1638
Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 989
Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1241, 1255
Tramways—Use of Mechanical Power, [240] 747
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [241] 56
Ways and Means, Comm. [239] 1160

WHITBREAD, Mr. S., *Bedford*
County Government, Leave, [237] 605; 2R. 1891
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 25, [238] 317; *cl.* 27, 324; *cl.* 65, 345; *cl.* 100, 497
Parliament—Privileges of Members, [240] 654
Prisons Act—Letters to Prisoners' Friends, [239] 959
Supplementary Estimate, Personal Explanation, [237] 1064, 1065
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 266

Williams, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) [Salaries, Compensations, &c.], Comm. [241] 1601
Eastern Question—Straits of the Dardanelles, [238] 1488;—Fleet in, 1754
Hertford College—University Tests Act, 1871, [239] 1593
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1219
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 955
Treaties of London and Paris, 1841, 1856, and 1871—British Fleet, [238] 1394

Wilmot, Sir H., *Derbyshire, S.*
Army Promotion and Retirement—Regimental Ranks of the Line, [238] 653

Wilmot, Sir J. E., *Warwickshire, S.*
American Mail Service, Res. [238] 1651
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [237] 1946
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1575
County Courts Jurisdiction (No. 2), 2R. [238] 1478
Criminal Law—Directors of Criminal Investigations, [238] 1145
Prosecution of Crime, [242] 1526
Eastern Question—War—Russians before Gallipoli, [238] 1145
Intermediate Education (Ireland), 2R. [241] 1531
Libel Law Amendment, 2R. [238] 1477
Metropolis—Newspaper Kiosques, [237] 1729
Mine Accidents—Life Brigades in Mining Districts, [238] 1490
National Portrait Gallery, Res. [238] 771
Navy—Rams of Iron-clads, [240] 1168
Navy—H.M.S. "Beagle"—Execution of a Native of Tanna—Judicial Powers of Naval Commanders, Res. [242] 1204
Northern Circuit—Assizes, [240] 39
Supply—Consular Services, [240] 1283, 1286
Diplomatic Services, [238] 1609
Turkey—Murder of Mr. Ogle, Res. [242] 1988

Wilson, Mr. C. H., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [238] 135
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1308

*Windward Islands*
*Barbadoes*, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 5, [242] 1178
*Taxation in St. Kitts*, Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 30, [242] 641

Winmarleigh, Lord
Army—Marking Deserters, [239] 110, 111
Factories and Workshops, 3R. [240] 3
Noxious Vapours Commission, Report, [240] 124

Wolff, Sir H. D., *Christchurch*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 2, [241] 1631
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
Bessarabia, [237] 1735
Black Sea, &c. [237] 156
[*cont.*

Wolff, Sir H. D.—*cont.*
Bulgaria—Election of a Prince, [239] 1287, 1288
Conference—Russia and Bessarabia, [239] 476, 527
Congress or Conference, [238] 978, 1047, 1355, 1361
Notice of Motion, [239] 1592
Peace, Conditions of, [237] 1535
Russia and Turkey—Treaties of 1856 and 1871, [238] 536
Treaty of San Stefano, [239] 201
Foreign Office—Temporary Writers, [241] 495
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [237] 302, 304; Comm. Amendt. 816
Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, [239] 292; Motion for an Address, 918, 1012
Military Forces of the Crown—Indian Contingent, [240] 625
Military Forces of the Crown, Res. [240] 573
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 942, 2062
Racecourses (Licensing), Comm. *cl.* 1, [240] 1486; *cl.* 6, Motion for reporting Progress, 1488; Amendt. *ib.*; Preamble, 1489
South America—British Cemetery at Monte Video, [240] 1886
Supplementary Estimate, [237] 988; Report, 1446
Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1265
Stationery Office, [239] 1781, 1782, 1798; [240] 42
Woods, Forests, &c. Office of, [240] 86, 88
Turkey—Roumelia, Atrocities in, [241] 1245
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [237] 267

**Women's Disabilities Removal Bill**
(*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Jacob Bright*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 12]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 19, [240] 1800
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Hanbury*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 140, N. 220; M. 80
Div. List, A. and N. 1872
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

Woodd, Mr. B. T., *Knaresborough*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. [239] 1292

**Wormwood Scrubs Regulation Bill**
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Colonel Loyd Lindsay*)
*c.* Ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 243]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 31

WHITWELL, Mr. J., *Kendal*
Army Estimates—Regular Forces in India, Home Charges, [242] 1422
  Warlike Stores, [242] 1410, 1412
Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. [238] 1134
China—Chefoo Treaty, [242] 1438
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 2R. [242] 1848
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 10, [241] 1856; *cl.* 15, 1882; *cl.* 16, 1886; *cl.* 21, 1920; *cl.* 30, 2074, 2077; *cl.* 31, 2081; *cl.* 34, 2085; *cl.* 37, 2087; *cl.* 38, *ib.*; *cl.* 53, 2092; *cl.* 55, 2098; *cl.* 59, 2137; *cl.* 71, [242] 180; Postponed *cl.* 5, 192; Consid. *cl.* 35, 1278
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [239] 1577
Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 579
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [239] 1186; Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1304, 1313, 1316; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1348, 1350
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, [239] 1095
Eastern Question—Conference, [237] 1211
  Treaty of Berlin—Article 18—Reforms in Turkey, [242] 2025
Ecclesiastical Buildings, (Fire Insurance), 2R. [238] 1921
Egypt—Suez Canal—Return of the Rates, &c. [239] 287
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [242] 1953
Factories and Workshops, Comm. *cl.* 5, [238] 93; *cl.* 10, 96; *cl.* 27, 318; *cl.* 52, 340
Freshwater Fish Protection, Comm. *cl.* 7, [241] 1035
Gibraltar—Trade Ordinance, [237] 251
Highways, Comm. *cl.* 11, [241] 477, 479; *cl.* 21, 1087, 1089; *cl.* 31, 1107; *add. cl.* 1156, 1338, 1349, 1358, 1366
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Financial Statement, Comm. [242] 1911
Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1531; Instruction, Amendt. 1723, 1724, 1726
Metropolis — Thames Embankment — New Opera House, [242] 1638
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, [239] 1519
Municipal Corporations Acts, 2R. [241] 1031
Mutiny, Comm. [238] 2031; *cl.* 66, [239] 149
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [242] 1584
  Freight, &c. on Account of the Army Department, [238] 1476
Parliamentary Reporting, Nomination of Select Committee, [240] 1677
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. [238] 2032
Post Office (Telegraph Department) Charges, [242] 1529
Ritualism, Res. [241] 933
Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [242] 776
South Africa—War Expenditure, [239] 1373
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, &c. [240] 963
  Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, [241] 1548
  Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [238] 1618
  Civil Service Commission, [239] 1618
  Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh, Purchase of, [238] 1526

[*cont.*

WHITWELL, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, [239] 1620, 1625
  Consular Services, [240] 1287, 1289
  Convict Establishments, [240] 1006
  County Prisons, &c. (Great Britain), [240] 1011
  Criminal Prosecutions—Sheriffs' Expenses, &c. [240] 945
  Diplomatic Services, [242] 1496
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [240] 1280
  Foreign Office, [239] 1486, 1490
  Home Office, [239] 1483
  House of Lords, Offices of the, [239] 1455, 1459, 1463
  Land Judges' Offices, Ireland, [242] 1271
  Land Registry, Amendt. [240] 980, 988
  Law Charges, [238] 1558
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [242] 1262, 1265
  Local Government Board, &c. [238] 1550; [239] 1639
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, Motion for reporting Progress, [242] 1423
  Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [240] 996
  Police Courts of London and Sheerness, [240] 990
  Post Office Telegraph Disallowances, [238] 1623
  Privy Council for Trade, &c., Committee of, [239] 1608
  Privy Council Office, [239] 1491, 1492
  Public Education in England and Wales, [242] 1251
  Public Offices Site, [238] 1540
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, [240] 671
  Queen's Bench, &c. [240] 968
  Royal Palaces, [238] 1518
  Temporary Commissions, [238] 1615
  Wellington Monument, [238] 1537
  Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [240] 89, 92
Telegraphs, 2R. [241] 1941, 2057
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1634; *cl.* 8, [241] 49
Ways and Means, Comm. [242] 1369
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. [239] 562, 1163
Weights and Measures, 2R. [238] 720; Comm. *cl.* 1, [241] 409

WHITWORTH, Mr. B., *Kilkenny*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [237] 1695; [239] 325

WILLIAMS, Mr. B. T., *Carmarthen*
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences), [240] 1881
Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1498; *cl.* 16, [241] 61, 62

WILLIAMS, Mr. W., *Denbigh, &c.*
Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. [239] 1515
Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Tithes Commutation, Consid. [242] 984, 990

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—Commons—*cont.*

*Insurrection in Crete*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
241] *July* 1, 499; Observations, Mr. Monk, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Bourke; Observations, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *July* 4, 813

*Crete and Mitylene*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 8, 957

*Atrocities in Roumelia*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 11, 1245

*Slavery and the Slave Trade*, Questions, Mr. Baxter, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *July* 11, 1247

*Free Trade*, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 15, 1468

*The Asiatic Dominions of the Sultan*, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 15, 1469

*Reported Conspiracy against the Sultan*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 16, 1580

*Tunis and Tripoli*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 16, 1580

*The Mediterranean Fleet—Detention of British Seamen*, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 18, 1852; *July* 19, 1971

*Reported Firing on a Boat's Crew by the Russians*, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 22, 2057

*Russian Troops in Turkey*, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, 2058

*Unsecured Creditors*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 2,
242] 993

*Slavery*, Withdrawal of Motion, Observations, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *August* 5, 1215

*Turkey and Russia—Bulgaria*, Question, Mr. Bruce; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 8, 1530

*Alleged Outrages in Thessaly*, Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 14, 1949

*Asia Minor—The Lazes*, Question, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 15, 2021

*Crete*, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 15, 2021

*The Papers*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 16, 2087

*Turkey—Eastern Affairs*

Moved, "That, whilst this House has learned with satisfaction that the troubles which have arisen in the East of Europe have been terminated by the Treaty of Berlin without a further recourse to arms, and rejoices in the extension of the liberty and self-government of some of the populations of European Turkey, this House regrets:—

"That it has not been found practicable to deal in a satisfactory manner with the claims of the Kingdom of Greece, and of the Greek subjects of the Porte:

[*cont.*

*Turkey—Eastern Affairs*—cont.

"That by the assumption under the Anglo-Turkish Convention of a sole guarantee of the integrity of the remaining territories of Turkey in Asia, the Military liabilities of this Country have been unnecessarily extended:

"That the undefined engagements entered into by Her Majesty's Government in respect of the better administration of those Provinces have imposed heavy responsibilities on the State, whilst no sufficient means have been indicated for securing their fulfilment:

"And that such engagements have been entered into, and responsibilities incurred, without the previous knowledge of Parliament" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *July* 29,
242] 527

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for communicating to this House the Treaty of Berlin, the Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, and the Convention between Great Britain and Turkey; assuring Her Majesty that this House has learnt with deep satisfaction the termination of the late unhappy War, and the conclusion of a Treaty between the Great Powers of Europe; and expressing an earnest hope that the arrangements made and sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government may, under the blessing of Providence, avail to preserve Peace, to ameliorate the condition of large populations in the East, and to maintain the interest of this Empire" (*Mr. Plunket*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Viscount Sandon*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *July* 30, 644; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Lowe*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *August* 1, 871; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Lord Elcho*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *August* 2, 998; after long debate, Question put; A. 195, N. 338; M. 143

Div. List, A. and N., 1121

Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Address to be presented by Privy Councillors

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *August* 12, 1761

*Turkey—The Eastern Question—Russia and the Porte*

Moved to resolve, That in the opinion of this House neutrality, whether conditional or absolute, in no way prohibits Her Majesty's Government from adopting such measures as are necessary to conform to the Treaties of 1856, and to guard Constantinople against an hostile occupation (*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) *Jan* 28, [237] 508; after short

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—Commons—cont.

*Roumania*, Question, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Answer, The Chancellor of the
237] Exchequer *Feb* 4, 925

*Alleged Outrages in Bulgaria*, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 4, 925;—*Religious Persecution in Bulgaria*, Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 5, 1054

*The Insurrection in Bosnia—The Herzegovina, &c.*, Question, Mr. Ashbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 4, 927

*Laws of Neutrality*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 5, 1051

*Alleged Alliance of Russia and Turkey*, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 8, 1324

*The Baltic Sea*, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 8, 1324

*Russian Sailors*, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, 1733

*The War—Austrian Interests*, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, 1733

*Bessarabia*, Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Courtney, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Goldsmid; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, 1735

*British Subjects in Constantinople*, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 31, 723; Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 18, 1847

*Russia—Colonel Wellesley's Despatches*, Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Monk *Feb* 18, 1852;—*Poles in Turkey*, Questions, Mr. Owen Lewis, Mr. John Bright; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 15, 1730

*Ill-treatment of English Doctors*, Question, Sir Joseph M‘Kenna; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 19, 1922

238] *Turkey—Crete*, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 21, 60

*British Subjects at Constantinople*, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 28, 452

*Appointment of Lord Napier and Sir Garnet Wolseley to Commands*, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 28, 453

*The Danube Commission*, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 4, 636

*Russia and Turkey—The British Embassy*, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 5, 758

*Russia and Turkey — Alleged Execution of Polish Doctors*, Question, Sir Frederick Perkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 5, 758

*Turkey—Greek Refugees*, Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 7, 873

*Turkey—Greeks in Bulgaria*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 14, 1289

*The War—Treatment of English Doctors by the Russians*, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 14, 1292

*Turkey*—Commons—*cont.*

*The Turkish Loan of* 1855, Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, The Chancellor of the
238] Exchequer *Mar* 19, 1594

*Turkey—Insurrection in the Greek Provinces*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1748

*Circular Remonstrance of Prince Gortchakoff* (1856), Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 21, 1754

*Affairs of Crete*, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 25, 1955

*The Dalmatian Frontier*, Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 25, 1957

*The Maps*, Observations, Mr. Newdegate, Mr.
239] Speaker *Mar* 29, 206

*Russia and Roumania—Sir H. Elliot's Despatch*, *April* 13, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 5, 671

*Crete — The Correspondence*, Observations, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Observations, Mr. Monk; Reply, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 29, 217; Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Monk; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 16, 1372; — *The Insurrection*, Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. John Bright; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 5, 667

*Murder of Mr. Ogle*, Question, Sir Charles Mills; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 5, 666; Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answers, Mr. Bourke *May* 9, 1596

*Russia and Turkey — English Holders of Turkish Bonds*, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, 960

*The Greek Provinces—Thessaly*, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, 1093

*Election of a Prince of Bulgaria*, Notice of Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff *April* 15, 1287

*The Seaport of Batoum*, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 16, 1366

*Circassians in Syria*, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 10, 1691

*Murder of Mr. Ogle*, Question, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answer, The Chancellor of the
240] Exchequer *May* 16, 25; Question, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 3, 1083; Observations, Mr. H. Samuelson; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 14, 1561; Question, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Bourke *June* 17, 1612

*Crete*, Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 20, 255

*The Turkish Loan of* 1855, Questions, Mr. Dodson; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 30, 929

*The British Fleet in the Sea of Marmora*, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 6, 1256

*Crete—Employment of Bashi-Bazouks*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, The Chancellor
241] of the Exchequer *June* 27, 329

*The Mohammedan Population of Bulgaria*, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 1, 488

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—Commons—*cont.*

*The Negotiations*

Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, The Chancellor of the
239] Exchequer *May* 6, 1420

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Fawcett*); after debate, Motion withdrawn

Notices of Motions, Mr. Chamberlain, Captain Pim *May* 7, 1517

Observation, Mr. Chamberlain; Notices of Motions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Fawcett *May* 9, 1592

*Policy of the Government—The Indian Contingent*, Observations, Mr. Rylands; debate thereon *May* 27, 762

*Alleged Agreement between England and Russia*, Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 14, 1493; Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 17, 1614

*Rumoured Defensive Treaty with Turkey*, Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross
241] *July* 8, 965

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention*

*The Convention between England and Turkey*, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 9, 1069

*The Convention with Turkey—Money Vote*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 12, 1335

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention*, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Dillwyn; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 16, 1578

*Annex to the Anglo-Turkish Treaty*, Notice of Question, Mr. Rylands *July* 22, 2050

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention—The Tribute of Cyprus*, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, 2051

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention—The Despatch of May* 30, Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 22, 2062

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention*, Questions, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of
242] the Exchequer *July* 23, 38

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention—Government of Cyprus*, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 23, 40

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention—The Negotiations*, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, 227

*The Anglo-Turkish Agreement—Production of Papers*, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, 230

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention*, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 2, 996

*Anglo-Turkish Convention*, Observations, Mr. Fawcett *August* 6, 1302

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention*, Observations, Mr. Fawcett; short debate thereon *August* 8, 1555

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—Commons—*cont.*

*The Anglo-Turkish Convention—Reforms in Asia Minor*, Question, Observations, Mr. E. Jenkins; Reply, Mr. Bourke *August* 16,
[242] 2088

*Russia and Turkey—The War Indemnity*, Questions, Mr. Otway; Answers, The Chan-
241] cellor of the Exchequer *July* 18, 1845

*Eastern Affairs—The Marquess of Hartington's Resolutions*, Notice of Amendments, Dr. Kenealy, Mr. Plunket *July* 22, 2049

*Alleged Treaty between Austria, Germany, and Russia*, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 26,
242] 390

*The Island of Cyprus*

241] *Occupation and Revenues*, Questions, Major Nolan, Mr. B. Samuelson, Sir Alexander Gordon, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answers, Colonel Stanley, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 11, 1242

*Indian Troops in Cyprus*, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Colonel Stanley *July* 22, 2054

242] *Sovereignty and Administration*, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 26, 387

*Health of the Troops*, Questions, Mr. Monk, Sir William Harcourt; Answers, Colonel Stanley *August* 14, 1946; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 15, 2023; Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, Colonel Stanley *August* 16, 2089

*The Tithes and Taxes*, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 15, 2015

Miscellaneous Questions (*General*)

237] *Turkey and Greece*, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 21, 254; —*The Correspondence*, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 29, 624

*The Reports of Consular Officers*, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 25, 463

*Present Position of H.M. Government*, Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *Jan* 25, 464

*The Suez Canal*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 28, 530

*Crete*, Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 29, 620; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 4, 927; Question, Observations, Lord Colchester, The Duke of Argyll; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 5, 1035; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 5, 1050

*Telegraphic Communication in Turkey*, Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 31, 726

*Greeks, The—Correspondence of Mr. Gladstone* (*M. Negroponte*), Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 31, 727

[*cont.*

*urkey*—Commons—*cont.*

*The Armistice*, Question, Colonel Barne; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
37] *Feb* 7, 1210

*The Supplementary Vote—Occupation of Constantinople by the Russians*, Questions, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *Feb* 7, 1211

*The Armistice—Despatch of the Fleet to Constantinople—Entry of the Fleet*, Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Bright, Sir John Kennaway, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 8, 1325

*The Dardanelles—Movements of the Fleet*, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 11, 1424; Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 12, 1534

*Constantinople — Movements of the Fleet*, Questions, Mr. E. Jenkins, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Lawrence Palk, Mr. Lowe, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, 1621; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, 1734

*The Armistice—Russian Forces within the Neutral Zone*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, 1851

*The Eastern Question—The Black Sea, Bosphorus, and Dardanelles*

*Treaties, &c., relating to*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 18, 156

*The Black Sea Ports*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 4, 924

*Blockade in the Black Sea*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 5, 1057

*Blockade of the Black Sea*, Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 7, 1205; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 8, 1322

*Trade in the Black Sea, &c.*, Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 14, 1621

38] *Occupation of Gallipoli*, Questions, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 21, 62;—*The Russians before Gallipoli*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 12, 1145

*Navigation of the Danube*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 1, 539

*The Straits of the Dardanelles*, Question, Mr. Watkin Williams; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 1488

*The Fleet in the Dardanelles*, Questions, Mr. Watkin Williams, Lord Elcho; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1754

*The Russian Conditions of Peace*, 1877—*Despatch of the Earl of Derby, Dec.* 25, 1877, Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. Dillwyn; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Bourke *Jan* 22, 320

[*cont.*

*Turkey*—Commons—*cont.*

*The Eastern Question—Negotiations for Peace*

*Despatches of January* 4, 8, *and* 10, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, Mr.
238] Bourke *Jan* 24, 373

*Proposed Terms of Peace*, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Jan* 24, 374

*The Dardanelles—The Conditions of Peace*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 12, 1535

*The Russian Conditions of Peace*, 1877, Questions, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 12, 1536

*The Eastern Question—The Terms of Peace*

Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 25, 300; *Feb* 26, 379; Question, Captain Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 28, 449; Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir William Fraser; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, 637; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 7, 876; Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1045; Question, Mr. J. Goldsmid; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 19, 1595

*The Eastern Question*

*The Treaties of* 1856 *and* 1871, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 1, 536

*Treaties of London and Paris*, 1841, 1856, *and* 1871—*The British Fleet*, Notice, Mr. Watkin Williams *Mar* 15, 1394

*P.P. Turkey, No.* 16

239] *Russia and England*, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *Mar* 29, 247

*Ministerial Statement*, Questions, Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 16, 1374

*The Eastern Question—Treaty of San Stefano*

*Russia and Turkey*, Question, Mr. Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 28, 117; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 29, 201; Question, Mr. Courtney; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 25, [238] 1957; Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, [241] 2056

*Retrocession of Bessarabia*, Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 2, 412; Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 3, 476; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 4, 527

[*cont.*

**Wyndham, Hon. P. S.,** *Cumberland, W.*
- County Government, 2R. [237] 1667
- Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1862
- Manchester Corporation Water, 2R. [237] 1530
- Metropolis—Union of Benefices Act, [239] 1370
- Northern Circuit—Assizes, [240] 38
- Solway Commissioners, [240] 262
- Supplementary Estimate, Personal Explanation, [237] 1059; Motion for Adjournment, 1060

**Wynn, Mr. C. W. W.,** *Montgomeryshire*
- Law and Justice—Assizes and Quarter Sessions, [240] 1604
- Ordnance Survey, [240] 256

**Yeaman, Mr. J.,** *Dundee*
- Customs—Wine Duties, Motion for a Select Committee, [238] 580
- Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Comm. [242] 620; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 621; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 623
- Factories and Workshops, Comm. *add. cl.* [238] 604
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Committee, [239] 474

**Yeaman, Mr. J.**—*cont.*
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [241] 1045
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [237] 430; Comm. *cl.* 33, [240] 1697; Consid. *add. cl.* [241] 640
- Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [240] 693

**York, Archbishop of**
- Ecclesiastical Benefices, Address for a Royal Commission, [238] 954, 970

**Yorke, Mr. J. R.,** *Gloucestershire, E.*
- County Government, 2R. [237] 1660
- Declaration of Paris, Res. [238] 1908
- Highways, Comm. Amendt. [241] 451; *cl.* 1, 465; *cl.* 4, 468; *cl.* 8, 472; *cl.* 18, 889; *add. cl.* 1154, 1157, 1160; Consid. *add. cl.* Amendt. [242] 197
- Poor Law—Compensation Allowances to Union Officers, [240] 1341
- Supplementary Estimate, [237] 1281
- Valuation of Property, Comm. [240] 1504, 1624

**Young, Mr. A. W.,** *Helston*
- Dental Practitioners, 2R. [237] 1992, 1993; Comm. *cl.* 22, Amendt. [240] 1319, 1321
- Dublin Tramways, 2R. [239] 24, 32, 34

## ERRATA.

In Vol. [239], page 1904, line 14 from bottom, *for* (Mr. Gregory) *read* (Mr. Osborne Morgan.)

In Vol. [240], page 983, lines 30 and 31 from top, *for* "Denbigh Boroughs (Mr. Watkin Williams)," *read* "Denbigh (Mr. Osborne Morgan)."
Line 11 from bottom, *for* "the Denbigh Boroughs," *read* "Denbigh."

In Vol. [241], page 1793, line 6 from top, for "England," *read* "India."

---

END OF VOLUME CCXLII., AND SIXTH AND LAST VOLUME OF SESSION 1878.

---

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

Gr